



City of Charleston  
Design Review Board  
Minutes  
January 3, 2022  
4:30 p.m.

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held at 4:30 p.m. on Monday, January 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2022 virtually (via Zoom) and adjourned at 6:19 p.m.

**Notice** of this meeting was sent to all local news media.

**Board members present:** Erica Chase (Chairperson), Andy Smith, Dinos Liollo, Erin Stevens, Stephanie Tillerson, Ashley Jackrel, and Ben Whitener

**Staff members present:** David Meeks, Alison Hill DeLong, & Andrea Derungs

Chair called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m., introduced Board members and Staff and explained protocol for the meeting.

The following applications were considered:

*(NOTE: Unless otherwise remarked, Chair voted all items, Copy of complete staff comments/recommendations are attached. Copies of all recusals/letters/emails/petitions mentioned during this meeting are on file.)*

**1. 1800 Bee's Ferry Rd. - TMS# 301-00-00-027**

Request approval for a completed mock-up panel.

Owner:	Madison Capital Group (Hobie Orton)
Applicant:	Cline Design Assoc./Karen Brannon
Neighborhood/Area:	West Ashley

Presenter: Karen Brannon

Project Detail: Karen said the project used typical 30-year architectural shingles. The metal accent roof was similar in color to the downspouts and gutters. The railing color was a deep chocolate brown. The column style and scale was the same on the covered entries and balcony porches. They used two different colors and sizes for siding. In the picture that wrapped around the side of the building, you saw the smaller sized siding. There was a flat panel utilized between the windows on the front elevation. The brick base trim would only be used on the club house. The style and color of the windows was an accurate representation of what they would be using, but they would be larger. She said the metal accent roof would be used on top of the entry canopies, and railings would be on every balcony, as well as on the open breezeways. Columns were also utilized on every balcony and entry canopy. The tan siding and panels were utilized at the entry points, while the white siding and board and batten was used throughout the rest. Dinos was concerned about the raw edge on the hardy board and asked if they had used it before. Karen said they had used it before, and it was a common detail they had used on other projects. They hadn't had any problems with it, even on the coast.

Public Comment: N/A

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the mock-up panel.

Board Comment(s)/Action: Ben said there were two different cuts at the bottom of the eve. He said that was something to pay attention to. Where the gutter meets the fascia, it was two different width cuts.

MOTION: Approval, with staff comments # 1-3.

MADE BY:  BW  SECOND:  AJ  VOTE: FOR  7  AGAINST  0

**2. 1426 Meeting St. - TMS# 464-14-00-121**

Request approval for a completed mock-up panel.

Owner:	Cohn Construction
Applicant:	Bello Garris Architects/ Nick Galzia
Neighborhood/Area:	Peninsula - UP

Presenter: Nicholas Galizia

Project Detail: Nick said the mock-up panel really showcased the shou sugi ban and entry condition. The primary façade had a glazing with infill metal. The canopy was for reference, but only happened on the parking lot side of the building. The shou sugi ban was oriented in different patterns across the elevations. They had also included a clear stain version of the siding in the entry cutaways on the SW corner of the building. A lot of emphasis was put on aligning the fasteners of the elevation for the siding. The weather barrier was black, so it would be black in between the gaps of the siding. The siding transitioned to a metal channel on the corners between the clear stain and black shou sugi ban. Dinos asked if the fasteners would appear that way. Nick confirmed they would. Dinos asked if the joint in the metal canopy could be avoided. Nick said the canopies were pre-manufactured, but he would speak with the contractor about tightening it up. Ben asked if it was their intent to have gaps between the boards, exposing the AWB. Nick said the gap was 3/8 of an inch, so it wasn't as big as it looked. Ben said he thought it had to be concealed from UV. Nick said they had a weather barrier.

Public Comment: N/A

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the mock-up panel.

Board Comment(s)/Action: N/A

MOTION: Approval, with staff comments # 1 and 2.

MADE BY:  DL  SECOND:  BW  VOTE: FOR  6  AGAINST  0

Erin Stevens was recused from this item.

**3. 334 Folly Rd. - TMS# 424-05-00-028, 029, 030**

Request final approval for a new Refuel gas station, convenient store, and car wash.

Owner:	Refuel Operation Co., Inc.
Applicant:	Graham Group Architecture/Christopher Friend

Neighborhood/Area: James Island

Presenter: Chris Friend

Project Detail: Chris said they had received comments about the gas canopy and the store's roof along the lower façade at their last presentation. They had flushed up the rear portion of the roof, and the gas canopy now had a shed roof. Ben asked if the carwash orientation had changed. Chris said it had. They had gone back and forth on that, and the final consensus had been to have all the buildings oriented the same way. Dinos said there had been a lot of discussion regarding the gas canopy, but it felt like it was screaming to be a gabled roof and match the others on site. Chris said he had presented a gabled version, but the owners preferred the shed roof since it most closely mimicked their trademark canopy.

Public Comment: N/A

Staff Recommendation: Final approval with the condition to submit a revised landscape plan to staff addressing the staff comments.

Board Comment(s)/Action: Dinos said the project was a model for others to use in the future, but he was still stuck on the canopy. Due to its scale and size, it screamed to be a gabled roof and match the other two on site. He said it was a significant component to the site and, architecturally, it made more sense as a gabled roof. Chris said putting a gable on the gas canopy would make it larger than the ones on the store and car wash. Dinos asked if they were in a position to waive the requirement of a mock-up panel. Andy said it was at their discretion. David confirmed they were. Dinos recommended waiving it from a conservation and sustainability standpoint and also because of the simplicity of the project. Stephanie asked Dinos for his final thoughts on the canopy. He said he thought it still needed to be a gable, even in light of Chris' comment. David asked if it would be as simple as raising the lower pitch to meet the other one. Dinos said that would be the simple solution. Ben said he agreed that the fuel canopy drew the eye and seemed foreign. He agreed with Dinos and said that raising it to be a low slope gable would match the car wash. He also encouraged the architect to make sure the woven corners were done correctly. David asked if changing the gas canopy would require the applicant to come back to the board, or if staff approval would be sufficient. Dinos said he would be satisfied with staff approval if the lower pitch was raised to meet the eave of the upper canopy.

MOTION: Final approval, with staff comments # 1, 2 and 3. And Board comments to submit to staff a final set showing the gas canopy as a true gable. No mock up panel is required for this project.

MADE BY: DL SECOND: AJ VOTE: FOR 7 AGAINST 0

- 4. 3486 – 3492 Maybank Hwy. - TMS# 279-00-00-055, 056, 057**  
Request conceptual approval for a new multi-family development.

Owner:	Hamlet at Maybank, LLC
Applicant:	Steve Farmartino
Neighborhood/Area:	Johns Island

Presenter: Steve Farmartino

Project Detail: Steve said many of the comments from their previous presentation had been addressed, but the one he wanted to mention was the clubhouse orientation. They had added 3D renderings to give context to the building orientations and landscape. When you came in off Maybank Hwy., the clubhouse was directly ahead. They didn't feel that not having the clubhouse exactly aligned with the road took away from the feel or look of the community. During the initial site planning, they had worked with many agencies about zoning and tree variances. There were several grand trees immediately to the right of the clubhouse and a large live oak directly to the rear. The space behind the clubhouse would include a pool and grilling area. He mentioned they also hadn't added a masonry water table, in spite of board comments, because they felt masonry wouldn't harmonize with the look and feel they were going for. One new update they had added was a second story porch to the 3-story units, which he thought helped pull the façade together. Dinos asked if they had attempted any reorientations of the clubhouse. Steve said they had, but with all the restrictions in place, this is what they ended up with, even though they'd probably come up with 50 different concepts. Dinos said he appreciated the design of the clubhouse and asked if there was anything more than the trees dictating its orientation. Steve said the connections from Maybank Hwy. and into Hayes Park, and how they related to the grand trees, dictated where the roads went. He said the grand trees were the most restrictive in terms of circulation and road design. Dinos asked if rotating the clubhouse to be more parallel with the road would also create issues. Steve said doing that would start detaching the pool area from the clubhouse. He said they were also pinched with the units to the north and the grand trees. He said they had explored it, but rotating it 30 degrees wouldn't bring much change.

Public Comment: N/A

Staff Recommendation: Deferral.

Board Comment(s)/Action: Andy said the concerns he had from last time, including the orientation of the clubhouse, had not been addressed. He didn't think it had moved forward from last time. He liked the architecture, and a lot of care had been given to the clubhouse, so it was a shame that you moved right past and didn't see it. He understood that the applicant had studied several iterations, but the board hadn't seen those iterations. He agreed with staff's comments and thought that the 3D renderings proved his point that some of the pods were congested. Dinos said he was confident that a solution could be found, but he was disappointed that they hadn't seen any other proposed designs for the orientation. He said there appeared to be better opportunities to engage the façade of the clubhouse. Stephanie asked Erin and Andy what they thought of the landscape. Andy said the landscape still needed a lot of work, specifically in species selection. He said they needed to settle the broader site design issues first. He said the great thing about cottage-style developments was that they weren't as dependent on streets as normal housing developments were, so they could work around the existing grand trees. Andy said his firm was working on this type of development, so he understood the difficulties of working on them, but he also knew the kind of opportunities they engendered. Erica said she agreed with Dinos and Andy. Although the applicant had been working on this for a year, it was only the second time the board had seen it. She asked to see the iterations they had worked through for the orientations of the clubhouse. David said he didn't see the existing trees on the landscape plan. Erin said they were faint, but they needed to be more clearly defined. She said that for a project like this, with so many structures, the landscape was an opportunity to add cohesion and tie everything together. She thought there were places with almost too many varieties. If they had a more unified planting palette, it would help tie it together. Andy asked if more mass planting was the way to go. She said it could be, but she felt the overall plan was cluttered and busy.

MOTION: Deferral, with staff comments # 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6. And Board comments, for the landscape and architecture to be more cohesive to unify the project through a simplified material pallet. 2) To reiterate what was said at the last Board meeting: The clubhouse should be as prominent as possible relating to scale and mass of the project. And to restudy the congestion/density of Pods 6, 7, 11, 12.

MADE BY: DL SECOND: ST VOTE: FOR 7 AGAINST 0

**5. 1475 Folly Rd. - TMS# 334-00-00-048**

Request preliminary approval for a new automotive repair shop.

Owner:	1475 Folly Road LLC
Applicant:	LeCraw Engineering, Inc.
Neighborhood/Area:	James Island

Presenter: Thomas Dugan, Dana King, Larry Lesser

Project Detail: Thomas said the site plan was similar to what it was at the previous presentation. They had removed the front canopy along Folly Road, added pervious pavers, and shifted the sidewalk connection to the multi-use path. They had also added some extra measures for stormwater. They had two infiltration areas that were connected by equalizer pipe. Their utility plan hadn't changed, and all the utilities were still underground. Larry said landscape changes corresponded to site plan changes, and they had added Sabal Palms along the north side of the building, like the board requested. Dana said they had removed the wrap around porch and now just had a gabled canopy over the entry. The bays were grouped in 3s with the roof line moving up and down over them. The light fixtures were revised, per staff recommendations, and the exposed rafter tails were extended so that they would be more prominent. The overhang would be 2.5ft. She said the color palette and materials were still the same. She said they included another rendering with a flat roof since there had been a lot of concern at the last meeting about the building not fitting into the industrial area. She personally felt like the gabled roof fit in better with the neighboring church and its gabled roof, but she wanted to present both options. Ben asked if they had studied the fenestrations of the Folly Road façade. Dana said the fenestrations on the office portion presented a symmetrical design with the same pack of three, which was similar to the garage portion. She said the interior played a part in the window layout, too, and the small window in the center was actually in the restroom since there was a limited amount of wall space for her to work with. The fixtures on the back also worked in sets of three to keep with the theme.

Public Comment: N/A

Staff Recommendation: Deferral.

Board Comment(s)/Action: Ben said he agreed with staff comments. The office space didn't work aesthetically with the building. Personally, he liked the sloped roof over the flat roofs, but he said the office part needed more study. He suggested possibly removing the overhang at the entry. Dinos suggested breaking it down to the simplest format. The general massing was successful. Even though the building was a smaller product, its impact on other projects coming forward in the Rethink Folly Road district would be significant. He said it was a comfortable expression of volumes, but it broke down when the fenestrations were applied. He believed the key was understanding the fenestrations in 80% of the building. For example, it went from a strong horizontality with the bay doors to a series of windows that were very residential. A simple movement would be to pick up the horizontality that was already expressed. He was curious about the exposed rafter tails. It felt like it was mixing languages. He suggested removing the fenestration from the office area and the gabled entry, and going from there. Andy said he agreed. He understood where the applicant was coming from, but the addition of stone to the drainage basin and the removal of the vegetation from the bottom was a digression. He thought the whole project was moving backwards and that there was the need to really stop and restudy the project. Dinos said the bones were good, in terms of the proportions and volumes, but it broke down with the translation from the bays to office space. Erica said she agreed. It was good with the 3 bays. Andy said he knew it was a functional site, but the challenge was making it more than just a functional site. Dinos

said they could pick up the horizontality of the bays with louvers. He said the problem with the renderings was you couldn't get a sense of depth. He said there was the opportunity to create greater recesses, and he could do without the bathroom window. He said they had provided conceptual approval with the hopes that they could come back with changes to the front portion. That hadn't happened.

MOTION: Deferral, with staff comments # 2, and 3. Board comments, 1) the Board embraces the volumetric study of the building but where the building design falls apart is at the translation of fenestration at the office area. When a resubmittal is developed, use the fenestration language of the garage bays to inform the fenestration in the office. 2) Reinforce the language of the building by omitting the exposed rafter tails. 3) Restudy and develop the landscape plan along with the evolution of the building and the addition of the stone drainage basin.

MADE BY: DL SECOND: AS VOTE: FOR 7 AGAINST 0

**6. Approval of the minutes from the 12.6.21 DRB meeting.**

MOTION: Approval.

MADE BY: AS SECOND: ST VOTE: FOR 7 AGAINST 0

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:19 p.m.

Submitted by Andrea Derungs  
Clerk of Council's Office