

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: JOHN ROBINSON (Chairperson), SEATON BROWN,
JAMES MEADORS, LUDA SOBCHUK, JAY WHITE
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: TORY PARISH, LAWRENCE COURTNEY



MEETING RESULTS
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

March 23, 2022 4:30 P.M. virtually via Zoom Webinar

1. Approval of Minutes from March 9, 2022, Meeting

MOTION: Approval

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

2. Revise the Order of the Agenda to allow 63 Columbus Street – Application for Partial Demolition and 63 Columbus Street – Application for Conceptual Review to move items 3 and 4.

MOTION: Motion to change the order

MADE BY: Meadors / SECOND: Sobchuck VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

3. 63 Columbus Street - - TMS # 459-09-02-152/153/168 BAR2022-000762

Request final approval for partial demolition of the Wilmot J. Fraser Elementary School.

Not Rated | East Side | c. 1956 | Old City District

Owner: Charleston County School District

Applicant: Andy Clark, AIA / Liollio Architecture

NOTE: The Board convened at this address on Tuesday, March 22, 2022, at 4:30pm for a site visit.

MOTION: Final Approval for partial demolition with Staff comments and Board comment related to the portals.

MADE BY: Sobchuk / SECOND: Brown VOTE: FOR 3 / AGAINST 1
(Jay White recuses.)

Staff Comments:

1. Ordinance section 54-240, paragraph b states, "In reviewing an application to demolish, or demolish in part, or remove, or alter the exterior architectural appearance of any existing structure, the Board of Architectural Review shall consider, among other things, the

- historic, architectural and aesthetic features of such structure, the nature and character of the surrounding areas, the historic or culturally important use of such structure and the importance to the city.”
2. Wilmot J. Fraser Elementary was an equalization school and was an important neighborhood anchor serving several generations of citizens, many of which still reside nearby.
 3. The building features mid-century detailing emphasizing horizontal elements, cast stone entry portals and window surrounds, deep overhangs, and symmetry around a nicely scaled courtyard and main entry.
 4. The existing windows are not original and do not match the grid of the original windows.
 5. The existing facility will not adequately accommodate the Early College High School program. The building requires seismic retrofitting and is ill equipped for use with its narrow corridors and low ceiling heights.
 6. The proposed partial demolition saves a large portion of the façade allowing the ability to maintain the original front elevation and courtyard arrangement, making a balance of history and progress.
 7. Salvage historic material as much as possible for reuse.

Staff Recommendation:

Final Approval for Partial Demolition with Board and Staff comments

Board Comment:

- Board member asks question regarding neighborhood meetings with Applicant response.
- Believe the building needs to be built and no question about demand. Short an engineering report and can't see deficiencies during site visit. Engineering report would be an objective report detailing any deficiencies.
- Based on Applicant presentation, even had a structural report been included, the structure seems to be very different from the prior school this board reviewed in that there is unreinforced cmu and could be seismic issues is preserved as-is. Preserving the front is sides is positive. Though would agree with HCF in recommendation to preserve the entry portals on the sides. Otherwise support with staff comments.
- Commendable that so many members of the public are in attendance. Also commend that Applicant for going to such great lengths to maintain the historic façade of the structure. Can't speak to engineering or seismic reinforcement, but acknowledge Staff comments regarding retrofitting and being ill-equipped for use. Would be in favor.
- Having attended equalization schools, can remember their characteristics, and it was noticed during the site visit that this school had some upgrades not found on those in the rural part of the state, such as lead and copper gutters and downspouts. Understand the drawbacks the building has as an educational facility in its current configuration. Applicant has listened to public, and partial demo with preserving the most visible façade is a good compromise. Share Board Member's concern regarding exclusion of structural report but this may not be a deal breaker.
- Board discussion regarding knowledge from an engineering report but whether this would impact the decision.

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

Request conceptual approval of support building for Early College High School on the site of Fraser Elementary, incorporating the existing Fraser Columbus Street façade as well as new construction.

East Side | c. 1956 (existing) | Height District 2.5-3 | Old City District
Owner: Charleston County School District
Applicant: Andy Clark / Liollo Architecture

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: Meadors / SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0
(Jay White recuses.)

Staff Comments:

1. The proposed building is more compact than the original footprint allowing for more open space.
2. The proposed new construction takes architectural cues from and pays respect to the original building and saved facades through brick detailing, window proportions, entry door colors, and signage fonts.
3. The replacement and new windows in the historic portion feature a grid that matches the original windows.
4. The proposed site plan limits the areas of fencing and pulls fencing from the street edge in a tasteful and limited manner.
5. The new construction portion over the existing gives more appropriate prominence to the school as opposed to the existing's low profile, and this allows for a sensitive and thoughtful weaving together of the new and existing portions.
6. Staff recommends Applicant to continue working with neighborhood groups on proposed commemoration elements planned to be included within the building.

Staff Recommendation:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

Board Comment:

- New part of this building is elegant, modest, and subordinate to the historic façade with Staff comments presented. No issue with the solid parts because brings balance to this façade. Issue with clerestory at front is a bit too industrial and doesn't play with the front façade. Otherwise in full support of conceptual presentation.
- Nice to have a project on a large lot space which does not tax the height, scale, and mass or overwhelm the neighborhood. A project that is new which uses less footprint than the existing or than allowed is noteworthy.
- Proposed building talks to the historic building and works well with the Trident campus. Part of the cost is due to the referenced underground drainage which is costly but benefits the community.
- Agree on Hampstead Square side that façade needs to be reviewed. If multi-purpose room could have additional light by extending the windows would be appropriate. At opposite side, the blank wall needs to be disrupted in some way, whether architecturally or with a mural.

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

5. 651 Meeting Street - - TMS # 461-16-02-061 BAR2020-000218

Request final approval of mock-up panel for mixed-use multifamily project.

New Construction | East Central | Historic Corridor District

Owner: Madison Capital Group

Applicant: Tony Giuliani / Goff D'Antonio Associates

NOTE: The Board convened at this address on Tuesday, March 22, 2022, at 4:00pm for a site visit.

MOTION: Approval of Mock-up with Board and Staff comments noted in accordance with Staff recommendation.

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR 3 / AGAINST 1
(Seaton Brown abstains.)

Staff Comments:

1. All exposed fasteners are to be eliminated.
2. Extraneous metal panel parts are to be eliminated, and all metal panel parts are to have the same factory finish.
3. Flood vents, sealants around windows and doors, lintels and any exposed MEP items in brick are to be painted the generalized brick/mortar blended color. Sealant around windows at metal panels is to match the metal panels.
4. The materials palette for this project is extremely simple and limited.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval of Mock-Up with Board and Staff Conditions noted, with materials allowed to be ordered and with Staff to work closely with Applicant as the elements go up on the building to ensure the appropriate quality and assembly of materials.

Board Comment:

- Was at mock-up site visit and agree with Staff comments.
- Second previous Board Member's comments.
- Questions for specific conditions found on mock-up but Applicant confirms that these will not occur on the building. Mock-up should show what is on the building.
- Sympathetic to the situation of supply chain issues for working out this mock-up.
- Mock-up is beneficial for design and building team as learning tool.
- Having seen many mock-ups, recognize when the range of issues becomes narrow enough to trust Staff to handle the remaining. This one is down to few materials and a small number of issues. Comfortable turning it over to Staff.
- On-site team during visit was responsive and seemed to understand the issues and criticisms.

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

6. 194 Cannon Street - - TMS # 460-10-04-013 BAR2020-000761

Request final approval for wall mural on parking garage.

New Construction | Old City District

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

March 23, 2022

Page | 5

Owner: 194 Cannon Street, LLC
Applicant: Dylan Towe / LS3P

MOTION: Final Approval

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

Staff Comment:

1. Applicant was asked to implement more place-specific art for this north wall and has responded with a design by a local artist representing an important educator and legendary civil rights advocate.

Staff Recommendation:

Final Approval

Board Comment:

- Was heavily scrutinized hotel design. Part of the resolution to the design problem was the aspect of this mural. Intent of this mural has been met. Very supportive.
- Was concerned in initial applications for project was the large wall. Like it.
- Agree with fellow Board members. Need more public displays of art especially one that is appropriate for the area, history, and culture.
- Previous art for the wall did not have local context that was more than abstract. Current proposal integrates meaning and locality and responded well. Great piece of public art.

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

7. 70 (&68) Romney Street - - TMS # 461-13-01-034/033 BAR2022-000764

Request conceptual approval for exterior alterations to include stucco repair and window replacement as well as new recessed front entry, front stair, ramp, planters, parapet coping, scuppers and downspouts.

Not Rated | East Central | c. 1944-1951 | Historic Corridor District
Owner: RCB Development & 70 Romney Street LLC
Applicant: Lucas Boyd / Boyd Architects

MOTION: Final Approval with Board and Staff Comments with final Review of For Permit Drawings By Staff.

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

Staff Comments:

1. Staff appreciates the elegant simplicity of the design. The design incorporates a minimalistic approach and minimally invasive work on the existing building.
2. The massing is treated with basic forms being preserved with as few moves being made as possible resulting in a more interesting composition of two interlocking volumes and an improved entry. The majority of the new work is appropriately being focused at the building entry.

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

March 23, 2022

Page | 6

- 3. Staff questions why the storefront material filling the existing loading dock doors is not the same in terms of their muntin/lite pattern and recommends that they be made so.
- 4. Although no detail exists with this submittal package, Staff assumes necessary details will be minimalistic as well.

Staff Recommendation:

Final Approval with Board and Staff Comments with Final Review of For Permit Drawings By Staff.

Board Comment:

- Share comment regarding the two larger windows and Staff’s suggestion for these to have matching pattern. Appreciated the concise presentation.
- Also appreciate the presentation. Unusual for Applicant to seek Conceptual Approval and earn Final Approval. Familiar with the building. Proposal is considerate to the fabric and a light touch. Agree with Staff recommendation.
- Gives new life o the building.
- Dramatic improvement.

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

8. 110 Calhoun Street - - TMS # 459-13-03-020 BAR2022-000723

Request preliminary approval or Emanuel Nine Memorial, Survivor’s Garden, and site improvements.

Garden District | Old and Historic District

Owner: Emanuel African Methodists Episcopal Church

Applicant: Arianne Wolfe / DesignWorks, LC

MOTION: Preliminary Approval with Board comments and Staff comment #3 and Final Review By Staff.

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

- 1. Sides of site walls should be consistent with each other, and Staff recommends both sides to be brick.
- 2. Per policy statement, site walls are to be kept at an appropriate scale to prevent a fortress-like appearance. Additionally, Zoning restricts site walls to be no taller that 7’-0” with 8’-0” piers for residential properties. This maximum height has been maintained by BAR for commercial projects because of the relationship of commercial and residential properties. The proposed site walls are 8’-0” with 9’-0” tall piers. Lower the height of the walls and piers or demonstrate specifically where and why extra height is desired.
- 3. Up-lighting of plants, site walls, and buildings is not typically approved or recommended. Staff reserves the right to adjust lighting package based on photometric data.

Staff Recommendation:

Preliminary Approval with Board and Staff comments

Board Comment:

- Projects like this are special conditions. Project continues to evolve in the manner of its concept, and don't feel need to fiddle with it. Highly qualified design team with clear concept to execute and proceed. Agree with approval.
- Agree with previous Board member.
- Commitment to entire design by team is extraordinary.
- Great project.
- Understand the 8' at the wall and to have the desire at the Memorial Garden to have a sense of enclosure. Curious about the south side with only wrought-iron fencing. How to enclose for more privacy? Applicant explains desire for visibility on south side and potential for those on Calhoun to view it. Also respect the existing condition of ironwork.

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

-
- 9. 24 George Street - - TMS # 457-04-02-001 BAR2021-000533**
Request conceptual approval for exterior building envelope repairs to include stucco repairs, repainting, window restoration, exterior door replacement, roof repair and replacement.
Not Rated | Ansonborough | c. pre-1943 | Old and Historic District
Owner: College of Charleston
Applicant: Chris Altman / SMHa, Inc.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

-
- 10. 900 King Street - - TMS # 463-16-01-001 BAR2022-000765**
Request conceptual approval for new storm water pump station and community area.
New Construction | North Central | Height District 2.5 | Historic Corridor District
Owner: City of Charleston
Applicant: Luda Sobchuk / SGA Narmour Wright Design

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments.

MADE BY: Meadors / SECOND: Brown

VOTE: FOR 3 / AGAINST 0
(Luda Sobchuk and Jay White recuse.)

Staff Comments:

1. The materials used were chosen to be compatible with or complementary to those used on the Enston Homes. Staff believes that these are appropriate with the possible exception of the board-formed concrete and asks the Board to weigh in on the use of this concrete treatment here. Staff is unfamiliar with "Corten steel wall panels textured as brick" and would like to see a sample of this material. Staff wonders if the project might benefit from a simplified material palette.
2. The overall site layout is well conceived, will be a valuable addition to the neighborhood, and represents a public-friendly outdoor space usable by the neighborhood.
3. While the height of the main building is a bit high proportionally to accommodate programmatic needs, it not out of scale with the surrounding Enston homes.

Staff Recommendation:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff Comments with Final Review of For Permit Drawings By Staff.

Board Comment:

- Appears that orientation is the same as the Enston Homes, regarding angle. Applicant responds that end gables are the same direction but main structure is not same angle. Grateful of coordination with Green Heart group and encourage, if possible, to create a program with them. Since community space is part of this project, what does the water look like? As it will fluctuate, will it hold mildew or fungus?
- How will wall of retention pond age? Applicant explains the pump cycle and that water will always be in the pond. Pump will turn the water in the pond to keep it cleaner, and a filter removes any larger objects. Wall material and finish to be considered.
- Size considerable. Consider what the walls of the pond will look like and be handled. Like the building. Overall structure needs as much attention as any other we've reviewed.
- Does the building's exterior material provide any sound mitigation for pump noise? Applicant response that pumps will be submerged. In conjunction with PSC, the Enston Homes all have a same material language, and this is the gateway to the neighborhood along Huger, so would prefer more masonry and stone in structure rather than in hardscaping to tone down the contemporary style.
- Seems best dealt with H/S/M with the structure's requirements and effort to be sympathetic to the neighborhood. Corten steel used on many civil projects because of low maintenance, and this is something to consider for a public infrastructure project. Color palette blends in. H/S/M do not concern.

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

11. 122-124 Cannon Street - - TMS # 460-00-04-160/161 BAR2022-000705

Request conceptual approval for the renovation of two existing structures and the addition of two new residential structures at the rear of the property.

New Construction | Cannonborough/Elliottborough | Height District 2.5-3 | Old City District

Owner: Cannon St Vacation Rentals LLC

Applicant: Ashley Jennings / AJ Architects

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

12. 1142 Morrison Drive - - TMS # 461-09-01-007/008 BAR2022-000766

Request conceptual approval of a seven-story mixed-use building with 424 multi-family units and a seven-story parking structure.

New Construction | East Central | Height District 4-12 | Historic Corridor District

Owner: LMC

Applicant: Clark Batchelder / Goff D'Antonio Associates

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

March 23, 2022

Page | 9

MOTION: Denial of height, scale, mass and general architectural direction, requiring a complete restudy, encouraging a multiple building approach, and incorporating Board and Staff comments.

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Brown

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. Restudy the suggested “bend” in the north wing to shift this wing to address Morrison Drive.
2. The parking deck has been located well by being pushed to the rear with only very minimal visibility from Morrison Drive. and Brigade Street. Even with it being minimally visible, the language of the parking deck component should be more articulated to have the development read more as a cohesive whole.
3. The use of siding at balconies seems to be arbitrary, and Staff recommends the use of brick here as well.
4. There is a fenestration change in areas of the building which appear to have the same exterior finish material. It would be better if the language of the differentiated pieces followed a more clearly discernable pattern.
5. Staff could not find a call out for the undersides of the balconies. This material should be GFRC panels for durability and maintenance.
6. In some renderings the vertical support at balconies is shown as a light color. There is an opportunity here to tie in the color of these elements with other vertical elements on the building.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval of Height, Scale and Mass with comments regarding the north wing as noted and Deferral of General Architectural Direction for Re-Study with Board and Staff Comments.

Board Comment:

- For clarity, existing building is not up for debate. Upper Peninsula Zoning Ordinance was not intended to create an oppressively monotonous effect on a significant stretch of Morrison Drive. Height is wrong because it is unmodulated. Scale is wrong because the fenestration has no discernible order. Massing is wrong because and there more successful precedents nearby where the projects have been broken into multiple buildings on rather large sites. What people miss about the architecture of Charleston is that it starts with the small, modest footprint. This huge footprint snakes across the site from end to end with almost no relief despite the jogs in and out. Deserves denial for H/S/M and general architectural direction.
- Agree with previous Board member. Also, entrance is not visible and as part of the parking element, it is a fortress in a sense. Creating a building entrance is important to any building, and this one is missing. Monotony on sides. End that faces intersection of Morrison could be better addressed, so there is a sense to the corner. Typically, there is a base / main floor, and bedroom floors with differently sized and proportioned windows. The base is described in the BAR Principles, but there is disinterest in the ground floor on this building. As this is amenity space, no one will be invited to this building and will enter from the garage. The property would benefit from separate buildings complimenting each other rather than one. May need to be restudied altogether.
- Hearing from the public earlier in this meeting about lack of excitement about much of the new construction in city and how it is almost too similar, not representing the historic context even in the parts where we hope to add a bit more contemporary design, and this is a perfect example of one of those projects. Applicant mentions this is similar to other buildings which may be the problem in that this may be the same vernacular of other

- buildings that have not lived up to the standards of the BAR or of with City of Charleston citizens expect. Agree with previous Board members and hope that if project receives a full denial, Applicant goes back to drawing board
- First floor fenestration is a good start; scale is right. First floor is workable but regarding footprint of building, would agree with Staff that orientation of the wing at the north should revise. Agree in looking at first floor massing and fenestration, project would benefit from, if not a grand entrance, a centrality to pull the building together. Agree with previous Board Member that while have several large buildings have been constructed in vicinity, there is an example in The Foundry of a solution of intentionally breaking up of a large lot into several different buildings that complement each other which might be good consideration due to scale of project. Otherwise, agree with fellow Board Member comments. Mismatch of first floor to higher levels.

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