Protocol

MEETING PARTICIPATION:
Information on each application, including documents submitted by the applicant, as well as post-meeting results and staff comments will be available online at www.charleston-sc.gov/bar.

To view or participate in the Board Meeting, please refer to the following options:
• **In-Person** (to participate or view)
  Public Meeting Room at 2 George Street, First Floor
• **YouTube Streaming** (to view live or after the meeting)
  The meeting will be recorded and livestreamed to the City of Charleston BAR-L YouTube channel at https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCBofP1rUhr3PnAGlY3w7a5Q/playlists.

PUBLIC WRITTEN COMMENT:
Use one of the following methods to submit written comments. The deadline to submit written comments is **12:00 PM, Tuesday, July 12, 2022** (one business day before the meeting). Comments must include your name, address, telephone number, meeting date, and project number. Written comments are provided to the Board 24 hours in advance of the meeting and will be acknowledged into the record and summarized; if this is a concern, you are encouraged to attend the meeting in person.
• Complete the Citizen Participation form at [http://innovate.charleston-sc.gov/](http://innovate.charleston-sc.gov/); or
• Call 843-724-3781; or
• Mail comments to: Department of Planning, Preservation & Sustainability, 2 George St, Charleston, SC 29401.
Protocol

MEETING PROCEDURES:
The Applicants (all team members) have been required to register and submit any documents in advance of the meeting. Staff will control the slide presentation that includes everything submitted by the Applicant by the deadline, in accordance with the Submittal Requirements. Applicants simply need to ask staff to advance to the next slide during your presentation. Applicants, Staff, and Board members are required to give their name whenever speaking.

PUBLIC COMMENT:
All applications heard today are part of public meeting format. Written public comment, received by the deadline of noon the day before the meeting, provided to the Board members 24 hours in advance of the meeting, is acknowledged into the record and summarized. Members of the public who wish to be heard in person during an agenda item’s public portion shall announce their name and address for the record.

BOARD MEMBERS:
Board members will be polled by the Chairperson for comments and for their vote on a motion. Each member, when voting, should respond “Yea, in favor” or “Nay, not in favor”. The Chair shall re-read the motion verbatim and the Board member making the motion should correct the Chair if he has not re-read the motion accurately.

Results will be posted on the City website at www.charleston-sc.gov/bar.
Agenda Item #1

Approval of Minutes from June 15 Retreat
Agenda Item #2

Approval of Minutes from June 22 Meeting
Agenda Item #3

257-261 King Street - - TMS # 457-08-01-050

Request first one-year extension of conceptual approval for renovation of rear façade to include new fenestration, rear entries, roof decks, and removal of elevator tower, originally granted on July 22, 2020.

Not Rated | c. 1902-44 (257-259 King) / c. 1944-51 (261 King, awning, façade)
Old and Historic District
Agenda Item #4

24 George Street (Silcox Gym, CofC) - - TMS # 457-04-02-001

Request conceptual approval for exterior building envelope repairs to include stucco repairs and repainting, window restoration, door replacement, and roof replacement.

Not Rated | Ansonborough | c. pre-1943 | Old and Historic District
Agenda Item #4 (24 George Street – Silcox Gym, CofC)

Applicant’s Presentation
While Silcox Center is not designated as historic under the National Register of Historic Places, it is located within the city of Charleston’s Old and Historic District. The original portion of the structure was constructed in 1938 as a gymnasium for the college designed by architect Albert Simons. This Georgian Revival style facility was constructed after the demolition of the Radcliffe-King Mansion, which had been used as the High School of Charleston from 1880 until 1924.

It is believed that the original handball courts, located on the north side of the building were removed around 1973. In 2005, an extensive interior renovation was completed in which the first floor was reconfigured for classroom and support space use. In addition, the original gymnasium bleachers were removed and a new running track was constructed around the gymnasium space. In 1981, the Johnson Center was constructed to the west and abutting Silcox PE & Health Center. In 2006, the Physical Education and Athletic Center complex was constructed north of the Silcox PE & Health Center.
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EXISTING PHOTOS
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EXISTING SITE WALL ALONG MEETING STREET
**EXISTING SITE PLAN**

**CofC Silcox PE & Health Center**

**ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN**

**PROPERTY INFORMATION**
- Address: 24 George Street, Charleston, SC

**ZONING INFORMATION**
- Zoning: GB - General Business
- Old City Height Districts
- Amusement & Recreation Overlay
- Old and Historic District

**FEMA INFORMATION**
- Flood Zone: X

**SITE REPAIRS LEGEND**
1. Replace Cracked Concrete Steps
2. Install New Wrought Iron Handrails at Front Entry to Meet Code
3. Major cracks at brick fence wall shall be repaired with compatible mortar. It is not intended for all joints to be repointed.

**SCALE:** 1/16" = 1'-0"
EXTERIOR REPAIRS LEGEND

1. Remove and replace existing steel window lintels and repair associated mortar and stucco.
2. Repair existing wood windows in kind, replace all glazing with laminated glass, repaint windows to match existing.
3. Repair damaged stucco, repaint all stucco to match existing color.
4. Replace existing doors with new exterior solid wood doors to match original door profiles.
5. Replace existing door with new exterior door frame.
6. Replace all existing wood doors, install new 7' metal door, 3/8" insulation and RTV painted. See details.
7. Remove existing slate roof and replace with Terra Cotta roof tiles made of design loading and size.
8. Replace exterior door handwheels.
9. Replace broken fall protection grill to match existing.
10. Replace existing plant, prime, prime and paint throughout.
11. Repair and repaint existing wood doors.
12. Replace existing wood door with new exterior grade steel door.
13. Remove existing wood decking, install new 3" metal deck, 4" insulation and 3/4" plywood. See details.
14. Remove existing slate roof and replace with Terra Cotta roof tiles made of design loading and size.
15. Replace existing parapet cap with cast stone cap to match existing profile.
16. Patch and recoat mortar wash at top of existing corbel.
17. Install new thru-wall pipe with backing per structural.
18. Install embedded carbon fiber reinforcement (if necessary), install new exterior parapet stringer, install new exterior parapet stringer, install new parapet cap and install existing metal deck.
19. Install new copper gutter and downspouts to match existing.

CofC Silcox PE & Health Center
ROOF PLAN
EXISTING BUILDING ELEVATIONS - NORTH, SOUTH & WEST

EXTERIOR REPAIRS LEGEND

1. REMOVE AND REPLACE EXISTING STEEL WINDOW LINTEL AND REPAIR ASSOCIATED MORTAR AND STUCCO.
2. REPAIR EXISTING WOOD WINDOWS IN KIND. REPLACE ALL GLAZING WITH LAMINATED GLASS. REPAINT WINDOWS TO MATCH EXISTING COLOR.
3. REPLACE EXISTING STUCCO. REPAINT ALL STUCCO TO MATCH EXISTING COLOR.
4. REPLACE EXISTING DOORS WITH NEW EXTERIOR SOLID WOOD DOORS TO MATCH ORIGINAL DOOR PROFILES.
5. REPLACE EXISTING DOOR WITH NEW EXTERIOR GRADE STEEL DOOR.
6. REMOVE ALL EXISTING GLASS DECKING. INSTALL NEW 3" METAL DECK, 4" INSULATION AND 3/4" PLYWOOD. SEE DETAILS.
7. REPLACE EXISTING SLATE ROOFING AND REPLACE WITH TERRA COTTA ROOF TILES. BASIS OF DESIGN LUDOWICI LUDO SLATE.
8. REPLACE EXTERIOR DOOR HARDWARE.
9. REMOVE EXISTING SASH REPAIRED OR REPLACED IN KIND. ALL DAMAGED OR DETERIORATED WOOD SHALL BE REPLACED.
10. REMOVE EXISTING PAINT, PREP, PRIME AND PAINT WROUGHT IRON FENCE.
11. REPAIR AND REPAINT EXISTING WOOD LOUVER.
12. REPLACE EXISTING METAL ROOF AND INSULATION. INSTALL NEW TAPERED INSULATION, MOD BIT ROOFING, AND ASSOCIATED FLASHING.
13. REPLACE CRACKED CONCRETE AT FRONT STEPS.
14. MAJOR CRACKS AT BRICK FENCE WALL SHALL BE REPAIRED WITH COMPATIBLE MORTAR. IT IS NOT INTENDED FOR ALL JOINTS TO BE REPOINTED.
15. REPLACE EXISTING PARAPET CAP WITH CAST STONE CAP TO MATCH EXISTING PROFILE.
16. REPLACE EXISTING MOTOR MASONRY WALL PER STRUCTURAL.
17. INSTALL NEW TRESSED WOOD PARAPET BRACING PER STRUCTURAL.
18. INSTALL EMBEDDED CARBON FIBER-REINFORCED POLYMER BARS IN EXISTING MASONRY WALL PER STRUCTURAL FOR PARAPET BRACING. PATCH EXISTING STUCCO BOTH SIDES OF PARAPET.
19. INSTALL NEW COOPER GUTTER AND DOWNSPOUTS TO REPLACE EXISTING.

NOTE: ALL WOOD COMPONENTS SHALL BE STRIPPED OF PAINT. REPAINT TO MATCH EXISTING COLOR.

URETHANE SEALANT

1/4" LAMINATE REPLACEMENT GLAZING WITH LOW E COATING

EXISTING WOOD SASH REPAIRED OR REPLACED IN KIND. ALL DAMAGED OR DETERIORATED WOOD SHALL BE REPLACED.
STUCCO
COLOR AND COMPOSITION TO MATCH EXISTING

TERRA COTTA ROOF TILE
BASIS OF DESIGN: LUDOWICI LUDOSLATE ROOF TILES

GENERAL ELEVATION NOTES:
5. REMOVE EXISTING ALL INTERIOR WINDOWS WITH MINERAL BASED PAINT TO MATCH "ORIGINAL" BUILDING PAINT COLOR (AS CURRENTLY VISIBLE ON PORTION OF NORTH FACADE)

EXTERIOR REPAIRS LEGEND
1. REMOVE AND REPLACE EXISTING STEEL WINDOW LINTEL AND REPAIR ASSOCIATED MORTAR AND STUCCO
2. REPAIR EXISTING WOOD WINDOWS AS NEEDED. REPLACE ALL GLASS WITH LAMINATED GLASS. REPAIR WINDOWS TO MATCH EXISTING
3. REMOVE DAMAGED STUCCO TO MATCH EXISTING COLOR
4. REPLACE EXISTING DOORS WITH NEW EXTERIOR SOLID WOOD DOORS TO MATCH ORIGINAL DOOR PROFILE
5. REPLACE EXISTING DOOR WITH NEW EXTERIOR GRADE STEEL DOOR
6. REMOVE ALL EXISTING SHINGLES. INSTALL NEW 1" METAL DECK. INSTALL NEW DRY-ICE ROOFING AND ASSOCIATED FLASHING
7. REPLACE EXISTING SLATE ROOFING AND REPLACE WITH TERRA COTTA ROOF TILES. BASIS OF DESIGN: LUDOWICI LUDOSLATE ROOF TILES
8. REPLACE EXTERIOR DOOR HARDWARE
9. REPLACE EXISTING WOOD LATH WITH NEW 1/2" WOOD LATH TO MATCH EXISTING
10. REPLACE EXISTING MOSS AND PRIME AND PAINT ALL EXTERIOR WOOD
11. REPLACE EXISTING IDENTICAL TO MATCH EXISTING
12. REMOVE AND REPLACE EXISTING WOOD LOUVERS
13. REMOVE EXISTING ROOFING AND INSTALL NEW TAPERED INSULATION, MOD BIT ROOFING, AND ASSOCIATED FLASHING
14. REPLACE CRACKED CONCRETE AT FRONT STEPS
15. REPLACE EXISTING PARAPET CAP WITH CAST STONE CAP TO MATCH EXISTING PROFILE
16. PATCH AND RECOAT MORTAR WASH AT TOP OF EXISTING CORBEL
17. INSTALL NEW TRAVERTINE PARAPET BRACING PER STRUCTURAL
18. INSTALL EMBEDDED CARBON FIBER-REINFORCED POLYMER BARS IN EXISTING MASONRY WALL PER STRUCTURAL FOR PARAPET BRACING. PATCH EXISTING STUCCO BOTH SIDES OF PARAPET.
19. INSTALL NEW COPPER GUTTER AND DOWNSPOUTS TO REPLACE EXISTING

KEY PLAN
- SOUTHWEST CORNER
- SOFT WALK
- LAVATORY
- LAUNDRY ROOM
- HOIST
- SANITARY SEWER
- DRAINAGE
- EXTERIOR REPAIRS LEGEND
- SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

TYPICAL - ALL EXTERIOR WINDOWS
- TYPICAL - ALL EXTERIOR WINDOWS

CofC Silcox PE & Health Center
EXISTING BUILDING ELEVATION - EAST
CofC Silcox PE & Health Center
ROOF MATERIAL MOCKUP PANEL

VIEW FROM GEORGE STREET

VIEW FROM GEORGE STREET

VIEW FROM PRIVATE PROPERTY ACROSS MEETING STREET
EXISTING SLATE ROOF TILES TO BE REMOVED
EXISTING WOOD TONGUE AND GROOVE DECKING TO BE REMOVED
EXISTING STEEL ROOF STRUCTURE TO REMAIN
EXISTING GUTTER AND DOWNSPOUTS TO BE REMOVED AND REPLACED IN KIND
EXISTING MASONRY WALL TO REMAIN: STUCCO TO BE PATCHED AND REPAINTED AS NOTED.

TERRA COTTA ROOF TILE
WATERPROOF UNDERLAYMENT
18" STRIP HIGH TEMP SELF-ADHERING MODIFIED BITUMEN MEMBRANE
3/4" PLYWOOD
UNDER EAVE TILE
4" RIGID INSULATION
3" METAL DECK
TRTD WD BLOCKING
COPPER FORMED DRIP EDGE WITH 1/2" HEM
5" COPPER GUTTER TO MATCH EXISTING PROFILE

EXISTING ROOF EAVE DETAIL
ROOF EAVE DETAIL

CofC Silcox PE & Health Center ROOF DETAILS
HIGH ROOF PARAPET DETAIL

1. SHEET 1 OF 11 - DRAWN BY: [Signature]

2. SHEET 1 OF 11 - DRAWN BY: [Signature]

LOW ROOF PARAPET DETAIL

3. SHEET 1 OF 11 - DRAWN BY: [Signature]

4. SHEET 1 OF 11 - DRAWN BY: [Signature]

PARAPET BRACING LEGEND

- NO PARAPET BRACING REQUIRED
- EMBEDDED CFRP BARS (SEE DETAIL 1)
- TREATED WOOD KICKERS (SEE DETAIL 2)

CofC Silcox PE & Health Center
ROOF DETAILS - PARAPET BRACING
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINAL ELEVATIONS</th>
<th>EXISTING DOORS</th>
<th>PROPOSED REPLACEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1938 DRAWINGS</td>
<td>WOOD DOORS IN WOOD FRAME</td>
<td>MAHOGANY WOOD DOORS WITH LAMINATED GLAZING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STEEL DOORS IN WOOD FRAME</td>
<td>EXISTING FRAMES AND TRANSOMS TO BE REPAIRED AND GLAZING REPLACED WITH LAMINATED GLAZING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CofC Silcox PE & Health Center**

**EXTERIOR DOOR REPLACEMENT**
June 29, 2022

Re: Silcox PE & Health Center Historic Background & Proposed Renovation Scope
SMHa Comm. No. 2018.00

Building Background:

The Silcox Physical Education & Health Center is a 48,904gsf four-level facility built in 1939 as a WPA project. No significant exterior renovations have occurred since construction. The last interior renovation was in 1995. The building materials reflect the time of construction & labor intensive installations - stucco over masonry, wood sash windows with divided glass, metal roof trusses with wood decking, some exterior ironwork & a slate roof original to the time of construction. The building houses a mix of classrooms, one indoor sports space & health science labs & academic offices for the Department of Health & Human Performance.

Proposed Renovation Scope:

The proposed exterior renovation scope is focused on addressing existing deficiencies and deterioration to the building's envelope.

Stucco:

Testing and sounding will be conducted on the existing stucco finish to determine material makeup and extent of delamination from the underlying masonry wall. Repairs are to be made with like material to existing. New paint will be applied to entire exterior.

Windows:

The existing window are wood double hung, true divided lites with single pane glazing. None of the existing glazing is impact resistant and many lites are damaged or missing due to vandalism. Scope to include renovation and repair of the existing wood frames, sashes, and muntins. The single pane glazing will be replaced with single pane, ¼” impact glazing to help mitigate vandalism damage and to improve performance of the windows in a high wind event.

Doors:

The existing doors are steel and not original to the building. It is proposed to replace the public entry and exist doors with mahogany wood doors to match the original door profiles. Service doors to the ground floor mechanical rooms would be replaced with new exterior grade metal doors.
Roof:

The existing roof is clad in natural slate shingles over diagonal 2x wood sheathing that dates to the original building construction time frame of 1930's and have exceeded their life cycle, requiring replacement. As described in more detail in the attached structural report, the building seismic performance is expectantly poor given the building mass and construction type. Options for improvement mostly involve invasive or economically unfeasible solutions however it has been identified that reduction of roof weight and strengthening the roof structural diaphragm would contribute to improving the seismic performance of the building. With this in mind, and consideration for life-cycle maintenance and high wind performance, the college has chosen to pursue a comprehensive upgrade of the roof to address the identified seismic deficiencies. It is proposed to remove the existing roof structure entirely to the existing steel trusses and replace with a new light-gauge metal deck with rigid insulation and Ludowici Ludoslate tile shingles. This approach will allow the roof structure to function as a more rigid structural diaphragm and will reduce the weight load by approximately 3lbs/sf over the current roof system.

Sincerely,
SMHa Inc.

Chris Altman, AIA
March 14, 2022

Margie Longshore  
SMHa, Inc.  
400 Hibben Street  
Mount Pleasant, SC 29464

subject: Current Results Letter – Roofing Replacement – Structural Considerations  
Silcox Envelope Repair & First Floor Renovation – Stage II  
College of Charleston – Charleston, SC  
State Project No. H15-9671-ML / ADC Project No: 20258

Dear Margie:

As ADC continues with the structural scope of work on this project, this letter represents the current results of the roof evaluation for structural issues that have been previously identified. At this point, a roof decking and diaphragm analysis has been done on the existing pitched roof of the Silcox building. Below are the findings of that analysis and evaluation along with recommendations for moving forward.

Summary:

Due to the 1994 upgrades, the roof does not need a plywood overlay to stiffen the diaphragm for the IEBC 75% current code level wind load forces and provided the condition of the planking is generally good, or nearly the same as when it was installed, the wood planking is ok to support the current gravity loads on the roof or a new roof of the same or less weight even in the case of wind uplift. The other checks that involve diaphragm connections to the walls have not yet been done. An analysis of the existing steel angle framed trusses is not included in this roof decking and diaphragm analysis.

Analysis:

Currently, one of the largest challenges in determining the capacity of the existing wood decking on the roof is that although we know the year it was installed, we don’t know what species and grade of lumber was used. Because of its age, we can say it’s a bit stronger than decking made more recently, but that only offers a comparative view. From the oldest references readily available, the decking is more likely to be Southern Pine 2x6 (1-5/8” actual dimension) Tongue & Groove planks of regular density. There did exist a denser version of decking at the time, but indication of its use is not found on the original drawings. This makes it hard to believe the contractor at the time would have just “opted” for the denser (higher cost) plank material. Today’s references to the grade of the lumber would put it at a bending stress of 900 to 1600 psi depending on the gradation of (Select Structural, No 1, No 2, etc). Because grading at the time was more of a Standard grade and a Dense (but not the densest) grade, we should safely assume the standard grade. If desired to get closer than the assumptive route, the existing decking can be tested. Without a test, it can be reasonably assumed that a bending stress of 1600 psi can be used, which would likely have been on the weaker side of the spectrum back when it was installed since wood strengths were stronger back then with tighter growth patterns and more resin.
Also because the existing structural drawings did not indicate a specific length of the decking to be used, it is a safe assumption that some of the stronger design Layup Types for decking planks weren’t used and that a “Controlled Random Layup” was used, where the ends of the planks could be cut or butted at any location as long as each board was supported on at least 2 cross supporting members and no adjacent planks were spliced in the same bay.

Due to both the assumed lumber grade and layup, it is found that the vertical allowable load capacity of the decking is 37 psf for strength of the decking. For serviceability of deflection at a limit of L/180 (largest allowed by code) the allowable load capacity is 23 to 26 psf. This disparity between strength and deflection load limits can help explain why the current roof has held up through the years but has visible signs of deflection (sag), however much of the sag is due to natural creep of the wood fibers. It is estimated that the current load on the decking (including self-weight, felt layer, ¼” slate shingles, fireproof spray, and a 20 psf live load) is 35.7 psf, meaning there is at most only 1.3 psf additional capacity for the roof. Although this wasn’t verified during recent site visits, the 2013 assessment indicated the presence of a layer of sheathing of unknown thickness. If that layer is present, and assumed to be ½” thick, its weight would be approximately equal to the “1.3 psf” just mentioned. Based on the age of the structure and the above stated assumptions, this is within a margin of error close enough to say there is no additional capacity. These statements assume that the decking is still in a near-original state with very little degradation over the years. It is worth noting that the 2013 assessment indicated the suspicion that the existing decking and sheathing were deteriorating.

When checking the roof decking for a current code load combination, that combines 3 types of loads simultaneously (rare but still a current code load combination) of dead load, wind load, and roof live load, it was found that combination pressure to be 41 psf which is slightly higher than the understood 37 psf capacity. This means if there was a roof live load during the extreme wind load event, the decking would become overstressed, or inadequate to support the required load.

In terms of the check for the roof diaphragm to be able to meet 75% of the current code level design wind loads, it is found that the wood planking alone as a diaphragm is not adequate, but the roof diaphragm does have the capacity for those loads and that it does not need to be upgraded as per the IEBC. The roof had an upgrade in 1994 that added some diagonal horizontal angle braces just below the planking. These braces basically “completed” the diaphragm from its original condition to create a full load path from wall-to-wall. The roof horizontal bracing has been analyzed and it has been found that the brace members and their welds are adequate to function as tension-only braced diaphragm members, provided their conditional state is good meaning there has not been excessive corrosion of the members or their connections. This means the roof does not need a plywood overlay to support IEBC level loading for wind forces, which is required to be checked during a re-roofing project.

**Recommendations:**

Due to the age of the roof at about 85 years old and based on the earlier condition assessment, it would be highly likely that there has been some condition degradation over the years that has not yet been seen due to inspection difficulties. It is ADC’s recommendation that without the ability to view the condition of the existing decking before the old roofing shingles and membranes are removed, it would
be prudent to plan for some amount of decking member replacement, perhaps as an allowance or contingency. At the discretion of the College, they might also decide to replace all deck planking with new material. If this option is selected, then other known issues can be easily repaired at the same time, namely the cleaning and recoating of the tops of the steel trusses to protect them from further corrosion. Further, the roof horizontal steel bracing members could be strengthened and upgraded to support code level seismic loads of which the current roof does not have adequate capacity as will be explained in the following paragraph.

Although the IEBC only requires certain checks (wind load) at the time of a re-roof project, it stands to reason that the roof ought to go through the same scrutiny for current earthquake level threats. This building’s seismic lateral resisting system is classified as an unreinforced masonry structure (URM) which is typically recognized as the most hazardous structural type. In fact, this building type is not allowed to be constructed under modern day codes in any region of moderate to high seismicity. The most common failures associated with this building type include inadequate anchorage of walls to floors/roof leading to wall fall out, excessive diaphragm deflection combined with building drifts causing upper level walls to collapse, low shear resistance due to older types of mortar mixes, and finally slender walls leading to out-of-plane buckling and collapse of load bearing walls.

Due to the mass of the structure, calculations have shown that there is a significantly higher demand on the roof diaphragm in a seismic loading condition rather than a wind loading condition on the order of 10 times higher. If the building does not undergo a full seismic analysis and retrofit project to correct known and previously identified deficiencies, at the very least there may be an opportunity during the current project to decrease an amount of seismic demand. The most efficient way to decrease seismic demand on a structure is to reduce its mass, and the most efficient location to reduce that mass is from the highest locations on a building. In other words, putting the heaviest elements near the bottom of a structure keeps the seismic demand on the structure lower than putting heavy elements near the top of the structure. Looking at the figure below, it is shown that under a standard equivalent lateral force analysis, the largest seismic load effects occur at the top of the structure. By reducing the mass at the top of the building there exists a benefit to the entire building to lower the story shear forces at each level and at the base of the structure. If anything can be done to reduce the weight of the roof of this structure it will reduce the seismic demand on the roof diaphragm, connections of the roof to walls, and the base shear of the structure at the foundation. As a comparison, a drop in roof weight of just 6 psf would translate to a roof seismic diaphragm load demand reduction of about 29,000 lbs.

\[ V = \sum F_i \]

**Figure 1 - Seismic Story Load Effects**
There has been consideration of using synthetic slate versus real slate shingles for the roof replacement. The gravity analysis indicates the roof structure is barely capable of supporting the weight of real shingles and does not provide much leeway for unknown loadings or unknown material conditions as may happen on any roof. The lesser weight of the synthetic shingles certainly provides a greater live and dead load safety factor which is a structural benefit whenever it can be achieved. Additionally, the lighter weight synthetic shingle reduces the seismic loading on the overall structure as previously explained. For these reasons, it is advantageous and thus recommended to use the lighter weight synthetic shingle from a structural standpoint.

ADC Engineering, Inc., appreciates this opportunity to be of service to SMHa and the College of Charleston. Please contact us if we can be of further assistance or if you have any questions or comments regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

ADC Engineering, Inc.

Jesse Malan, S.E., P.E.
Project Manager / Structural Engineering

Mark Dillon, S.E., P.E.
Principal / Structural Engineering

copy:
Chris Altman – SMHa
Agenda Item #5

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

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

New Construction | Height District 4 & 6 | Garden District | Old and Historic District
Agenda Item #5 (518 East Bay Street)

Applicant’s Presentation
Refer to Response to Comment #3

STAFF COMMENT #1

Sidewalks have been redrafted. Proposed design is shown on exterior elevations sheet 24 as well as on renderings sheets 3A & 3B. The new sidewalks incorporate planters and grassed areas along the sidewalks.

RESPONSE TO STAFF #1

The sidewalk dimensions are shown along the north elevation and should be provided with additional rail along curbside.

RESPONSE TO STAFF #2

The six-story portion of the facade is to be given relief to its "previous flatness." The mid-rise portion has been reworked to project a more urban appearance.

RESPONSE TO STAFF #3

The central portion of the North Facade is restudied to give relief to its "previous flatness." Additional trees will be added.

RESPONSE TO STAFF #4

For the southern portion of the East Bay Street face, new planters are still planned but located further back from the street.

RESPONSE TO STAFF #5

The central portion of the North Facade is restudied to give relief to its "previous flatness." Additional trees will be added.

RESPONSE TO STAFF #6

The 3-story gabled form is looked at with rework of the roof slopes. More typical "straight form of parapet" is shown on the north side.

RESPONSE TO STAFF #7

The central recessed portion of the north elevation is flat and should be provided with additional relief through articulation and layering.

RESPONSE TO STAFF #8

The central portion of the North Facade is restudied to give relief to its "previous flatness." New windows have been added to the West and East walls surfaces of those projected and blocks.

RESPONSE TO STAFF #9

The north elevation has been redrafted. Proposed design is shown on exterior elevations sheet 24 as well as on renderings sheets 3A & 3B. The new sidewalks incorporate planters and grassed areas along the sidewalks.

RESPONSE TO STAFF #10

The sidewalk dimensions are shown along the north elevation and should be provided with additional rail along curbside.

RESPONSE TO STAFF #11

The central portion of the North Facade is restudied to give relief to its "previous flatness." Additional trees will be added.

RESPONSE TO STAFF #12

For the southern portion of the East Bay Street face, new planters are still planned but located further back from the street.

RESPONSE TO STAFF #13

The central portion of the North Facade is restudied to give relief to its "previous flatness." Additional trees will be added.

RESPONSE TO STAFF #14

The 3-story gabled form is looked at with rework of the roof slopes. More typical "straight form of parapet" is shown on the north side.

RESPONSE TO STAFF #15

The central recessed portion of the north elevation is flat and should be provided with additional relief through articulation and layering.

RESPONSE TO STAFF #16

The central portion of the North Facade is restudied to give relief to its "previous flatness." New windows have been added to the West and East walls surfaces of those projected and blocks.
1. Corner of Washington Street and Charlotte Street looking south towards Calhoun Street

2. Washington Street looking south towards Calhoun Street

3. Corner of Washington Street and Charlotte Street looking towards site

4. Washington Street looking north towards Chapel Street
EXISTING EAST BAY STREETSCAPE - EAST SIDE

CURRENT PROPOSED EAST BAY STREET STREETSCAPE - EAST SIDE

518 East Bay Street
ENLARGED STREETSCAPES
ENLARGED STREETSCAPES

EXISTING CHARLOTTE STREET STREETSCAPE

EXISTING EAST BAY STREETSCAPE - WEST SIDE

CURRENT PROPOSED CHARLOTTE STREET STREETSCAPE
PREVIOUS NORTH ELEVATION - FACING MOLUF'S

FACE BRICK
METAL RAILING WITH GLASS PANELS
METAL JULIET BALCONY & METAL RAILING SYSTEM
(TYP.)
BRICK RECESSES
STACK BOND (TYP)
METAL SYSTEM FOR CLIMBING VINES

THIRD FLOOR - 33'-6"
SECOND FLOOR - 22'-0"
PODIUM LEVEL 1 (GROUND) - 0'-0"
FOURTH FLOOR - 46'-6"
FIFTH FLOOR - 57'-8"
SIXTH FLOOR - 69'-10"
PARAPET - 81'-10"
PODIUM LEVEL 2 - 11'-0"
FIRST FLOOR - 2'-0"

REFERENCE SHEET 22 FOR TYPICAL NOTES FOR THIS PORTION OF BUILDING

CURRENT NORTH ELEVATION - FACING MOLUF'S

FACE BRICK
METAL RAILING WITH GLASS PANELS
METAL BALCONY & METAL RAILING SYSTEM
BRICK ROWLOCK & SOLDIER COURSE BAND (TYP. AT ALL LOCATIONS)
METAL BALCONY & METAL RAILING SYSTEM
METAL PANELING AT PROJECTED BAY

THIRD FLOOR - 33'-6"
SECOND FLOOR - 22'-0"
PODIUM LEVEL 1 (GROUND) - 0'-0"
FOURTH FLOOR - 46'-6"
FIFTH FLOOR - 57'-8"
SIXTH FLOOR - 69'-10"
PARAPET - 81'-10"
PODIUM LEVEL 2 - 11'-0"
FIRST FLOOR - 2'-0"

REFERENCE SHEET 22 FOR TYPICAL NOTES FOR THIS PORTION OF BUILDING
3/32" = 1'-0"

PREVIOUS COURTYARD (EAST) ELEVATION LOOKING WEST WITH ADJACENT BUILDING SECTIONS
Date: 5/16/2022

FACE BRICK
ALUMINUM STOREFRONT
ENTRANCE SYSTEM
METAL PANELING
METAL CANOPY
EXIT DOOR & STEPS
CHARLOTTE ST
ADJACENT PROPERTY
PARKING

3/32" = 1'-0"

CURRENT COURTYARD (EAST) ELEVATION LOOKING WEST WITH ADJACENT BUILDING SECTIONS
Date: 7/5/2022

FACE BRICK
ALUMINUM STOREFRONT
ENTRANCE SYSTEM
CHARLOTTE ST
ADJACENT PROPERTY
PARKING

PODIUM LEVEL 2 - 11'-0"

CHARLOTTE ST
ADJACENT PROPERTY
PODIUM LEVEL 1 (GROUND) - 0'-0"

3/32" = 1'-0"

3/32" = 1'-0"

COURTYARD (EAST) ELEVATIONS
518 East Bay Street
PREVIOUS COURTYARD (SOUTH) ELEVATION LOOKING NORTH WITH ADJACENT BUILDING SECTIONS

CURRENT COURTYARD (SOUTH) ELEVATION LOOKING NORTH WITH ADJACENT BUILDING SECTIONS

Date: 7/5/2022

Date: 5/16/2022

REFER TO SHEET 24 FOR TYPICAL NOTES FOR THIS PORTION OF BUILDING

PODIUM LEVEL 1 (GROUND) - 0'-0"

PODIUM LEVEL 2 - 11'-0"

FIRST FLOOR - 2'-0"

SECOND FLOOR - 22'-0"

THIRD FLOOR - 33'-6"

FOURTH FLOOR - 46'-6"

FIFTH FLOOR - 57'-8"

SIXTH FLOOR - 69'-10"

PARAPET - 81'-10"

3/32" = 1'-0"
518 East Bay Street
PREVIOUS PROPOSED CHARLOTTE STREET ENTRY & RELOCATED 77 WASHINGTON ST
PREVIOUS PROPOSED MATERIALS

COPPER PERGOLA ENTRY

METAL WINDOW TRIM

MESH INSERT

GLASS PANELED CURTAIN WALL & ENTRANCE SYSTEM

METAL DOOR & PANELS

518 East Bay Street
PREVIOUS PROPOSED MATERIALS

Date: 5/16/2022
CURRENT PROPOSED MATERIALS

518 East Bay Street

Date: 7/5/2022
CURRENT PROPOSED MATERIALS

COPPER Pergola Entry

Metal Window Trim

Perforated Metal Panel

Glass Paneled Curtain Wall & Entrance System

Metal Door & Panels
Agenda Item #6

578 Meeting Street - - TMS # 458-01-03-031

Request conceptual approval for mixed-use building to include 225 market-rate residential apartment units, retail/live-work program at ground level, amenity program, and two-tier parking garage.

New Construction | East Side | Height Districts 3.5 & 5 | Historic Corridor District
Agenda Item #6 (578 Meeting Street)

Applicant’s Presentation
CONCEPTUAL BAR REQUEST

A request for conceptual BAR approval for height, scale, mass and general architectural direction. In addition, a request for additional height as described in the zoning compliance section on this page has been made.

TMS 459-01-03-031

APPROVALS AND ZONING CONFORMANCE

SPW Review – Sep. 9, 2020
BZAZ-Approval- Feb 9, 2021 for rezoning to MU-2 and height change Approval from 5/2.5-3 to 5/3.5 zoning
BAR Demolition Request-March 24,2021- Salvage of historic façade and building demolition approval
TRC Pre App Review – June 17,2021

ZONING COMPLIANCE

The proposed design is in compliance with zoning standards and has the necessary zoning entitlements in place.

The project is requesting review by the Board of Architectural Review to permit an additional half story on the portion of the project in 3.5 story height district and an additional story in the 5 story allowed height district allowed by Section 54.306-D and 54-306.4 “Based on Architectural Merit and context.” The project is also requesting relief from the requirement in Section 54-306.X that the height of a non-residential floor be between 16” and 20”.

ARCHITECT
DYNAMIK DESIGN
5901 PEACHTREE DUNWOODY RD
BUILDING C, SUITE 250
ATLANTA, GA 30328
D:678.506.8863
Rlkirby@dynamikdesign.com

CONSULTING ARCHITECT
LS3P
205½ KING STREET
CHARLESTON, SC 29401
D:843.958.5417
RGowe@ls3p.com

CONCEPTUAL BAR REQUEST

578 MEETING ST
CHARLESTON, SC
CONCEPTUAL BAR REVIEW • 07-05-2022
FDC2020-03
© COPYRIGHT 2021 DYNAMIK DESIGN

5901 PEACHTREE DUNWOODY RD
BUILDING C, SUITE 250
ATLANTA, GA 30328
D:678.506.8863
Rlkirby@dynamikdesign.com
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ENLARGED LANDSCAPE PLAN

578 MEETING ST
CHARLESTON, SC
CONCEPTUAL BAR REVIEW • 07-05-2022

FLOURNOY Development Group
ENLARGED LANDSCAPE PLAN

578 MEETING ST
CHARLESTON, SC
CONCEPTUAL BAR REVIEW • 07-05-2022

FLOURNOY
Development Group

578 MEETING ST
CHARLESTON, SC
CONCEPTUAL BAR REVIEW • 07-05-2022
FDC2020-03
© COPYRIGHT 2021 DYNAMIK DESIGN
RENDERING - MEETING STREET AND JOHNSON STREET (SW)
RENDERING - MEETING STREET AND JOHNSON STREET (SW)

578 MEETING ST
CHARLESTON, SC
CONCEPTUAL BAR REVIEW • 07-05-2022
RENDERING - STUART STREET AND NASSAU STREET (NE)

578 MEETING ST
CHARLESTON, SC
CONCEPTUAL BAR REVIEW • 07-05-2022
We are requesting Conceptual BAR Approval of Height, Scale, Mass and General Architectural Direction. In addition, we are seeking approval for an additional half story in both the 3.5 story district and the 5 story district.

Reasons for Architectural Merit:

- **Celebration of the Regis**
  1. Setting off from the historic building in both the horizontal and vertical directions to give it breathing room
  2. Utilizing a glassy hyphen adjacent to the Regis to showcase the Regis as historic
  3. Setting back the building along Meeting Street from the Regis so that the new defers to the old
  4. Activating and engaging the roof of the Regis as an extension of the amenity deck above

- **Thoughtful Massing**
  1. Large breaks in the building and significant setback above the Regis
  2. Architectural expression is adjusted along commercial Meeting Street vs residential Stuart, Johnson, and Nassau Streets
  3. Recessed and lowered hyphens between masses
  4. Setting back in height at the corners by the church
  5. 6th floor at Meeting Street is significantly set back from the building’s edge to minimize its view from pedestrians

- **Contributions to the Public Realm**
  1. Additional four feet width (average) of sidewalk along Meeting Street (beyond the ten feet required)
  2. Added courtyards at the Regis for public space and full interaction with remaining sides of the historic remnant
  3. Activation of the ground floor throughout the building, informed by surrounding context: commercial architectural style at Meeting Street, residential stoops at Stuart and Johnson Streets, and a lush alleyway with stoops along the property line by the church
  4. Enhanced ground floor materials, including cast stone and additional glazing for activation
APPENDIX
EXISTING PHOTOS

A) VIEW FROM JOHNSON ST

B) VIEW FROM JOHNSON ST

C) VIEW FROM CORNER OF JOHNSON AND NASSAU ST

D) VIEW FROM CORNER OF JOHNSON AND NASSAU ST
EXISTING PHOTOS

A) VIEW FROM NASSAU ST
B) VIEW FROM CORNER OF NASSAU ST AND STUART ST
C) VIEW FROM STUART ST
D) VIEW FROM CORNER OF STUART ST AND MEETING ST
CONTEXT ELEVATION - MEETING STREET (WEST) AND STUART STREET (SOUTH)
PROPOSED ELEVATION - STUART STREET (NORTH)
PROPOSED ELEVATION - NASSAU STREET (EAST)

FLOURNOY
Development Group
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PROPOSED FLOOR PLAN - LEVEL 02

LEGEND
- MULTIFAMILY UNITS
- COMMON AREAS
- AMENITY SPACES
- PARKING
- LIVE/WORK UNITS

578 MEETING ST
CHARLESTON, SC
CONCEPTUAL BAR REVIEW • 07-05-2022

FLOURNOY
Development Group
PROPOSED FLOOR PLAN - LEVEL 04

LEGEND
- MULTIFAMILY UNITS
- COMMON AREAS
- AMENITY SPACES
- PARKING
- LIVE/WORK UNITS

FLOURNOY Development Group

578 MEETING ST
CHARLESTON, SC
CONCEPTUAL BAR REVIEW • 07-05-2022

LS3P DYNAMIK DESIGN
AREA TABULATION

5 STORY HEIGHT DISTRICT
~21,000 GSF PER TYPICAL FLOOR
~8,700 GSF PROPOSED AT LEVEL 06
APPROXIMATELY 41% COVERAGE

3.5 STORY HEIGHT DISTRICT
~36,650 GSF PER TYPICAL FLOOR
~19,325 GSF ALLOWED (3.5 STORY)
50% COVERAGE
~34,400 GSF PROPOSED AT LEVEL 04
~15,075 GSF ADDITIONAL PROPOSED
39% ADDITIONAL COVERAGE

LEGEND

TYPICAL STORY IN 5 STORY DISTRICT

PROPOSED LEVEL 06

TYPICAL STORY IN 3.5 STORY DISTRICT

PROPOSED LEVEL 04
PREVIOUS DESIGN

FLOURNOY
Development Group

578 MEETING ST
CHARLESTON, SC
CONCEPTUAL BAR REVIEW • 07-05-2022
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Agenda Item #7

850 Morrison Drive - - TMS # 459-13-02-004/005/009/010/011

Request appeal of Staff decision regarding denial of illuminated signage.

c. 2020 | Height District 4-12 | None | Historic Corridor District
Agenda Item #7 (850 Morrison Street)

Applicant’s Presentation
CUSTOMER: Pinnacle Financial Partners

PRODUCT NUMBER: TFC #32511

PRODUCT TITLE: Site Plan

DRAWN BY: DPS

DATE: 3/31/22

CHECKED: AWW

DATE: AWW

APPROVED: AWW

DATE: AWW

REVISIONS:

1. AWW Revision 1
2. AWW Revision #
3. AWW Revision #
4. AWW Revision 1
5. AWW Revision #
6. AWW Revision #

SCALE: 1" = 1'-0"

PAPER SIZE: 11 x 17

THE DESIGNS/INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS DRAWING ARE PROTECTED UNDERU.S. AND INTERNATIONAL TRADEMARK LAW AND ARE THE SOLE PROPERTY OF THE FITTS COMPANY, INC.

ANY REPRODUCTION WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED DESIGN SUBMITTED FOR YOUR PERSONAL USE IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROJECT PLANNED FOR YOU BY THE FITTS COMPANY, INC. IT IS NOT TO BE SHOWN TO ANYONE OUTSIDE OF YOUR ORGANIZATION NOR IS IT TO BE USED, REPRODUCED, COPIED, OR EXHIBITED IN ANY FASHION OR IN ANY PART OF THIS DESIGN WITHOUT EXPRESS WRITTEN CONSENT.

REVISIONS:

1. Channel Letters 108" Tall
2. Channel Letters 28" Tall

PAGE: 1 OF 16
# 108" Tall Channel Letters

**Site Address:**
850 Morrison Drive,
Charleston, SC 29403

**Product Title:**
Channel Letters

**Dimensions:**
- **Height:** 108" (2743.2 cm)
- **Width:** 480.052" (1219.3 cm)
- **Depth:** 62.848" (159.7 cm)
- **Length:** 85.709" (217.8 cm)

**Front View:**
- **Letters:** "Pinnacle"

**Left Side View:**
- **Dimensions:**
  - Height: 5.000" (12.7 cm)
  - Width: 24.302" (61.8 cm)
  - Depth: 62.848" (159.7 cm)

**Revisions:**
1. AWW Revision 1
2. AWW Revision 2
3. AWW Revision 3
4. AWW Revision 5
5. AWW Revision 4
6. AWW Revision 6

**Scale:**
3/16" = 1'-0"
108" Tall Channel Letters

**Front View**

- **3/16" Thick 7328 White Acrylic**
- With 3M 3630-337 Process Blue Vinyl Applied To The First Surface

**Left Side View**

- **1.5" Trim Cap**
- **Returns & Trim Cap(s)**
- **Painted Smooth Finish**
- **Pinnacle Black**

**Materials**

- **3/16" Thick 7328 White Acrylic**
- **3/16" Thick 7328 White Acrylic**
- **3/16" Thick 7328 White Acrylic**
- **3/16" Thick 7328 White Acrylic**
- **3/16" Thick 7328 White Acrylic**

**Sizing**

- **3/16" = 1'-0"**

**Other Details**

- **Front View**
- **Left Side View**
- **Returns & Trim Cap(s)**
- **Painted Smooth Finish**
- **Pinnacle Black**

**Additional Notes**

- Any reproduction without written consent is strictly prohibited. This is an unpublished design submitted for your personal use in connection with the project planned for you by The Fitts Company. It is not to be shown to anyone outside of your organization nor is it to be used, reproduced, copied, or exhibited in any fashion all or any part of this design (excepting registered trademarks)
108" Tall Channel Letters

Pinnacle Financial Partners
850 Morrison Drive, Charleston, SC 29403

Building Rendering - Letters Day

CUSTOMER: Pinnacle Financial Partners
SITE ADDRESS: 850 Morrison Drive, Charleston, SC 29403
PRODUCT NUMBER: TFC #32511
PRODUCT TITLE: Building Rendering - Letters Day
DRAWN BY: DPS
CHECKED: AWV
APPROVED: AWV
DATE: 3/31/22

REVISIONS:
1. AWW Revision 1
2. AWW Revision #
3. AWW Revision #
4. AWW Revision #
5. AWW Revision #
6. AWW Revision #

SCALE: NTS
PAPER SIZE: 11 x 17

ANY REPRODUCTION WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED DESIGN SUBMITTED FOR YOUR PERSONAL USE IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROJECT PLANNED FOR YOU BY FITTS COMPANY, INC. IT IS NOT TO BE SHOWN TO ANYONE OUTSIDE OF YOUR ORGANIZATION NOR IS IT TO BE USED, REPRODUCED, COPIED, OR EXHIBITED IN ANY FASHION ALL OR ANY PART OF THIS DESIGN EXCEPT AS SPECIFICALLY AGREED TO IN WRITING WITH THE FITTS COMPANY, INC.
108" Tall Channel Letters

CUSTOMER: Pinnacle Financial Partners
SITE ADDRESS: 850 Morrison Drive, Charleston, SC 29403
PRODUCT NUMBER: TFC:32511
PRODUCT TITLE: Building Elevations
DRAWN BY: CPS DATE: 3/31/22
CHECKED: AW DATE: AW004
APPROVED: AW DATE: AW004

REVISIONS:
1. AW Revision 1
2. AW Revision #
3. AW Revision #
4. AW Revision #
5. AW Revision #
6. AW Revision #

SCALE:
NTS

PAPER SIZE: 11 x 17

THE DESIGNS/INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS DRAWING ARE PROTECTED UNDER U.S. AND INTERNATIONAL TRADEMARK LAW AND ARE THE SOLE PROPERTY OF THE FITTS COMPANY, INC. ANY REPRODUCTION WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED DESIGN SUBMITTED FOR YOUR PERSONAL USE IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROJECT PLANNED FOR YOU BY THE FITTS COMPANY, INC. IT IS NOT TO BE SHOWN TO ANYONE OUTSIDE OF YOUR ORGANIZATION NOR IS IT TO BE USED, REPRODUCED, COPIED, OR EXHIBITED IN ANY FASHION. ALL OR ANY PART OF THIS DESIGN (EXCEPTING REGISTERED TRADEMARKS) IS PROTECTED UNDER U.S. AND INTERNATIONAL TRADEMARK LAW.
108" Tall Channel Letters - LED Layout

NOTE:
MAX MODS PER SERIES: 38
MAX MODS PER PS: 76

CUSTOMER:
Pinnacle Financial Partners

PRODUCT NUMBER:
TFC#32511

PRODUCT TITLE:
Building Elevations

3490 Venture Dr.
San Angelo, Tx.
76905
Ph. 1-325-227-4577
FAX 1-325-227-6841
www.p-led.com

THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS ARE THE CONFIDENTIAL PROPERTY OF
PRINCIPAL LED, LLC. ANY REPRODUCTION OR USE WITHOUT PRIOR WRITTEN
CONSENT IS PROHIBITED.

TITLE:
108" Pinnacle - 111936

DATE:
23 Feb 2022

DRAWN BY:
Wesley Klepac

AMP DRAW:
15.40 A

SIGN HEIGHT:
108 in

SIGN DEPTH:
5 in

FACE MATERIAL:
7328

LIGHTING:
Face Lit/Perf

REVISIONS:

SCALE:
NTS

PAPER SIZE:
11 x 17

ANY REPRODUCTION WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. THIS IS AN
UNPUBLISHED DESIGN SUBMITTED FOR YOUR PERSONAL USE IN CONNECTION WITH THE
PROJECT PLANNED FOR YOU BY THE FITTS COMPANY, INC. IT IS NOT TO BE SHOWN TO
ANYONE OUTSIDE OF YOUR ORGANIZATION NOR IS IT TO BE USED, REPRODUCED, COPIED, OR
EXHIBITED IN ANY FASHION. ALL OR ANY PART OF THIS DESIGN (EXCEPTING REGISTERED
THE DESIGNS/INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS DRAWING ARE PROTECTED UNDER U.S. AND
INTERNATIONAL TRADEMARK LAW AND ARE THE SOLE PROPERTY OF THE FITTS COMPANY,
INC.

CAUTION: THIS LAYOUT IS ONLY AN ESTIMATE.
Channel letter depth, face color, material, and thickness can vary which
may effect the number of modules required. To ensure accuracy, it is
recommended that you test light in a darkened environment prior to installing
or shipping to site to ensure the light output is commercially acceptable.
Final material estimates are the responsibility of the sign manufacturer.
Unless noted in header, Layout is based on the use of acrylic face material.

(638) Qwik Mod 2 Modules
(UL#: PL-QM2-TW150-P, SKU#: M-QMDX0-71)

(14) pcs Universal 60W Driver(s)
(UL#: PL-60-12-U, SKU#: P-OH60-12-PL)
108" Tall Channel Letters - East Office Tower Elevation

Right Side of Letters to Mount Even with Right Side of Windows
Letters will Mount Centered on the Wall Above the Windows

CUSTOMER: Pinnacle Financial Partners
SITE ADDRESS: 850 Morrison Drive, Charleston, SC 29403
PRODUCT NUMBER: TFC:32511
PRODUCT TITLE: Building Elevations
DRAWN BY: DPS
CHECKED: AVW
APPROVED: AVW
DATE: 3/31/22

REVISIONS:
1. AWW Revision #
2. AWW Revision #
3. AWW Revision #
4. AWW Revision #
5. AWW Revision #
6. AWW Revision #

SCALE: NTS
PAPER SIZE: 11 x 17

ANY REPRODUCTION WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED DESIGN SUBMITTED FOR YOUR PERSONAL USE IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROJECT PLANNED FOR YOU BY THE FITTS COMPANY, INC. IT IS NOT TO BE SHOWN TO ANYONE OUTSIDE OF YOUR ORGANIZATION NOR IS IT TO BE USED, REPRODUCED, COPIED, OR EXHIBITED IN ANY FASHION ALL OR ANY PART OF THIS DESIGN EXCEPTING REGISTERED TRADEMARKS. THE DESIGNS/INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS DRAWING ARE PROTECTED UNDER U.S. AND INTERNATIONAL TRADEMARK LAW AND ARE THE SOLE PROPERTY OF THE FITTS COMPANY, INC.
108" Tall Channel Letters - Letter Installation Section View

PENTHOUSE ROOF
173' - 5 1/2"

LEVEL 09
137' - 0"

LEVEL 08
123' - 0"

GLASS GUARDRAIL SYSTEM

MP-1: RIBBED METAL WALL PANEL RF/ SCREEN SYSTEM

ROOF
152' - 0"

MP-2: ACM WALL CAP, CAP TO EXTEND TO EDGES OF FINS

MP-1: RIBBED METAL WALL PANEL BK SIDES OF WING WALL, TYP

GLASS RAIL SYSTEM

1. AWW Revision 1
2. AWW Revision #
3. AWW Revision #
4. AWW Revision #
5. AWW Revision #
6. AWW Revision #
28" Tall Channel Letters

Pinnacle

Left Side View

Front View

CUSTOMER: Pinnacle Financial Partners
SITE ADDRESS: 850 Morrison Drive, Charleston, SC 29403
PRODUCT NUMBER: TFC-UK2511
PRODUCT TITLE: Channel Letters
DRAWN BY: DPS
CHECKED: AH
APPROVED: AH
DATE: 3/31/22
SCALE: 1" = 1'-0"
REVISIONS:
1. AWW Revision 1
2. AWW Revision #
3. AWW Revision #
4. AWW Revision #
5. AWW Revision #
6. AWW Revision #
PAPER SIZE: 11 x 17

THE DESIGNS/INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS DRAWING ARE PROTECTED UNDER U.S. AND INTERNATIONAL TRADEMARK LAW AND ARE THE SOLE PROPERTY OF THE FITTS COMPANY, INC. ANY REPRODUCTION WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED DESIGN SUBMITTED FOR YOUR PERSONAL USE IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROJECT PLANNED FOR YOU BY THE FITTS COMPANY, INC. IT IS NOT TO BE SHOWN TO ANYONE OUTSIDE OF YOUR ORGANIZATION NOR IS IT TO BE USED, REPRODUCED, COPIED, OR EXHIBITED IN ANY FASHION, ALL OR ANY PART OF THIS DESIGN (EXCEPTING REGISTERED TRADEMARKS).
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28” Tall Channel Letters

Returns & Trim Cap(s)
Painted Black

3/16” Thick 7328 White Acrylic
With 3M 3630-337 Process Blue
Vinyl Applied To The First Surface

Left Side View

Front View

3/16” Thick 7328 White Acrylic
28" Tall Channel Letters
28" Tall Channel Letters - Retail West Elevation

CUSTOMER: Pinnacle Financial Partners
SITE ADDRESS: 850 Morrison Drive, Charleston, SC 29403
PRODUCT NUMBER: TFC.32511
PRODUCT TITLE: Building Elevations
DRAWN BY: DPS
CHECKED:
APPROVED:
DATE: 3/31/22
REVISIONS:
1. AWW Revision #
2. AWW Revision #
3. AWW Revision #
4. AWW Revision #
5. AWW Revision #
6. AWW Revision #

SCALE: NTS
PAPER SIZE: 11 x 17

THE DESIGNS/INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS DRAWING ARE PROTECTED UNDER U.S. AND INTERNATIONAL TRADEMARK LAW AND ARE THE SOLE PROPERTY OF THE FITTS COMPANY, INC. ANY REPRODUCTION WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED DESIGN SUBMITTED FOR YOUR PERSONAL USE IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROJECT PLANNED FOR YOU BY THE FITTS COMPANY, INC. IT IS NOT TO BE SHOWN TO ANYONE OUTSIDE OF YOUR ORGANIZATION NOR IS IT TO BE USED, REPRODUCED, COPIED, OR EXHIBITED IN ANY FASHION ALL OR ANY PART OF THIS DESIGN (EXCEPTING REGISTERED PATTERN DESIGN)
28" Tall Channel Letters - Retail South Elevation
Sign Policy Statement Restudy
By motion of the Board of Architectural Review at the May 25th, 2020 meeting, the following guidelines were amended regarding the installation of signs in the Old and Historic, Old City District and Historic Corridor Districts.

As part of the built environment, signs have a significant visual impact. In the past, businesses were primarily locally-owned and signs reflected local aesthetics. In the global age, many businesses answer to national or international corporate entities. Signs developed by these global marketers are often intended for suburban, high-traffic areas and are not compatible with pedestrian-oriented streets. Therefore the Board of Architectural Review makes the following statement of policy:

1. Standard corporate sign packages that make no reference to their context, surroundings or background generally will not be allowed. Signs should respect the size, scale and design of the building.

2. Signs should be reviewed as part of an overall graphics system for a building. If multiple tenants occupy one building, their signs should be coordinated in terms of size and placement.

3. Signs should contain the business name and the minimum amount of information necessary to convey the type of business. Repetitive signs or extraneous information will not be allowed.

4. Sign materials should be compatible with those of the historic building and should not obscure significant architectural features. Lighted signs are generally not appropriate for the historic districts but may be reviewed in newer and evolving areas of the City where the submittal demonstrates the signage to be harmonious with the building and its context. External lighting of signage is to be a neutral white and color may be allowed for internally lighted signage which is muted in tone and harmonious with the building and its context.

5. Signs should be attached to the building carefully to prevent damage to historic fabric (for example, fittings should penetrate mortar joints rather than brick).

6. This policy statement is intended to supplement, not supersede, previous site specific signage policy statements.

7. Any illuminated signage is to be reviewed and approved by the City Architect before an Approval will be entered into the Data Management System by Staff.

These policy statement Amendments were approved by resolution by the Board of Architectural Review - Large on May 25th, 2022.
MEETING RECORD

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

May 25th, 2022, 4:30 P.M., virtually via Zoom Webinar

Amendments to the BAR General Sign Policy

Staff Comments:

1. Certain parts of the Historic Corridor District are experiencing significant new growth.
2. This growth is creating a rapid influx of proposed signage which is not directly addressed in the Sign Policy Statements. Most are asking for signage types which we would normally have to Deny based on the existing language of the General Sign Policy Statement.
3. Denial of these submittals may result in Appeals possibly resulting in a large number of these signage submittals coming before the Board on a regular basis.
4. The advent of new lighting technologies coupled with an evolving architectural language of in some of these areas can be compatible and appropriate but must be reviewed carefully on a case-by-case basis.
5. External lighting is to have a concealed light source and be a neutral white. Internally illuminated signage may have colors which are generally muted in tone and are harmonious with the building and its context. Overly bright, jarring, or garish colors will be reviewed by the Board on Appeal of Staff Decision if Applicants desire.
6. As an internal check, any illuminated signage should be reviewed and approved by the City Architect before an Approval is entered into the City’s Data Management System by Staff.
7. Staff has had City Corporate Counsel review the proposed Policy Amendments and has incorporated minor additions and modifications to the proposed Amendment language.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval for amended language to the General Sign Policy Statement to include the Historic Corridor District and the allowance for review of additional types of signage and the illumination thereof that is harmonious with the aesthetics of the building and its context.
Previous Board Comment:

- BAR has many signage policy statements which are specific and focused on certain areas of town in order to protect the integrity of the historic district and fabric of Charleston. Not the case for Upper Morrison, Upper Meeting, Upper King. The signage section of the zoning already has constraints on size, type, number, illumination. And then there is proximity to DRB territory which has signage policies. Should BAR simply not have a signage policy north of Line and rely on the base zoning ordinance? Unusual to have lit signage on top of a building in Charleston but is a new building.
- Except for the old Coke plant sign, there are not many which can be seen from a distance, and this differentiates Charleston. Historically, Charleston had a tremendously and varied vocabulary of signage. Reservation in adopting something tonight is constitutional issues related to commercial speech - any broader implications that have to do with more than aesthetics? As a result of large buildings, we have blocked the view of the historic skyline. Blocking it and then having large corporate signs that don't differentiate us from other cities should be avoided. Suggest developing a policy or ordinance that does not add workload to Staff or bring sign applications individually to the Board. While this is a deliberating body, encourage a bright-line rule.
- The Pinnacle example is advertising. No one would know how to get to that building by the sign. That is advertising.
- Want to avoid commercial homogeneity.
- Inherently different between vehicular level and human street level and what is visible to identify for wayfinding. On the peninsula, must consider that signage might be visible for 270 degrees.
- Would be best to review a few individual sign applications in the interim than to adopt a policy in haste. Suggest seeking national standard or preservation standard for the district which integrates new building signage with historic properties. Sign Policy Statement for Western End of Spring Street and Cannon Street Corridor might be a template.
- Regarding proposed policy statement changes, adding the proposed flexibility seems fine and would advocate for even more latitude. Concerned about case-by-case for staff. These edits are simple and clean and unobstructive.
- Case-by-case can be arbitrary. Should be tied down or be able to point to a standard.
- Regarding 997 Morrison, because it wasn't advertised on the agenda, it will need to be placed on next meeting.

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

John E. Robinson, Chairperson

Tory J. Parish, BAR L Administrator
By motion of the board of architectural review at the May 25, 2020 meeting, the following guidelines were amended regarding the installation of signs in the old and historic, old city district, and historic Carter districts.

As part of the built environment, signs have a significant visual impact. In the past, businesses were primarily locally owned, and signs reflected local aesthetics. In the global age, many businesses answer to national or international corporate entities. Signs developed by these global marketers are often intended for suburban, high traffic areas and are not compatible with pedestrian oriented streets. Therefore, the board of architectural review makes the following statement of policy:

1. Standard corporate sign packages that make no reference to their context, surroundings, or background, will not be allowed. Signs should respect the size, scale, and design of the building.
2. Signs should be reviewed as part of an overall graphics system for a building. If multiple tenants occupy one building, their single sign should recognize the building name only.
3. If there is only one sign which contains the business name, it should not be illuminated. Repetitive signs or extraneous information will not be allowed.
4. Sign materials should be compatible with those of the historic building and should not obscure significant architectural features. Lighted signs are not appropriate for the historic district, but may be reviewed in newer and evolving areas of the city where the submittal demonstrates the signage to be harmonious with the building and identifies the building only. External lighting of signage is to be a neutral white and color may be allowed for internally lighted signage which is muted in tone and harmonious with the building and its context.
5. Signs should be attached to the building carefully to prevent damage to historic fabric (for example fittings should penetrate mortar joints rather than brick).
6. This policy statement is intended to supplement, not supersede, previous site-specific signage policy statements.
7. Any illuminated signage is to be reviewed and approved by the city architect before an approval will be entered into the data management system by staff.

James C. Meadors
843-270-5444
By motion of the Board of Architectural Review at the May 25th, 2020 meeting, the following guidelines were amended regarding the installation of signs in the Old and Historic, Old City District and Historic Corridor Districts.

As part of the built environment, signs have a significant visual impact. In the past, businesses were primarily locally-owned and signs reflected local aesthetics. In the global age, many businesses answer to national or international corporate entities. Signs developed by these global marketers are often intended for suburban, high-traffic areas and are not compatible with pedestrian-oriented streets. Therefore the Board of Architectural Review makes the following statement of policy:

1. Standard corporate sign packages that make no reference to their context, surroundings or background generally will not be allowed. Signs should respect the size, scale and design of the building.

2. Signs should be reviewed as part of an overall graphics system for a building. If multiple tenants occupy one building, their signs should be coordinated in terms of size and placement.

3. Signs should contain the business name and the minimum amount of information necessary to convey the type of business. Repetitive signs or extraneous information will not be allowed.

4. Sign materials should be compatible with those of the historic urn not obscure significant architectural features. Lighted signs are generally not appropriate for the historic districts but may be reviewed in newer, evolving areas of the City where the submittal demonstrates the signage to be harmonious with the building and its context.

5. Signs should be attached to the building carefully to prevent damage to historic fabric. For example, fittings should penetrate mortar joints rather than brick.

6. This policy statement is intended to supplement, not supersede, previous site-specific signage policy statements.

7. Any illuminated signage is to be reviewed and approved by the City Architect before an Approval will be entered into the Data Management System by Staff.

8. Signage not deemed to be subtle, restrained and harmonious with the building and context which is more out of the ordinary in size, color, general tone and composition will be Denied and may be Appealed to the Board by Applicant.
By motion of the Board of Architectural Review at the July 13th, 2022 meeting, the following guidelines were amended regarding the installation of signs in the Old and Historic, Old City District and Historic Corridor Districts.

As part of the built environment, signs have a significant visual impact. In the past, businesses were primarily locally-owned and signs reflected local aesthetics. In the global age, many businesses answer to national or international corporate entities. Signs developed by these global marketers are often intended for suburban, high-traffic areas and are not compatible with pedestrian-oriented streets. Therefore the Board of Architectural Review makes the following statement of policy:

1. Standard corporate sign packages that make no reference to their context, surroundings or background will not be allowed. Signs should respect the size, scale and design of the building.

2. Signs should be reviewed as part of an overall graphics system for a building. If multiple tenants occupy one building, their signs should be coordinated in terms of size and placement.

3. Signs should contain the business name and the minimum amount of information necessary to convey the type of business. Repetitive signs or extraneous information will not be allowed.

4. Sign materials should be compatible with those of the historic building and should not obscure significant architectural features. Lighted signs are not appropriate for the historic districts but may be reviewed in newer, evolving areas of the City where the submittal demonstrates the signage to be harmonious with the building and its context. External lighting of signage is to be a neutral white and color may be allowed for internally lighted signage which is muted in tone and harmonious with the building and its context and identifies the building only. External lighting of signage is to be neutral white and color may be allowed for internally lighted signage which is muted in tone and harmonious to the building and its context.

5. Signs should be attached to the building carefully to prevent damage to historic fabric (for example, fittings should penetrate mortar joints rather than brick).

6. This policy statement is intended to supplement, not supersede, previous site specific signage policy statements.

7. Any illuminated signage is to be reviewed and approved by the City Architect before an Approval will be entered into the Data Management System by Staff.

These policy statement Amendments were approved by resolution by the Board of Architectural Review - Large on July 13th, 2022.