

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: JOHN ROBINSON, JAMES MEADORS, LUDA SOBCHUK,
KARO WHEELER (ALTERNATE)
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: TORY PARISH, LAWRENCE COURTNEY



MEETING RESULTS
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

November 22, 2021 4:30 P.M. virtually via Zoom Webinar

- 1. 289 King Street - - TMS # 457-04-04-105/309 to 320 BAR2021-000654**
Request conceptual approval of previously approved design (now expired) for a clerestory, rooftop apartment, and amenity use at rear of the building previously approved on November 10, 2015.
Not Rated | Height District 3 & 6 | c. 1900 | Old and Historic District
Owner: 289 King Street LLC & 289-291 King Street of Charleston LLC
Applicant: Tara Romano / Neil Stevenson Architects

MOTION: Conceptual Approval

MADE BY: Meadors / SECOND: Wheeler VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. The project received Conceptual Approval November 10, 2015. Since then, extensions were filed, but lapsed after December 31, 2019.
2. No changes have been made to the previously approved submittal set.
3. The most visible part of the project will be from a small portion of Liberty Street, and this elevation of the new portion features well-balanced glazing and siding to counter play with the monolithic brick structure below.

Staff Recommendation:
Approval of Conceptual Design

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

-
- 2. 20 Ehrhardt Drive - - TMS # 460-15-01-023 BAR2021-000655**
Request final approval of demolition of structure.
Medical District | c. 1964 | Old City District
Owner: Medical University of South Carolina
Applicant: Jake Beck / LFK Architects, LLC

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

November 22, 2021

Page | 2

MOTION: Approval of demolition of the structure

MADE BY: Meadors / SECOND: Sobchuk VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. The building is found to be unremarkable and with no real character-defining elements.
2. Any grand trees on site will need to be addressed by TRC.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval for demolition

Board Comments:

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

3. 28 Ehrhardt Drive - - TMS # 460-15-01-024 BAR2021-000656

Request final approval of demolition of structure.

Medical District | c. 1960 | Old City District

Owner: Medical University of South Carolina

Applicant: Jake Beck / LFK Architects, LLC

MOTION: Approval for demolition of this structure

MADE BY: Meadors / SECOND: Wheeler VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. While Staff is reluctant to encourage demolition of anything historic, we find this building to be unremarkable with few character-defining features.
2. Any grand trees on site will need to be addressed by TRC.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval for demolition

Board Comments:

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

4. 1080 & 1090 Morrison Drive - - TMS # 461-09-03-003 BAR2020-000131

Request approval of mock-up panel for new construction of an office building with ground floor retail and parking deck.

East Central | Historic Corridor District

Owner: 1074 Morrison LLC

Applicant: Zach Carman / The Middleton Group

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

November 22, 2021

Page | 3

NOTE: The Board convened at the address on Friday, November 19, 2021 for a site visit at 4:00 pm.

(Karo Wheeler recuses.)

MOTION: Approval of the Mock-Up incorporating all Board and Staff comments with Final Approval by Staff.

MADE BY: Meadors / SECOND: Sobchuk VOTE: FOR 3 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. Previous Board motion was for a reworking of the metal parts. The workmanship on these items has improved.
2. Staff agrees with the use of the darker color at the lintel over the slate panel.
3. All vinyl siding-like J-molds on metal panels should be eliminated.
4. Provide sealant at ends of the sill flashing.
5. Staff has long advocated that flashing should be as inconspicuous as possible, and therefore, flashing should be minimized, should have hemmed edges, and should be held as tightly against the building's exterior surface as possible, and should match the color of the adjacent primary building materials.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval with Board and Staff comments

Board Comments:

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

5. 741 Meeting Street - - TMS # 463-12-02-020/021/022 BAR2021-000657

Request approval of mock-up panel for new mixed-used structure.

East Central | Historic Corridor District

Owner: Middle Street Partners / MSP 741 Meeting LLC

Applicant: Craig Clements / Sottile & Sottile

NOTE: The Board convened at the address on Friday, November 19, 2021 for a site visit at 4:30 pm.

(Karo Wheeler recuses.)

MOTION: Approval of the Mock-Up with Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: Meadors / SECOND: Sobchuk VOTE: FOR 3 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. Extend the dark paint over the opening in the stucco portion to indicate the full beam flange as the lintel.

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

November 22, 2021

Page | 4

2. Staff has long advocated that flashing should be as inconspicuous as possible, and therefore, flashing should be minimized, should have hemmed edges, and should be held as tightly against the building's exterior surface as possible, and should match the color of the adjacent primary building materials.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval with Board and Staff comments

Board Comments:

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

6. 530 Meeting Street - - TMS # 459-05-01-024 BAR2021-000660

Appeal of Staff decision to limit signage.

East Side | Historic Corridor District

Owner: Greystar Summit

Applicant: Andrew Bonner / Positive Signs, LLC dba Signarama of Charleston

DEFERRED BY STAFF

7. 595 King Street - - TMS # 460-08-02-019 BAR2021-000661

Appeal of Staff decision to limit signage.

Cannonborough/Elliottborough | Old and Historic District

Owner: Greystar Hoffler Place

Applicant: Andrew Bonner / Positive Signs, LLC dba Signarama of Charleston

DEFERRED BY STAFF

8. 176 Concord Street - - TMS # 459-00-00-009/091 BAR2021-000658

Request preliminary review of façade enhancements with Final Review by Staff.

French Quarter | Height District 56/30V | Old City District

Owner: Leaucadia Coast Properties

Applicant: Nathan Schutte / McMillan Pazdan Smith Architecture

MOTION: Preliminary Approval with Board and Staff comments, Final Review by Staff, and Deferral of site work.

MADE BY: Sobchuk / SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. No objections are made to the proposed building modifications.
2. All site work and site changes including the altered design of the park between the boardwalk and hotel are deferred for a new TRC review and determination of BAR purview.
3. At the north elevation of the pool terrace, we suggest stacked balconies for consistency with the west wall.
4. Provide shutter hardware, to include hinges, dogs, and locking devices.

Staff Recommendation:

Preliminary Approval with Board and Staff comments, Final Review by Staff, and Deferral of site work.

Board Comments:

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

9. 609 King Street - - TMS # 460-08-02-015

BAR2021-000518

Request final approval for partial demolition, stabilization, and relocation of the structure.

Category 0 | Cannon/Elliottborough | c. 1925-1935 | Old and Historic District

Owner: Evening Post Publishing Co.

Applicant: Richard Gowe / LS3P

MOTION: Approval with Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: Meadors / SECOND: Wheeler VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. Our understanding of the previous Board motion is the intent to save and also to have exposed 25' or double the previously proposed depth. Board should clarify if the remnant is required to be a fully expressed element once relocated and part of a new design.
2. Regarding the proposed relocation and any potential contingency plan needed, the Applicant has indicated that HABS quality documentation, with measured drawings and photographs, has been completed in order to reconstruct the façade if necessary.
3. Approval for partial demolition is to be contingent on the approval of a new building for this location.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval with Board and Staff comments

Board Comments:

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

10. 635 King Street -- TMS # 460-08-02-010 to 013/110/112/113/117 BAR2021-000636

Request conceptual approval for a 240-unit apartment building with ground floor retail. Request also includes extra height at the ground floor and an extra floor through architectural merit.

(Courier Square Phase 2, Building 1)

Cannonborough/Elliottborough | Height District 4 & 7 | Old and Historic District

Owner: Ron Owens / Evening Post Industries Inc.

Applicant: Dylan Towe / LS3P

MOTION: Denial incorporating Board and Staff comments; to explore a single style expression; denial for general architectural direction; and denial of an additional floor based on architectural merit.

MADE BY: Wheeler / SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. A multiple expression building can work in this location on King Street. However, there are too many architectural expressions on this building. As we wrap the corners of the King Street elevation, there are additional expressions, and these are problematic. The nature of Charleston buildings is narrow frontage with depth into the block. The north and south facades of this building, as proposed, present multiple expressions where multiple buildings would not be constructed, as these elevations are not street-facing but interior to the block. Implement three expressions or fewer on King Street and continue these, meaningfully, into the interior of the block to authentically wrap, at a minimum, the four and seven/eight story massing portions.
2. Alternatively, use one architectural expression. The challenge of making this appear as three buildings when the finished floors and heights align would be mitigated in a single expression, while massing modulation would be just as important.
3. Regarding the industrial expression,
 - a. While the architectural language is not inappropriate, "industrial", as a label, might be inappropriate for this portion of King Street. This street did include some warehouses, such as the Morris Sokol warehouse, but industrial buildings were not present.
 - b. Omit the classical balustrade.
 - c. Decrease the height of the top center allowing the towers to be the taller elements.
 - d. Omit the crenellation of the tower elements.
 - e. Break the large glass panels at the storefront into two smaller parts.
4. Regarding the transitional expression,
 - a. Raise the center so that the "shelf" created above the fourth floor at King Street is broken.
 - b. Raise the center above the eighth floor so there is less uniformity across the top of the multiple expressions.
 - c. Revise the fenestration within the heavy frame at the center of the first and second floors as it is not cohesive.
5. Regarding the classical expression,
 - a. Revise the ground floor storefront bays to be the same or symmetrical rather than have the northmost bay different while the expression presents symmetry to King Street.
 - b. Refine the language to be consistent vertically. The top floor features detailing somewhat inconsistent with the remainder of the building and should be restudied.
6. Regarding the north and south elevations,
 - a. Reduce the number of expressions.
 - b. Arched windows are used in an inconsistent manner and should be restudied.

- c. Omit the combination of clapboard siding over a rusticated base. This portion should be revised to coordinate with the King Street expression.
- d. Consider accessible unit entries from the alley at the south.
- 7. At the five-story building portion on the west,
 - a. Take steps to further unify the north/south and west elevations in an effort to make the three elevations of this portion more cohesive.
 - b. Confirm the size of the windows, as these appear large for the residential nature of this building.

Staff Recommendation:

Denial, with Board and Staff comments, for general architectural direction and height. The building is not found to achieve architectural merit to receive an eighth story.

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