



City of Charleston  
Design Review Board  
Minutes  
August 7<sup>th</sup>, 2023  
4:30 p.m.

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held at 4:30 p.m. on Monday, August 7<sup>th</sup>, 2023, at 2 George St. and adjourned at 6:46 p.m.

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

**Board members present:** Andy Smith, Acting Chair, Dinos Liollo (left at 6:00 p.m., returned at 6:01 p.m.), Erin Stevens, Stephanie Tillerson (left at 6:00 p.m.), Lucas Boyd, and Jeff Johnston

**Staff members present:** Travis Galli, and Patrick Carlson, recording

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

### **Applications**

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. 3919 Savannah Hwy.– TMS # 285-00-00-205 | DRB2022-000140**  
Requesting preliminary approval for a new 1-story bakery with retail space

Owner:	Carl and Lillie Smalls
Applicant:	Mark A. Rawlings
Neighborhood/Area:	West Ashley

Presenter: Mark Rawlings

**Project Detail:** Mr. Rawlings said that the proposed building was a 1-story bakery that had integrated several minor suggestions from the previous DRB presentation. The primary changes included slightly raising the building, incorporated a more substantial brick base, creating a more detailed landscape plan, and eliminated a porch centered on the back area. The rest of the building and property layout was the same as the initial presentation. The landscaping plan had seen more detailed development, and the landscape architect and civil engineers were present if there were any remaining questions.

Jeff asked if there was going to be a menu board situated near the anticipated drive-thru area. Mr. Rawlings said there was going to be one situated in an appropriate spot, but did not have any details on the design and location of that feature.

Jeff asked how advanced the mechanical coordination and calculations had developed if there was going to be a larger commercial-grade hood to accommodate the anticipated range and cooking features in the kitchen. Mr. Rawlings said the necessary calculations had been applied during the building studies to ensure compliance.

Jeff asked about the intended location of the exterior trash areas because different plans in the application indicated different locations. Mr. Rawlings said that the intention was to build it on the upper right-hand side of the property and would adjust the plans accordingly.

Jeff asked if there was any intention of screening the propane tanks and mechanical units by the drive-thru. Mr. Rawlings said they looked at that and would include the necessary plans in the final application.

Public Comment: None

Staff Recommendation: Preliminary approval

Board Comments/Action: Mr. Rawlings responded to a staff recommendation and said they had included an anticipated color palate and Travis said that he believed David was asking for the applicant to declare them specifically on the renderings.

Andy asked about the width of the drive-thru. Mr. Rawlings said that he believed it was drawn to an approximate width of 15 ft. Andy said that since it was a one-way, it could be reduced to 12 ft. across and create some space for the requested screening on the back façade of the building.

Stephanie said that additional landscaping appropriately placed on the back façade could soften the perimeter of the building.

MOTION: Approval, with board comments:

1. Study screening for HVAC system
2. Provide replacements for the Red Maple, Arborvitae, and Indian Hawthorne
3. Provide design and location details of menu board
4. Provide design and location details of dumpster enclosure

MADE BY: ST SECOND: JJ VOTE: FOR 6 AGAINST 0

**2. 1518 Main Rd.– TMS # 253-00-00-078 | DRB2023-000169**

Requesting conceptual approval for the renovation to St. John’s High School stadium, concessions, and entry plaza

Owner:	Charleston County School District
Applicant:	Geoff Clever
Neighborhood/Area:	John’s Island

Presenter: TJ Helms

Project Detail: Mr. Helms said that he worked for Studio Architects, and would be presenting on behalf of the applicant. He said the site work was primarily focused on underground drainage and would be adding new landscaping along the main road, a new plaza with updated lettering by the entry to the stadium, and a seating area by the fence line. He mentioned the district did not allow vents or hoods in concessions stands so they would adjust the plan to accommodate an industrial air frying system.

Dinos asked if the graphic along Main Rd., pending district approval, would be made out of fabric or painted. Mr. Helms said that it would be printed on a more elevated windscreen product.

Erin asked how high the proposed lettering on the front façade would be and Mr. Helms said that it would start 4 ft. above the ground and end about 8 ft. above the ground.

Dinos asked if the windscreen graphic was a direct request from the district. Mr. Helms said that the district requested that the site excite people as they entered the parking area and the graphic was one element of that aspect. Dinos said that different lighting schemes could also be used to convey different things to the public.

Jeff asked if any additional fencing was going to be added. Mr. Helms said that the existing fencing was going to be replaced in some areas, with a few modifications, to align properly with the grandstand and the anticipated windscreen graphic.

Jeff asked if the turf field was going to be enclosed. Mr. Helms said that there was a fence between the turf area, the parking lot, and the track, but they were not planning to add additional fencing around the entire area.

Dinos asked if the proposed ground location of the school logo would be embossed or painted. Mr. Helms said it would be stained concrete with a brick-banded border.

Erin said that planting dwarf palmettos in front of the proposed signage would eventually block the lettering so she suggested considering different plantings.

Andy said that the Saw Palmettos should be more spread out and the site could utilize synthetic turf to accommodate a more pedestrian area with lower maintenance expectations. Erin said that they did not want to set a precedent for advocating the usage of artificial turf. Andy agreed and said it made sense in this situation but should not be considered overall precedent for future applications.

Andy suggested removing certain project details and orienting the application in a more streamlined manner before the preliminary review.

Dinos said that the proposed signage could become visually static without any additional lighting or features that could provide a greater sense of presence. He said that the space could be used to create more specific identity and branding elements.

Andy said that the square paneled areas could have LED lighting installed.

Jeff said it was weird to have the name of the school spread across two facades and addressing that element would fix the weirdness.

Lucas said that he did not mind the proposed lettering and their position and appreciated the precise intervention and improvements proposed by the project.

Public Comment: None

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval

Board Comments/Action:

MOTION: Conceptual approval, with board comments:

1. Study entry façade, layout of letters, consider back lighting, and consider additional wall uses
2. Study proposed landscape in front of entry wall to avoid design conflicts
3. Substitute Saw Palmettos with other plantings
4. Pare down plan set per submittal requirements
5. Orient all plans with the same north orientation for easier review

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

**3. 1137 Folly Rd.– TMS # 337-08-00-119 | DRB2023-000153**

Requesting conceptual approval for a new 1-story building for the Goddard Preschool

Owner:	MWC Equipment, LLC & Windsurfer Enterprises, LLC
Applicant:	AAG Architects, LLC

Neighborhood/Area: James Island

Presenter: Anish Shah

Project Detail: Mr. Shah said that he was presenting on behalf of the applicant. He said there was a non-jurisdictional wetland on one side of the property and it would be modified into a constructed wetland to accommodate the building. He said five trees were also recommended to be removed, based on their condition and conversations with adjacent property owners. The total anticipated area to be used encompassed 1.9 acres and would include the main building, a playground, staff parking, and an access point. Based on previous DRB recommendations, the applicant explored using different methods of preventing cars from going into the building. Some proposed design combinations included low retaining walls, fences, and security bollards of different shapes. He also said the landscaping would be throughout the entire property with proposed site plantings that focused on native species and outlined the constructed wetland in the middle of the site. The overall roof plan had been simplified with a low slope roof and some mechanical equipment positioned on top. The north side would be a covered screened porch area as an outdoor alternative in bad weather. The east elevation would present a brick base with every third brick protruding in order to create texture across the façade along with fiber cement siding and a standing seam metal roof. The site ultimately reflected certain elements of scale and architectural language from adjacent retail sites to create a more cohesive sense of visual community.

Lucas asked about the proposed ceiling heights. Mr. Shah said that the ceilings would be between 10 and 12 feet, depending on the classroom, and the overall roof bearing would be 16 ft. and 6 inches.

Dinos asked about the exterior protruding area between the two classrooms and Mr. Shah said that it was designed to break up the façade.

Dinos asked if it was possible to adjust the head of the windows and doors to align with each other. Mr. Shah said that it was possible.

Public Comment: None

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval

Board Comments/Action: Dinos said that he thought the elevations were evolving nicely but asked if it would be stronger to keep the line of the roof on the same level, eliminate the masonry, and push it back in order to create a stronger visual presentation.

Lucas said that he also thought the building was evolving into a very defined and clear visual but could benefit from simplifying the overall façade. He also suggested expanding the windows or introducing more awnings in order to lessen the growing forehead effect of the façade.

Jeff said the distance of the existing awnings from the windows was odd and it should be closer to the windows themselves. However, this would expand the forehead problem so the overall massing needed to be addressed.

Dinos said the canopy needed to be more delicate, simple, and evenly spaced.

Andy said the overall massing and height issues needed to be addressed before moving on to the next stage.

Dinos said the overall evolution was very positive but needed to see how the details were adjusted to fit a more finalized proposal.

MOTION: Deferral, with board comments:

1. Restudy proportionality of window trim and create more delicate window canopies
2. Study building volumes to present clarity in material selection and form

3. Study lintel heights and overall window fenestration for alignment purposes
4. Simplify the shed roof and eliminate the vertical lattice
5. Move any proposed Saw Palmettos away from pedestrian/childcare areas
6. Eliminate the bay window on the east elevation

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

**4. Pier View St. (116 and 105 Daniels Landing)– TMS # 275-00-00-114, 228 | DRB2023-000171**

Requesting conceptual approval for two new 4-story apartment buildings (Building one: 73 units, and Building two: 54 units)

Owner:	Parcel R Phase 4 Development Co, LLC
Applicant:	Housing Studio, Dmitry Lednev
Neighborhood/Area:	Daniel Island

Presenter: Chuck Travis, Brian Riley, John Winters, Carl Nalls

Project Detail: Mr. Travis said that he was the principal of the Housing Studio and, with his team, would be presenting the application. He said they were specifically presenting about Phase IV in the development of The Waterfront site on Daniel Island, focusing on two proposed apartment buildings with onsite retail and parking spaces. The proposal had one u-shaped building facing south across a pool deck to help break up the mass of the structure along the major corridor, Pier View St. The second was a more typical square shape overlooking an adjacent pond. The street between the two buildings would be utilized for trash and other community services, provide an area to move-in, and access the garages.

Mr. Riley said that he was the civil engineer for the proposal and said the site was fairly straightforward since the street layouts already existed. The completion of the site would help finalize the street network. The existing lake on the north side of the site would remain and the building would be oriented so that residents would be able to enjoy the proximity to the water and the adjacent park.

Mr. Winters said that the hardscape would consist of continuing the Daniel Island pavers along the 10 ft. wide sidewalk with planters adjacent to the parking areas that would contribute to a strong connection between the two buildings. The plan for the building areas involved planting columnar canopy trees in combination with local palms in order to bring down the scale of mass of the building.

Mr. Nalls said that the previous project phases were guiding the look and character of the proposed buildings using clean lines, simple materials, and light colors. Some of the proposed materials included light colored brick, lap siding, aluminum railings, and tabby features. He said the building had also been raised slightly to match the flood plain. The mechanical units would also be positioned on the roof of both buildings.

Jeff asked how the surrounding area informed the context that defined the building design.

Mr. Nalls said several adjacent buildings had informed their design.

Jeff asked to see how the slope of the roofs compare to the proposed buildings at a future presentation.

Lucas asked if the height differences had something to do with their flood zones.

Mr. Riley said that both buildings were in a flood zone and the second building's height was controlled by the artificial elevation of Pier View St.

Public Comment: None

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval

Board Comments/Action: Dinos said that it was an impressive proposal, but both buildings were so massive they demanded additional detailing in order to help conceptualize their place in the development.

Jeff said they were reviewing the buildings in a vacuum and needed more information about the opinions of the Daniel Island DRB and associated groups, in addition to surrounding streetscape information, to make an informed decision.

Andy said it was important to listen to other groups while not encroaching on each other's purview and precedent.

Jeff said it was difficult to understand the project context when the context is not part of the application.

MOTION: Deferral, with board comments:

1. Provide roof plans
2. Provide a streetscape plan
3. Provide enlarged building elevations
4. Substitute another plant for Drift Rose

MADE BY:   JJ   SECOND:   DL   VOTE: FOR   5   AGAINST   0  

## **Minutes**

### **1. Approval of minutes from the 7/17/23 meeting**

MOTION: Approval

MADE BY:   ES   SECOND:   LB   VOTE: FOR   5   AGAINST   0  

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:46 p.m.

Patrick Carlson  
Clerk of Council's Office