



CITY OF CHARLESTON BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW - LARGE

MEETING RESULTS

AUGUST 24, 2022

4:30 P.M.

2 GEORGE STREET

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: John Robinson (Chairman), Seaton Brown, James Meadors, Luda Sobchuk, Jay White

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Tory Parish, Lawrence Courtney

MINUTES

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM AUGUST 10, 2022 MEETING

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Approved as submitted

MADE BY: White SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0
(John Robinson abstains.)

APPLICATIONS

2. 48 COURTENAY DRIVE

TMS # 460-15-01-044 | BAR2022-000882

Not Rated | N/A | c. 1939 | Height District 85/125 | Old City District

Request final approval for demolition.

Owner: 48 Courtenay Drive, LLC

Applicant: Stephen Ramos AIA

NOTE: The Board convened at this address on Tuesday, August 23, 2022 at 4:30 p.m. for a site visit.

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Approve the demolition incorporating Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: White SECOND: Sobchuk

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

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. The existing structure is unique for Charleston with a primary form that is one-and-a-half stories with dormers and a placement parallel to and set back from the street. As far as the Sanborn maps indicate, the primary form has been an L-shaped for at least fifty years which is atypical.
2. The structure appears to be well-built and well maintained. However, maintenance condition should not be the determining factor in a decision for demolition as this would sort properties based on the care or the neglect provided.
3. The structure shows layers of additions making the original form almost hard to discern and an exercise in conjecture.
4. Character-defining features might include the gable end brackets, dormers, brick porch columns which have been incorporated into enclosed space, and steeply pitched roof gable which may not have been original to the building. However, character-defining features, which were original, are hard to discern.
5. The context surrounding the structure has changed dramatically over the years and is quite varied including other residential structures used for business, MUSC offices and facilities, and large buildings to the south.
6. Salvage materials wherever possible.
7. Applicant has been coordinating with City Staff on grand trees.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Due to the many layers of additions which have muddled the original house and due to the evolving context, we recommend Approval for Demolition.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Photographs found indicate the form and roof configuration is unchanged. Peculiarities in form and detailing make it unique and make it Charleston. Different for the city. New exterior skin may or may not cover original material. One of the last original buildings on the site but also it was an island, the first in the found photos, and later a set.
- Ordinance addresses considerations for review of demolitions. Toughest for this one is its an island, surrounding by MUSC, but found photo indicates it was built that way. Hard to discern the form. If amongst its contemporaries, would be hard to support. Last of its kind and will be surrounded by very large buildings, so comfortable with demolition. Not because building isn't sufficient quality but because of context.
- Appreciate thoroughness of application.

3. 24 GEORGE STREET – CofC SILCOX GYM
TMS # 457-04-01-001 | BAR2021-000533

Not Rated | Ansonborough | c. pre-1943 | Old and Historic District

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

Owner: College of Charleston
Applicant: Chris Altman / SMHa

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Final Approval with Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: Meadors SECOND: Sobchuk VOTE: FOR 3 AGAINST 0
(Seaton Brown and Jay White recuse.)

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. Responding to previous comments regarding the additional height to the roof, the thickness of the new roof has been reduced by using a 1.5" steel deck instead of a much deeper one, as previously detailed. Therefore, the roof edge requires a much smaller profile, and the gutter will appear to be very close to same location as the existing condition.
2. The downspout is called out as 4"x6" which is likely simply a typo; the downspouts should be 6" in diameter.
3. Staff considers the Ludoslate an acceptable substitution for the original natural slate in this case, being used for a reduction in weight, but cautions that substitutions such as this are to be made on a case-by-case basis. In this application, there is limited area of visibility due to distance from the building and height over grade, an anticipated close appearance to the existing roof, and durability and sustainability benefits.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Final Approval with Board and Staff comments

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Revised detail looks great. Confirm copper comes down fascia.
- Fulfilled conditions.

4. 518 EAST BAY STREET

TMS # 459-13-02-010, 459-13-02-004, 459-13-02-005, 459-13-02-009

BAR2022-000797

New Construction | N/A | Height District 4 & 6 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for multi-family/mixed-use building.

Owner: 518 East Bay, LLC

Applicant: Luda Sobchuk / SGANW Design

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Conceptual Approval incorporating Board and Staff comments

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

STAFF COMMENT:

1. Applicant has responded to the prior Board and Staff comments. The building components each have a clean and ordered language while complimenting each other. The massing has been revisited in order to provide a transition down to the existing house on Charlotte Street and to enliven the north façade of the six-story portion. The fenestration has been refined for consistency within each building component and refinements have occurred along the ground floor at Washington Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Reference Secretary of Interior’s Standards for relocating a structure, but another city department values the tree affecting relocation placement. Could be a mistake to locate it with a gap. Therefore, proposed location may be the best. Appreciate the changes to the building and applicant’s addressing previous Board critique. Materials which need to be studied include railing material and material and its vertical orientation at sixth floor. Painting of brick may make it appear too monolithic.
- Join in comments of previous Board Member feedback as well as practical constraints regarding items not in purview. A much cleaner presentation, fenestration is better, better coherency to overall, and sixth story is greatly improved.
- Agree with previous Board Members. Project is enormous, so some massive walls. Southeast and northeast corners are more interesting.
- Step-down to single house is better and more sympathetic showing deference to historic structure – a good and sympathetic compromise.

5. 145 CALHOUN STREET

TMS # 457-04-02-022 | BAR2021-000545

Not Rated | Neighborhood | c. 1955 | Old and Historic District

Request final approval for minor addition to existing steel trellis.

Owner: King and Calhoun LLC

Applicant: Kevan Hoertdoerfer / Hoertdoerfer Architects

APPROVED

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED XX

MOTION: Deferral with subsequent review by Staff including Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: White SECOND: Brown

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 1

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. Previous meeting alluded to the follow-up review being handled by Staff, but this was not included in the Board’s motion.

2. Applicant's drawings continue to be "light" and do not show elements such as downspouts requested. Staff finds their locations to be unclear but assumes that the downspouts are placed behind the new cross-bracing. However, the section showing the location of the downspout seems to be at the location of the shorter knee wall.
3. Structural page S210 shows the addition of a cross-braced frame at the western end of the new terrace structure to be attached to the third-floor deck. Architectural drawings depict the framing attached to the top of a knee wall at the edge of the roof. Please confirm and check for consistency between drawings prior the follow-up review.
4. Staff has had the opportunity to evaluate the polycarbonate glazing system to be used and finds it acceptable in terms of aging and durability. It is noted that this system is only rated for 145 mph wind loads in this hurricane prone area but that this will suffice for all but the most severe weather events.
5. While Staff is confident that Applicant can make the project and its details work, it is important that prominent elements be shown and will be at the next submission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Preliminary Approval and more information to be provided for a Final Review by Staff.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Package is light, and applicant is asking for final. Material samples of anything unusual, such as polycarbonate, are to be included, per submittal requirements. Many small but important details missing from documents. For process to move smoothly, Board has to understand what they are approving. The details do matter. Building is prominent. No problem with aesthetics, but Board can't give a level of approval based on the information provided.
- Agree with previous Board Member. Every comment is asking for additional information. Small items but combined are a problem.

6. 186 CONCORD STREET

TMS # 459-00-00-091 | BAR2022-000880

Not Rated | c. 1942 | Old City District

Request final approval for modifications to front entry and to storage area on southwest side.

Owner: Leucadia Coast Properties LLC

Applicant: Kevan Hoertdoerfer / Hoertdoerfer Architects

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Approval with Board comments

MADE BY: White SECOND: Sobchuk VOTE: FOR 3 AGAINST 2

STAFF COMMENT:

1. ~~Staff believes that this proposed change will alter the character-defining feature that is the recessed entry and create a situation where the open doors are placed along the~~

~~primary façade from the street, a condition which has not been shown to have ever existed.~~

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Denial with Board and Staff Comments

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Doors were added as part of a rehabilitation project. While the masonry opening is historic, that which fills it is only 18 years old, so comfortable with proposed.
- Agree, comfortable with it and will not alter visibility of front facade.

7. 1085 MORRISON DRIVE

TMS # 461-09-03-057 | BAR2022-000822

c. 2011 | Height District 4 & 12 | East Central | Old City District

Request final approval for new outdoor dining shade structure.

Owner: RCC Investors 1081 Morrison LLC

Applicant: Kevan Hoertdoerfer / Hoertdoerfer Architects

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Approve with Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: Brown SECOND: Sobchuk VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 1

STAFF COMMENT:

1. Please confirm a guttering system, which seems to be depicted in the structural sections. Confirm location and type of downspouts (color, profile, etc.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Preliminary Approval with Final Review by Staff

BOARD COMMENTS:

- (none)

8. 29-35 GEORGE / 306 KING / 84-88 SOCIETY STREETS

TMS # 457-04-04-007/008/017/025/113

BAR2022-000749

New Construction | N/A | Height District 6 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for construction of two new buildings: Building A at George Street and Building B at Society Street to include a hotel and mixed-uses incorporating a portion of the existing building.

Owner: Category Company / GS Acquisition LLC
Applicant: Bittoni Architects / Goff D'Antonio Associates

APPROVED

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED XX

MOTION: Deferral with Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: Meadors SECOND: Brown VOTE: FOR 3 AGAINST 1
(John Robinson recuses.)

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. Building A, the apartments, at 29-35 George Street is more contemporary in its expression, especially at the ground plane. The front elevation is treated as two vertical masses with elegant detailing to emphasize vertical proportions of elements. Staff finds the language blends well with the newer, more modern CofC buildings across the street and will lead to a comfortable feeling along this stretch of George Street. The large amount of glazing along the lower portion at George Street should serve to activate and provide interest at this area.
 - a. A 10' deep sidewalk is required in front of the building, and Applicant may confirm if additional depth is planned. Please also confirm the depth of the roof overhang which serves as a canopy to a portion of the George Street sidewalk.
 - b. Staff encourages Applicant to continue seeking ways to incorporate outdoor areas for additional activation at the sidewalk level. The use of more operable door panels might be an interesting solution.
 - c. While it is elegantly detailed, restudy the top of the sixth-floor. The combination of dark color and the height of wall over the top of the windows continues to be bothersome in that it makes the building a bit top heavy. The recessed round-top windows may further this idea of heaviness. Restudy the top floor to find ways to lighten and diminish its effect on the whole.
 - d. Please define the use of the term "unitized" glazing.
2. Building B, the hotel, at 84-88 Society incorporates the remnant front quarter of the existing building at this location on which a roof terrace is to be planned. Adjacent to the this will be welcoming front entry area which leads to the interior of the site where a pocket park is planned behind 302 King Street. A large five-story building sits directly across Society Street which makes the scale of this building more acceptable. The architectural expression has been kept reasonably simple, drawing from nearby elements. An extra half-story at the top is well pushed back from the street and will likely not be visible. However, this extra height requires a finding of architectural merit and context by the Board. Regarding Building B:
 - a. A small but additional increase between planes at the front elevation is encouraged for cleaner massing articulation and additional deference to the salvaged remnant structure.
 - b. Applicant to describe what is occurring at the building at 306 King Street, as this has been noted in the submittal as part of the request for a finding of architectural merit.
 - c. While not visible from the public right-of-way, it is proposed for a finding of architectural merit, therefore Staff suggests giving the park behind 302 King

Street a sense of enclosure and using the mix of hardscape and landscaping and perhaps even public art to create a sense of place.

- d. Applicant should describe what type of sound mitigation measures are expected, as noted on page AB2.05, and whether these are expected to have any visual impact.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Continuation of blocking the King Street buildings. Many great details, but it is applicant's responsibility to follow those that came before and also to look at existing inventory of buildings which we all appreciate. This height is a continuation of lack of appreciation for existing inventory of buildings which surround the site. For this reason, can't support additional half story.
- Project has come a long way from last presentation. Great example of going back to the drawing board and intentionally adapting to Charleston community. Would like to understand unexplained reference to 306 King Street. Appreciate recessed top windows at top, reminiscent of the Johnson Center. Height doesn't fit this area. Still some further vantage points where may be seen. Can't support merit for extra half story but project generally in right direction.
- Much improved in architecture, mass, and scale. Agree with Staff comments and colleagues. Half story is unnecessary height to context and surroundings. Materials are interesting – similar and responsive to context. Not sure why rounded windows at top are needed – top seems disconnected. Existing one-story on Society Street is architecturally disconnected, in style and transition. Not comfortable to support the extra half story.
- A most thorough reconsideration of architectural direction in wake of denial, and a good example of what Board expects from a denial. Extremely compelling on both streets – order, scale, proportions, material palette, syntax. Could potentially support merit and extra story based on architectural design. Commend intellectual and creative flexibility.
- Additional lines of sight would be helpful.

9. POLICY STATEMENT FOR HISTORIC MATERIALS DEMOLITION PURVIEW

WITHDRAWN BY STAFF

John E. Robinson, Chairperson

date

Tory J. Parish, BAR-L Administrator

date