



**CITY OF CHARLESTON  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW (BAR-L)**

**MEETING RESULTS OF JULY 13, 2022**

A meeting of the Board of Architectural Review – Large (BAR-L) was held on Wednesday, July 13, 2022, at 4:30 p.m. in the Public Meeting Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, 2 George Street.

The following applications were considered:

**1. Approval of Minutes from June 15 Retreat**

MOTION: Approval as amended

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Brown

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Board Comment:

- Item 3 under 'Continuing Education Requirements' to be revised to be "Professional licensure requirements also applicable."

---

**2. Approval of Minutes from June 22 Meeting**

MOTION: Approval

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

---

**3. 257-261 King Street - - TMS # 457-08-01-050**

**BAR2020-000211**

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

Owner: 257 King Street Partnership

Applicant: Alicia Reed / Reggie Gibson Architects

MOTION: Approval

MADE BY: Meadors / SECOND: White

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. This is a vested right first year approval extension, requiring automatic Board approval if submitted in a timely manner, which is good for one year and may be renewed four more times in one-year increments, per Ordinance Section 54-962. This extension is to expire on July 22, 2023.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval of a first one-year extension of conceptual approval to expire on July 22, 2023.

---

4. **24 George Street (Silcox Gym, CofC) - - TMS # 457-04-02-001** **BAR2021-000533**  
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  
Owner: College of Charleston  
Applicant: Chris Altman / SMHa

**NOTE: The Board will convene at this address on Tuesday, July 12, 2022, at 4:30pm for a site visit.**

MOTION: Deferral including Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: Meadors / SECOND: Sobchuk VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0  
(Jay White recuses.)

Staff Observations:

1. Regarding the proposed roof replacement with terra cotta tiles, according to the Secretary of Interior's Standards, in regard to roofing,
  - a. Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, recommends identifying, retaining, and preserving the functional and decorative features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. These include the roof's shape, decorative features, and roofing material as well as size, color, and patterning.
  - b. Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, recommends, "if using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered."

Staff Comments:

1. No exception is taken with the proposed painting, stucco repairs, window restoration, door replacements, fencing and coping wall repairs. These appear to be thoughtfully considered, appropriately limited in scope, and in keeping with the original design of the building.
2. Applicant shall describe the method to be used for removing the existing paint and preparing the wrought iron fencing for new paint during the preliminary or final review.
3. The first change to the roof relates to the underlying roof structure for improvements to the building's seismic performance. This will raise the roof surface by approximately 8 inches on the larger gabled portion. This increase in height will be covered in copper flashing. Per on-site discussion, restudy stepping out the blocking so that it sits beyond the corbeling and install a new larger copper gutter above the existing to screen this new fascia.
4. Regarding the Board entertainment of the Ludoslate tiles, Staff considers these to be an improvement over the synthetic slate tiles reviewed for this project in June 2021. Additionally, there is limited area of visibility based on distance from the building and height over grade, durability, sustainability benefits, and the anticipated close appearance to the existing from the view corridor. It is understood that a change in materials in no way constitutes a precedent, and that materials which may deviate from accepted norms are approved on a case-by-case basis.
5. However, it is understood by Staff that it is the combination of removing the wood decking and existing shingles in lieu of new lightweight decking, plywood, and Ludoslate tiles that will result in the weight reduction of three pounds per square foot. Staff wonders, considering the minimal weight difference between the Ludoslate assembly and real slate assembly, if somehow

increasing the structural capacity of the roof would accommodate real slate, although there may likely more factors at play.

**Staff Recommendations:**

Conceptual Approval with Staff and Board comments and with refinement of the relationship of the new roof height, gutter, and corbeling.

**Board Comment:**

- Good research and site visit. The 8-inch reveal at the cornice will be visible and is concerning. Discussion placing the insulation on the interior of the structure, but applicant seeks to keep the interior aesthetics as proposed. Stainless steel at window heads should be wrapped in stucco.
- Raising the roof 8 inches changes the proportions in this area and will be visible. If proposal currently changes the interior from wood decking to metal decking, the interior aesthetics would already be changing.
- New ceiling is not in our purview as it is not visible.

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

---

**5. 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 including Board and Staff comments.

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 3 / AGAINST 1

(Luda Sobchuk recuses.)

**Staff Observation:**

1. Please note that the exact location of the relocated house is not yet set. Depending on an evaluation of an arborist with respect to trimming the crown of the tree to remain, it may shift a little, but probably not much from what is currently shown.

**Staff Comments:**

1. The general architectural direction of the six-story portion has improved with more glazing at the ground floor on East Bay Street, more interest on the north elevation, and a simplification to the fenestration. However, the overall six-story mass is still rather blocky. Restudy how to enliven the top through subtractive or additive sculpting.
2. At the East Bay Street façade of the six-story portion, and other locations, trim is placed above the fourth floor terminating at locations with minimal change in plane below. Applicant to describe what creates the vertical line below and how much, if any, change in plane exists. Increased change in plane may be needed for the trim to make a real nod to the adjacent four-story portion.
3. Applicant to confirm size of standard window at the six-story portion along East Bay and Washington.
4. Restudy the fenestration on the six-story portion for consistency.
5. As part of this, study how the language of the south side (courtyard elevation) of the six-story portion might more closely reflect or be consistent with the language of the other elevations of this portion, rather than adopting the language of the four-story mass at Washington and Charlotte.
6. As part of this, study how the scale transition from the north elevation to the east and west elevations might be better resolved. While recessed slightly, the residential terrace doors and transoms at the

northeast corner of Washington Street reflect the sizing of the north side doors and are much smaller than those on the Washington Street elevation. With consistent massing and detailing, study what might make this scale transition, if required, more cohesive.

7. As part of this, at the ground floor along Washington Street of the six-story portion, study how to make the two sets of metal doors and panels more similar in size and proportion, for preliminary review.
8. At the four-story portion at Washington and Charlotte, continue to study how the door pairs at balconies might better relate to the adjacent windows.
9. At the four-story portion at Washington and Charlotte, sculpt the end closest to 6 Charlotte Street to prevent from overwhelming the existing house.
10. Continue the exterior material into the opening of the parking garage.
11. Additional renderings from Charlotte Street would still be preferred to better understand visibility to the courtyard and elevated plaza.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Understanding an Applicant's desire to keep a complex and multi-faceted project moving forward, Staff is comfortable with a split recommendation of Conceptual Approval for the three- and four-story portions along East Bay Street, Conceptual Approval for the general location of the relocated single house from 77 Washington, Deferral for the six-story portion for massing and general architectural direction related to fenestration, and Deferral for massing at the four-story portion at Charlotte and Washington Streets. Otherwise, recommendation is for deferral for these specific issues.

**Board Comment:**

- The structure at 77 Washington is confirmed to be at the back of sidewalk currently, whereas the newly proposed location on Charlotte is shifted back from the sidewalk. The Secretary of Interior Standards indicated a relocated structure should maintain the same relationship with the street. Staff comments are within the boundary of what we consider at conceptual review. Some items previously discussed have been perhaps brushed away not for necessity but convenience. A split motion would fix some portions in place. Agree with staff recommendation.
- Not agreeable to a split motion because it locks in portions which might be affected for the better through revisions to the unapproved portions, especially regarding the location of the 77 Washington structure. On board with other comments. Should be deferred.
- The lower height portions and facades are successful but struggling as previous Board member on the remainder, so a split motion could make sense.

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

---

**6. 578 Meeting Street - - TMS # 458-01-03-031**

**BAR2021-000560**

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

Owner: Flournoy Development Group / Exchange Real Estate Holdings LLC

Applicant: Ross Kirby / Dynamik Design

**MOTION:** Denial including Board and Staff comments with additional comments of finding massing not appropriate in relation to the historic façade, hyphens inadequate at breaking the massing, and no architectural merit warranting additional height.

**MADE BY:** White / **SECOND:** Brown

**VOTE:** FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

**Staff Comments:**

1. Continue the material language into and through the opening that frames the Regis Milk element, as this currently stops abruptly. The transition should be more purposeful. This comment is typical for other sides of building masses where this might occur
2. The building portions at Meeting Street rely on a heavier framework up through the fourth floor which erodes as it nears the Regis Milk remnant. This framework appears too minimal and should be strengthened. It is too minimal to serve as an anchor for these portions and too minimal to be noticed as diminishing in deference to the Regis Milk element. Additional pilasters, articulation to the massing, or some interplay of layers on the exterior may improve this condition.
3. At the Meeting Street portions, the cornice above the fifth-floor stops is not consistently placed and does not reflect changes in the massing below. This should be restudied.
4. While reduced per Staff's recommendation, the abundance of railing along the top floor against Meeting seems out of context and should be eliminated or reduced.
5. The curved railing at this portion is inconsistent with the remainder of the building. Should the railing be retained, its design should be restudied.
6. The location of the parking garage access makes much more sense now as located aligned with the courtyard above. Continue the exterior material into the opening.
7. On the Nassau and Stuart Street facades, the taller brick portions are reading as façade treatment rather than having any depth, and this should be restudied.
8. Renderings indicate a material change at the recessed portions and balconies. Applicant to confirm.
9. The "bridge" element should be authentically a bridge with transparency through its sides. Omit the residential units in the bridge. The size of the bridge and the transparency of this element are impacted by their inclusion.
10. The top of the Meeting Street portions is still a bit tall and should be lowered.
11. There may be a push to quiet this building in deference to the existing historic element, and this is appreciated. However, the project should be restudied for vibrancy and dynamism, and, especially at the Meeting Street portions.
12. Additional renderings should be provided to demonstrate what views, if any, might exist from the west into the pool courtyard as the materials around the courtyard are simplified and downgraded.

**Staff Recommendation:**

As proposed, the project must receive a finding of architectural merit and context for both height districts. We do not find that the project meets all facets for a finding of architectural merit and context yet, and for this reason, we recommend deferral.

**Board Comment:**

- Regarding the requirements for additional height, the argument is not compelling as these items mentioned should occur anyway. For example, additional setback is a logical move on this street, and another setback is due to an easement. Only minimal improvements to the massing. Proposal doesn't celebrate the historic building, just dwarfs it.
- Concerning that renderings were not provided for all sides. A significant upgrade but project hasn't hit the mark yet for architectural merit. Considerate to the church, but church has not provided an endorsement, and neither has Public Works. As a thoroughfare into the city, a perspective from the Ravenel Bridge should be provided. Agree with previous Board member and Staff comments.
- Project has evolved to be better. The hyphens are an attempt to provide the appearance of separated buildings. Meeting Street façade is peaceful and calm. Agree with previous Board member regarding additional height for reasons stated. Not opposed in principle to the bridge element but didn't fully see or get to understand.
- Most uncomfortable is the Meeting Street portion which is squatty without vertical proportions, heavy and massive. No examples of bony on Meeting Street, and this is a pair. Less uncomfortable with other parts where it's broken up and has a change in plane.

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

---

**7. 850 Morrison Drive - - TMS # 459-13-02-004/005/009/010/011 BAR2022-000849**

Request appeal of Staff decision regarding denial of illuminated signage.

c. 2020 | Height District 4-12 | None | Historic Corridor District

Owner: Pinnacle Financial Partners

Applicant: Steven Fitts & Kathy Wood / The Fitts Company, Inc.

**Application Withdrawn by Applicant prior to Board discussion.**

**Staff Comments:**

1. Staff has denied the illumination of signage. The proposed includes three illuminated signs - the sign at the top of the building facing the harbor and two (technically) tenant signs low, facing Morrison Drive.
2. Staff is reviewing this signage under the General Signage Policy Statement, which indicates, "lighted signs are generally not appropriate for the historic district."
3. Zoning Ordinance Section 54-415.b.4 states, "With the exception of a building façade fronting a public street or public right-of-way, façade signs shall be limited to those facades which have a building entrance accessible to the general public or pedestrian." Therefore, all signage for this building should be placed on the Morrison Drive side of the building, as this is the primary street which the building fronts and which access by the general public would occur.
4. Staff and Board have traditionally envisioned signage as a wayfinding device directing one to an entry point rather than advertising. This signage may be better placed at the corner of Morrison Drive and Johnson Streets as a monument sign but would need to be worked into an elaborate landscaping plan.
5. While Pinnacle Bank is a tenant in this building, it is understood by Staff that the building will be known as the Pinnacle Building. BAR has permitted illuminated monument signs which reflect the name of the building but have denied illumination of individual tenant signs.
6. Lit signage on building tops is inconsistent with peninsular Charleston with the exception of an institutional use where it is serving a function as a critical way-finding device, such as at Children's Hospital.
7. Zoning Ordinance Section 54-410.b states, "Light sources shall be shielded from all adjacent residential buildings and streets and shall not be of such brightness so as to cause glares hazardous to pedestrians or automobile drivers or so as to create a nuisance to adjacent residential districts." Residential units lie on the west and south sides of the property.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Denial of Appeal with restudy of signage.

---

**8. Sign Policy Statement Restudy**

DISCUSSION ONLY; NO VOTE TAKEN.

**Board Comments:**

- Omit extraneous sentence at the end of item #4: "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."
- Consider adding an item noting there shall be no presumption of approval or inclusion of national corporate logos and branding.

---



John E. Robinson, Chairperson

07/27/22

date

---



Tory J. Parish, BAR-L Administrator

07/27/2022

date