

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

May 25, 2022

4:30 P.M.

2 George Street, Public Meeting Room

1. Approval of Minutes from April 27, 2022, Meeting

MOTION: Approval

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

2. 1,3,5,7,9,11 Ashley Boulevard - - TMS # 457-11-01-039 BAR2020-000132

Request third one-year extension of conceptual approval for new construction of four single-family attached dwellings, requesting additional half floor (3rd story) based on architectural merit and context, originally granted on June 13, 2018; with first one-year extension granted on June 10, 2020.

New Construction | Charlestowne | Old and Historic District

Owner: Barnes Moultrie Ward LLC

Applicant: Tara Romano / Neil Stevens Architects

MOTION: Approval

MADE BY: Meadors / SECOND: White

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comment:

1. This is a vested right third year approval extension, requiring automatic Board approval if submitted in a timely manner, which is good for one year and may be renewed two more times in one-year increments, per Ordinance Section 54-962. This extension is to expire on June 10, 2023.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval of a third one-year extension of conceptual approval to expire on June 10, 2023.

3. 997 Morrison Drive - - TMS # 461-13-01-056

BAR2022-000795

Request appeal of Staff decision.

New Construction | East Central | Historic Corridor District

Owner: Charleston Tech Center

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

May 25, 2022

Page | 2

Applicant: Andy Bonner, Signarama

MOTION: Approval of subtle and restrained concealed exterior illumination of the Monument sign; Deferral for Restudy with Board and Staff Comments of the Blade Sign.

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR 3 / AGAINST 2

Staff Comments:

1. Staff is reviewing this signage under the General Signage Policy Statement.
2. This Policy Statement discourages the use of illuminated signage.
3. Certain locations of the Historic Corridor District such as this one are evolving quickly with new or significantly altered construction.
4. Staff believes that in this location of the District, restrained illumination of signage is acceptable considering the particular building characteristics and context.
5. The blade sign is internally lighted while the monument sign is lighted externally.
6. Lighting should be subtle and restrained to avoid hotspots and jarring conditions.
7. The blade sign needs to better match the aesthetic of the building, and the sign should be better broken up with color so as to avoid the uninteresting look of a simple uniformly lit rectangle.
8. Specific checks should be in place to avoid an unintentional approval of inappropriate signage. All illuminated signage should be approved by the City Architect.
9. All external lighting is to be white only and adjustable in order to establish an appropriate level of illumination, which once defined shall not be changed unless authorized by this Board.
10. Amendments to the General Sign Policy are recommended and presented at the end of this agenda.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval of subtle and restrained concealed exterior illumination of the Monument sign; Deferral for Restudy with Board and Staff Comments of the Blade Sign for better compatibility with the building.

Board Comments:

- No issue with monument sign; need to discuss signage for multi-tenant buildings which should be part of a wholistic signage package and approach.
- Illumination of signage which would occur after business hours is unnecessary.
- BAR has traditionally viewed signage as wayfinding device. Comfortable that monument sign identifies the building, but uncomfortable with individual blade signs for tenants.
- Monument sign identifies the building; agree with staff.
- Suggest adding "Morrison" to the sign.

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

4. 547 Meeting Street - - TMS # 459-05-01-016

BAR2020-000207

Request final approval of mock-up panel.

New Construction | Height District 5 | Historic Corridor District

Owner: TMG 547 Meeting Street LLC

Applicant: Kyra Brower / LS3P

NOTE: The Board convened at this address on Tuesday, May 24, 2022, at 4:30pm for a site visit.

MOTION: Approval of mock-up but substituting the use of GFRC.

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 1
(Luda Sobchuk recuses.)

Staff Comment:

1. All Staff and Board concerns have been clarified or addressed except for continued concerns over the durability and longevity of the GFRP at the uppermost cornice. To be clear, Staff’s concerns center not around the general comparisons between GFRP vs. GFRC, but rather the durability and longevity of the specific product itself. We are simply looking for the best product for the application and our experience informs us that, generally, GFRC is a more durable material, at least for horizontal surfaces. That said, Staff can imagine cases where specific products made from either material may be better than one made from the other. Therefore, it becomes very necessary for the Applicant to present the attributes and performance history of the specific product which they wish to use, and we have asked that they do so tonight.

Staff Recommendation:

The Board needs to be comfortable with whichever material (GFRP vs. GFRC) they believe is best and vote accordingly and specifically on this matter. Otherwise, Staff recommends Approval of the Mock-Up.

Board Comments:

- BAR has wrestled with synthetic alternatives and warmed to some, though none foolproof. Profession experience has not increased any confidence with GFRP. GFRC is the better choice here. Being out of reach isn’t the issue but what it will look like in 30 years.
- GFRP can yield a more perfect look, but not necessarily what this building needs.
- Was not on the Board for previous reviews of this project. Refer to Board colleagues for their expertise on this material for this project.
- Mock-up has improved.
- Would be willing to defer to the manufacturer’s representation of the product’s quality and durability.
- Mock-up has improved.
- Fiberglass boat hull looks great until it doesn’t. At this height, the trim won’t get cleaned.

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

5. 26 Cumberland Street - - TMS # 458-05-03-091

BAR2022-000721

Request preliminary approval for construction of a new multi-family building on a property having facades along Cumberland, State, and Linguard Streets. New building incorporates existing historic building along Cumberland Street.

French Quarter | Height District 3.5 | Old and Historic District

Owner: LP Cumberland South LLC

Applicant: Eddie Bello / Bello Garris Architects

MOTION: Preliminary Approval with Board comments and Staff comments 2 and 3, and Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 1
(Luda Sobchuk recuses.)

Staff Comments:

1. The height over the canopy at the penthouse has increased significantly. Applicant should describe what necessitates this.
2. On the renderings, at the second and third floors of the corner at Cumberland and State, the previous submittal depicted glazing which, more successfully, mimicked the glazing on the remainder of the building. Each side of the cantilevered portion depicted three vertical three-lite panels rather than a large nine-lite grid. Final version should depict three vertical panels rather than the 9-lite grid.
3. The layering of brick detailing is fundamental to this project. Details 6/A301, 6/A302, 6/A305, and 4/A306 depict a full brick length cantilevered. Consider an additional brick step at this portion of the detail.

Staff Recommendation:

Preliminary Approval with Board and Staff comments

Board Comments:

- The GFRP proposed on this project is designed to emulate metal. The product has been used successfully to emulate metal. The proposed location will permit it to be cleaned. Comfortable with Staff comments and with proposal by Applicant of Final Review by Staff.
- Watched the last meeting regarding the project. Still concerned project may be antagonist to the historic building on Cumberland. Some attempt to incorporate evident. Also concern that images from the alley are not shown which were included at last review. Additional renderings from various locations on Cumberland would be helpful.

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

6. 134 Columbus Street - - TMS # 460-08-02-006

BAR2022-000796

Request final approval for demolition of existing structures.

1950,1965–1989+/- | Not Rated | Cannon-Elliottborough | Old and Historic District

Owner: Evening Post Publishing Co.

Applicant: Richard Gowe / LS3P

NOTE: The Board convened at this address on Tuesday, May 24, 2022, at 4:00pm for a site visit.

MOTION: Final Approval for demolition. (with Board commentary relating to Staff comment 2 that demolition requests are heard on their own account and not for opportunity post demolition)

MADE BY: Brown / SECOND: White

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. The building that exists today at 134 Columbus is a conglomeration of additions related to utilitarian uses built over several decades. The existing facades do little to engage the public right-of-way and nothing to articulate an edge against King Street.
2. Demolition of the building creates opportunity to better engage King Street and the Lowcountry Lowline.
3. The original building which was constructed in 1950 was visible for only 15 years, but was a decent example of mid-century masonry architecture. Unfortunately, the character-defining features of that 1950s building, which included the blade clock over the front entry, the entry portal, and the windows, no longer exist. It is believed that the 1960s cladding of this building was done in such a manner as to make removal difficult without irreparably damaging what may remain of the older structure.
4. The 1960s addition and envelopment of the 1950s building is unremarkable mid-century utilitarian architecture of which many better examples exist.

Staff Recommendation:

Final Approval for Demolition.

Board Comments:

- Ordinance requires that we review demolitions without consideration of the future use; so staff comments 2 is irrelevant.

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

7. 77 Washington Street - - TMS # 459-13-02-004

BAR2022-000747

Request final approval for partial demolition and relocation,
c. 1857-1869 | Rated 4- | Garden District | Old and Historic District
Owner: Washington Partners LLC / 518 East Bay, LLC
Applicant: Luda Sobchuk / SGANW Design

MOTION: Final Approval for partial demolition and relocation.

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Brown

VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0
(Luda Sobchuk recuses.)

Staff Comments:

1. The building is an atypical version of the Charleston Single, specifically due to the single fenestration bay on the front. The building appears to have been significantly altered over its lifetime.
2. The building at 77 Washington became part of a three-building complex which served as the Brooks Rooming House Motel and was operated by the brother of the operator of the Morris Street Motel, an institution listed in the Green Book.
3. The rear portion, which is proposed for demolition, is not present on the 1955 Sanborn maps and, therefore, was constructed afterward.
4. Relocation of the building will provide context for this building as well as for the building at 6 Charlotte Street. Currently both of these single houses sit solo.
5. The proposed relocation would maintain appropriate orientation for the piazza of this Charleston single.

- 6. As a reminder regarding demolition, the Ordinance requires consideration of (1) historic, architectural and aesthetic features, (2) nature and character of the surrounding area, (3) historic or culturally important use of the structure, and (4) the importance to the city.

Staff Recommendation:

Final Approval for partial demolition and relocation.

Board Comments:

- Thank you to the Applicant for taking the initiative to save the building.
- Comfortable with staff’s recommendation.

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

8. 518 East Bay Street - - TMS # 459-13-02-004/005/009/010/011 BAR2022-000797

Request conceptual approval for new construction of multi-family mixed-use building.

New Construction | Height District 4 & 6 | Garden District | Old and Historic District

Owner: Washington Partners LLC / 518 East Bay, LLC

Applicant: Luda Sobchuk / SGANW Design

MOTION: Deferral for restudy with Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0
(Luda Sobchuk recuses.)

Staff Observations:

1. The pairing of the two single houses will create context for both.
2. Regarding the height and massing, the project steps down to the south side of the project, and down to three stories on the corner, which relates contextually to the area.
3. The gabled building at the intersection of Charlotte and East Bay anchors the corner, provides a focus for the entry of the main use of the building, and relates to the gabled forms of the adjacent single houses.
4. Rather than depending solely on multiple expressions, the project’s architectural languages relate to the individual building components. For example, the center portion along East Bay provides a loggia and simple and ordered fenestration, very appropriate for Charleston’s mid-rise buildings.

Staff Comments:

1. To bring interest and consistency to the blank wall portions at the north elevation, consider a facade treatment that mimics the fenestration pattern. Alternatively, this portion could be pulled off the property line in order that openings be placed in the walls. The Applicant is aware of the concern and is working on proposed solutions related to façade treatment.
2. The central recessed portion of the north elevation is flat and should be provided with additional relief through articulation and layering.
3. At the north elevation, restudy the location of the trim bands between the fourth and fifth floors. Consider relocating these to be placed between the fifth and sixth and to incorporate into the cornice of the fifth-floor portion. Restudy how the trim works on the NW corner for consistency on the west and north elevations.
4. Structures that are 6 stories or more shall be abutted by sidewalks no less than 10 feet in width (Sec. 54-306.G). Applicant to confirm the width of the sidewalk along Washington

- Street in front of the six-story portion and to adjust the massing if necessary. There is also a tight corner on the East Bay side where the landscape planter reduces the width. Adjust as needed.
5. Staff would suggest examining the width of the sidewalks at the intersection of East Bay and Charlotte. As this area is anticipated to be active, consider a continuous 10' wide sidewalk and what effect this would have on the design of the courtyard and access to it.
 6. While the pedestrian experience on Washington Street is not ideal, this portion does coincide with the industrial nature of the Columbus Terminal. Applicant should continue to study how to enhance this experience. With the current proposed mix of louvers and wired mesh, consider all louvers or consider incorporating vegetation onto the mesh.
 7. Additional renderings showing the proximity of the building to the existing house would be beneficial to the submittal package. It appears that the four-story building is placed very close to and looms over the existing house at 6 Charlotte Street. Additional breathing room may be needed.
 8. The six-story portion has a blocky appearance, which may be most evident on the north elevation. Restudy of the massing to soften it somewhat could be beneficial. Consider how some play in heights can enliven the top of the building and the skyline. Consider how breaking the parapet height might soften the overall image.

Staff Recommendation:

Deferral for restudy with Board and Staff comments

Board Comments:

- The overall strategy for development of this property will be very effective. Agree with all Staff comments, but will address comments 4, 5, and 6 as these deal with the pedestrian experience. Presence of verge is out of purview. Staff comments indicate the building ought to be set back particularly at East Bay and Washington because it feels cramped. Agree. No reason why west façade can't be square to the street. Zigs and zags which is very atypical for Charleston architecture. Think it should be made square to the street which might resolve another issue. The three-story cross gable form, which works well, abuts the four-story mass in an uncomfortable way. Squaring these up might resolve the conflict. Agree with staff recommendation.
- What is right with the building are the three- and four-story buildings. Would approve right now. Corner with Juliet balconies is well done. The covered walkway very common on broad is also practical for use. Those elements are successful. Uncomfortable with the architectural direction of the larger mass on the north side of the project. Southern end and corner are very successful in current form and how it integrates the moved building.
- Agree with previous Board commentary with exception of the zig-zag on East Bay. This is atypical but the setback allows the public to gather and an entrance to the buildings. Would like to see renderings from up and down East Bay and also from the Irish Memorial. Could be helpful to understand how it fits in the overall neighborhood. Understand this is the first bit of new to the neighborhoods. Agree on concern of future develop and it being not as appropriate for the neighborhood. Last, the height, the larger massing could come down one story and be much more appropriate. Like the glass box.
- Would add that the Washington Street pedestrian experience includes a lot of traffic and appreciative of the work being done there.

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

9. 584 Meeting Street - - TMS # 459-01-03-045

BAR2021-000581

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

New Construction | Height District 5 | East Central | Historic Corridor District

Owner: Meeting Street Acquisitions LLC

Applicant: William Rodon Hornof / 2RZ Architecture

MOTION: Preliminary Approval incorporating Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 1

Staff Comments:

1. The design responds to the Board's previous motion and the staff comments which were selected for incorporation into the Board's motion. While the massing and character of the building continue to "break the mold" of large projects in the area, there is a better sense of order to the facades and a better sense of connection between the ground floor and upper floors.
2. Some of the exterior materials proposed for the exterior are significantly atypical for Charleston. As Staff and Board have been hearing some criticism regarding the more formulaic and homogeneous large projects in this area so this change may be welcomed.
3. Regarding the proposed exterior materials, the porcelain panels can provide sharp clean edges and corners, which this design relies heavily upon. The wrapping of the panels into the reveals for the windows is critical. The windows appear to be recessed approximately 6 inches from the face of the panel. Board should determine if this is enough to achieve the feeling of depth and reveal that the design relies heavily upon.
4. The chartreuse green accents on Nassau Street are a bit jarring, but the color can be tested and reviewed during the mock-up review.

Staff Recommendation:

Preliminary Approval with Board and Staff Comments.

Board Comments:

- This project differs and breaks the mold by clearly expressing the podium that all these projects have. Has developed to express this more cleanly and concisely. Would add to staff, watch your metal work details. Charleston is infamous for poor metalwork. Watch parapet cap, lashing, trims, etc. Agree with staff recommendation.
- Applicant took to heart what Board directed previously, and project has improved. Charleston is not used to buildings of this scale that take a whole block. Successful way of addressing. Would point to this as a way to address the problem of a single building taking up a whole block.
- Many flashing details, including many with the vertical standing seam. Provide complete detail drawings. Reads like you have a layer hanging on; reads as many appealing layers of structure. Saw lights on the exterior. Not supportive of these as shown.
- Continue to like this project. Refreshing to see next century. Did a building with porcelain tile. Looking forward to seeing it.
- Fin the building antagonistic to the context of the area. What proposed is one way to do it but there are other ways. Not supportive.
- Need to see again at Board.

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

10. 1 Barre Street - - TMS # 457-07-01-030 BAR2018-000096

Request material changes and exterior alterations from previously BAR approved design.
New Construction | Height District 3 | Harleston Village | Old and Historic District
Owner: Charles on Broad LLC
Applicant: Antunovich Associates

MOTION: Approval of change from limestone to cast stone, elimination of fourth floor terraces at Barre Street elevation, widened porticos at Barre Street elevations entrances, single doors entrances at Barre Street facade, and final review by Staff of revised for-permit drawings.

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

Staff Comments:

1. Applicant has worked diligently with Staff to preserve the look and feel of the original Approved proposal.
2. Staff has asked the Applicant to be clear in the enumeration of changes and discuss the properties of proposed new materials.
3. Since embarking on this aggressive value engineering, many items initially removed have been added back or replaced with materials Staff considers to be close to the originally proposed in terms of aesthetics and durability. The most prominent example of this is the change from limestone to acid-etched cast stone cladding and parts which are intended to match that at the nearby Jasper project, developed by the same team.
4. Metalwork has been minimally changed, most notably at the perimeter fencing, which has been reduced slightly in height and in the grilles at windows which results in only a minimal change to the overall appearance of the project.
5. It is necessary for Staff to get a more thorough look at the comprehensive package of changes and should do so at "Final Review By Staff of For Permit Drawings" where any more minor items may be worked out with Applicant.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval with Board and Staff Comments with Final Review by Staff of the Revised "For Permit Drawings."

Board Comments:

- Elevation and overall appearance have changed and the proposed differences are not necessarily a change of materials. Could be comfortable with material change but we are not reviewing changes to the appearance. The change in appearance disturbs.
- Issue is the division between the units - is flat and creates unusual roof structure. If raised as a demising wall rather than a picture frame, would be acceptable.
- Did applicant meet with neighborhood association?
- Window sizes, height of parapet, etc same as was before? Applicant responds that windowsill was raised to make windows operable.
- Seems there is more than material change. Downspouts provide definition. Also, for example, the width of the chimney. Need to look at the version from final approval.
- The material changes lead to a significant cumulative effect. The downspouts looked good and gave definition. Applicant has reduced the number and to save costs.
- Don't mind the switch of limestone to cast stone, like next door. Rare to see a three-story stone façade in Charleston. The cast stone façade as proposed now is two feet shorter than previously shown. This lowering is affecting the proportions of everything much more

than material choices. Window proportions changing for example, while this is presented as material changes only.

- Issues of dimension change and proportions should come back to BAR.
- Can't change roof pitches, dimensions, floor-to-floor, etc. What permit was given for is what should have been seen at BAR. Otherwise there were changes made without proper approval prior to the request for material changes.
- Can defer and compare signed and sealed permit drawings for changes or can stick with what was approved by BAR with material changes. However, if building was dimensionally changed and changes were not intentionally presented to staff, we have significant challenge.
- Staff to look at approvals and compare with this application.
- We can only vote on the change of materials tonight.

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

11. 838 Morrison Drive - - TMS # 459-07-00-010

BAR2022-000798

Request appeal of Staff decision.

Meeting Street Manor/Cooper River Court | Historic Corridor District

Owner: Woodfield Investments, LLC

Applicant: Laura Davis / Warren Group

MOTION: Approval of internally illuminated lit monument sign and garage signs, denial of blade sign, and (requirement that) no tenant signage shall be illuminated.

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

Staff Comments:

1. Staff is reviewing this signage under the General Signage Policy Statement.
2. This Policy Statement discourages the use of illuminated signage.
3. Certain locations of the Historic Corridor District such as this one are evolving quickly with new or significantly altered construction.
4. Staff believes that in this location of the District restrained illumination of signage may be acceptable considering the particular building characteristics and context.
5. It is understood at this time that all lighting is to be external. If internal lighting is proposed, the specific signage will need to be resubmitted and re-evaluated.
6. Lighting should be subtle and restrained to avoid hotspots and jarring conditions.
7. Specific checks should be in place to avoid an unintentional approval of inappropriate signage. All illuminated signage should be approved by the City Architect.
8. All external lighting is to be white only and adjustable in order to establish an appropriate level of illumination, which once defined shall not be changed unless authorized by this Board.
9. Amendments to the General Sign Policy are recommended and presented at the end of this agenda.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval of subtle and restrained exterior illumination of the described signage.

Board Comments:

- Applicant has presented a complete and comprehensive unified sign package which is tasteful and restrained. Fine with lighting as presented. Goosenecks might be more fussy

and less sleek unlike the graphics package. Commendable to provide unified coherent language.

- Agree with internally lighted for building and wayfinding for garage including blade and monument signs. Difference in signage as marking the building and signage as advertising. Don't think that illumination should be allowed for any tenant signage. If they are open, they would be lit anyway.
- Agree.
- Agree.
- Can see blade sign from far away. Have a monument sign for building identification. Don't need a blade sign also. Supportive of the monument sign, even illuminated, but no others to be illuminated. Not supportive of the blade sign.
- Consensus on the internally lit monument sign. Consensus on the safety signs garage signs. And no illuminated tenant signage?
- Much signage on King predates our signage policies.
- Concerned around monument and garage signage, no illuminated tenant signage and a mixed review on existence of blade sign.

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

12. 850 Morrison Drive - - TMS # 459-02-00-001 BAR2022-000799

Request appeal of Staff decision.

New Construction | Historic Corridor District

Owner: Pinnacle Financial Partners

Applicant: Kathy Woods, The Fitts Company

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

13. 269 King Street - - TMS # 457-08-041-117 BAR2022-000800

Request appeal of Staff decision.

Not Rated | c. < 1888 with 1930s façade work and 1999 storefront work |

Old and Historic District

Owner: Restoration on King LLC

Applicant: Ashley Fannin / Advance Sign Group

WITHDRAWN BY BOARD AS APPLICANT NOT PRESENT

14. 93 Society Street - - TMS # 457-04-04-260 BAR2022-000801

Request appeal of Staff decision.

Not Rated | Ansonborough | Old and Historic District

Owner: King Street Collection LLC

Applicant: Zach Norris / Bourne Group

MOTION: Denial of illumination of blade sign.

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. Staff is reviewing this signage under the King Street Signage Policy Statement which addresses signage in the “King Street Area.”
2. This Policy Statement generally prohibits the use of illuminated signage but indicates that they may be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
3. Historically, the King Street area was filled with chaotic and random signage, evolving into some neon signage over time.
4. Certain locations of King Street such as this one have been evolving with new or significantly altered construction.
5. Staff believes that in this location of the city restrained illumination of signage is acceptable considering the particular building characteristics and context and should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
6. The blade sign is internally lighted, which is prohibited by the Policy Statement. While Staff thinks that this modest internally illuminated sign is appropriate at this location, the type of lighting needs to be better clarified.
7. Lighting should be subtle and restrained to avoid hotspots and jarring conditions.
8. The sign may incorporate color which is muted and harmonious with the building and context.
9. Specific checks should be in place to avoid an unintentional approval of inappropriate signage. All illuminated signage should be approved by the City Architect.
10. An Amendments to the King Street Sign Policy is not needed as this is being reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
11. The Board has already agreed to allow the evaluation on the Mock-Up of a “softly glowing” internally lighted curved fluted glass band on which signage is to be placed over the primary entry into the project.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval of subtle and restrained interior illumination of the blade sign which may include color harmonious with the building and context.

Board Comments:

- Canopy element is lit which is designed to draw from King Street. Proposed seems to be a duplication of that effort and may conflict with it. Against the illumination.
- Unclear how it conflicts with the architecture. Against the illumination.
- Agree, and oversized proportionally. Duplicates. Not comfortable with it illuminated or not illuminated.
- This sign is the only one proposed for illumination on the building. Unique part of town and can help to create more activity. Can provide an ambiance of lighting.
- Very uncharacteristic in design for area.

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

15. BAR General Sign Policy Statement Amendments

MOTION: Defer

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

May 25, 2022

Page | 13

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. There are increasing requests for illuminated signage in various parts of the city.
2. Current BAR Sign Policy Statements generally prohibit or discourage the use of illuminated signage.
3. Certain locations of the Historic Corridor District are evolving quickly with new or significantly altered construction.
4. Staff believes that in certain locations of this District illuminated signage may be acceptable with respect to particular building characteristics and context.
5. Specific checks and balances need to be in place to avoid an unintentional approval of inappropriate signage. The City Architect shall sign off on all illuminated signage prior to a Staff Approval being entered into EnerGov.
6. External lighting shall be white and reduced to as subdued a level as practical. Internal illumination is to be subtle and restrained, may be colored with the colors being muted in tone and to be harmonious with the building aesthetic and context.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval of Amendments to the BAR General Sign Policy Statement as presented herein to allow for illuminated signage which is subtle in character and harmonious with the associated building aesthetic and context.

Board Comments:

- Generally good. All areas could be construed as evolving. Could make policy for the Historic Corridor District. Hold the line on illumination and review it only at the Historic Corridor District?
- “Will not be allowed” regarding signs not respecting the aesthetics and scale of the building. Multiple tenants occupying one building should have one single sign for building identification. Instead of “should” if the only sign has the business name, it should not be illuminated. Repetitive signs or extraneous information” will not be allowed”. Lighted signs are not appropriate for the historic districts, leads back to monuments signs.
- Concerned that we may make things so standardized that won’t have the opportunity to have some variability in city with diff architectural styles and contexts. Agree with most all but wonder if the need to leave the door open a little.
- Gives staff a lot of control. Then a mechanism can be trigger but not normal application.
- Staff ran policy revisions by legal, and this is the word smithed version. Do want to keep putting it on the agenda if not voting on it tonight.

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

John E. Robinson, Chairperson

date

Tory J. Parish, BAR-L Administrator

date