



CITY OF CHARLESTON BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW - LARGE

MEETING RESULTS

SEPTEMBER 14, 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 24, 2022 MEETING

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: X

MADE BY: White SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

APPLICATIONS

2. 678 KING AND 666 KING STREET (LOWLINE AFFORDABLE HOUSING)

TMS # 460-04-04-118 / 034 | BAR2021-000672

New Construction | Westside | Height District 5 | Historic Corridor District

Request preliminary approval for new construction of a 55-unit Affordable House Project.

Owner: Robinson Villa / Lowline Housing Partners LLC

Applicant: Brian Fessler / McMillan Pazdan Smith

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Preliminary Approval incorporating Board and Staff comments and Final Review By Staff of For-Permit drawings with murals submitted as a separate application package to the Board.

MADE BY: White SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. Recent revisions include a lowering of and a simplification of the detailing of the parapets, resolving with something cleaner and more in tune with the overall design language.
2. Related to some prior Board perspective of the proposed building as a gateway building, especially from the elevated highway, the project will certainly occupy a unique location. However, the newly provided perspectives indicate the building to be more of a peripheral building. In this position, the many planes, edges, steps, and interactions on the proposed will provide a frontage that is both interesting and respectful of this unique location.
3. Two brick colors are proposed, with elements such as the window sills and headers utilizing the darker color. Staff is neutral with no concern on either color, but not overly supportive of two brick colors for the building.
4. BAR Staff is supportive of public art and/or graphics but suggest that the design of the graphic panels, unless approved, be considered murals and reviewed separately at a later day, considering these to be placeholders.
5. BAR Staff maintain the concern over the green tone proposed in the images. At Conceptual Review, it was determined that the color and tone would be reviewed as part of a mock-up panel. Staff is equally concerned about some of the colors and tones used in the graphic panels, finding a muting or neutralizing of these to be necessary and appropriate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Preliminary Approval with Board and Staff comments. Alternatively, if the Board is comfortable with Staff handling the color guidance and Board separately reviewing the graphics separately, Final Approval with Board and Staff comments and Final Review by Staff of "For Permit" drawings.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Appreciate the adjustments. Murals provide opportunity to display something positive and intentional about Charleston and Upper Peninsula. These should be handled separately, and it is understood that these will be painted decorated surfaces. Moving in good direction.
- What we see on the Interstate is driven by colors at ground which are understood to be an extension of the neighborhood. Appreciate changes and commitment to the project. View from ground is engaging. Uncomfortable with the green color as it extends above the Interstate, so uncomfortable with it overall. Comfortable with the project otherwise.
- Agree with previous. This particular shade of green is a bit jarring, which we are hearing from several, but it does not have to be nailed down in a preliminary review. The color can benefit by being broken out like the mural package which does come with the understanding that it will be installed. Agree that aesthetics of building, including more substantial planes, have improved tremendously. Strong proposal.
- Agree with previous. Would like to see mural package separately and color reconsidered. Appreciate Applicant's providing the context videos. Excited to see the murals and contemporary nature in juxtaposition with the more traditional language along King Street.
- Agree with previous. Supportive from the beginning. Simplification meets the previous comments. Supportive of the public art in the form of murals and looking forward to seeing their design. Regarding the use of two brick colors, we can look at on the mock-up panel.
- Board discussion over timeline of the mural submission included considering the images in the preliminary package as placeholders. Mural package to be submitted and approved prior to a Final Approval by Staff.

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

3. HAMPSTEAD MALL SOUTHEAST PARK RENOVATION

TMS # 459-09-02-151 | BAR2022-000897

New Construction | East Side | Height District 2.5-3 | Old City District

Request conceptual approval for renovation of existing park to include an outdoor classroom with landscape and hardscape improvements. Installation of new perimeter fence and pedestrian gates.

Owner: Charleston County School District

Applicant: Geoff Clever / Studio Architects

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Conceptual Approval incorporating Board and Staff comments with Final Approval to be made by Staff including on the issue of material.

MADE BY: Meadors SECOND: Brown
(Jay White recuses.)

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. Staff understands the need to secure this area to be used by the adjacent school for a certain period of time during the day and that agreements are in place to regulate when the park is open to the public.
2. The Zoning Division has no issues with the heights and location of the fencing and piers.
3. While curbing consistently around the project would be consistent with the northern quadrants, the fencing is an upgrade from the chain-link fencing that exists there now. The pre-manufactured fencing, piers and curb walls should match the existing at the northern quadrants of the Mall as closely as possible.
4. Omit the knee wall adjacent to the gate between the two entry piers in order to maintain the symmetry that was created with the piers and fencing at these locations.
5. The stucco texture of the piers and curb walls shall match the stucco texture of the similar elements at the northern quadrants; the proposed appears too rough in the photographs. It is assumed that the color of the newly proposed elements matches the color on similar elements in the northern quadrant.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Final Approval with Board and Staff Comments with Final Review by Staff of "For Permit" drawings.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Applicant confirmed wrought iron to be used between the piers and pre-manufactured aluminum fencing to be used elsewhere with reasons including cost and consistency with other CCSD campuses including Early College High School across the street.
- Great project; excited to see the improvements. Concerned full fencing is not inviting to the neighborhood even though the park is to be used by the public after school hours. Suggest

one entry be large enough for food trucks. Applicant confirms maintenance gate is largest and no pushback from the public regarding accessibility.

- Aesthetic improvement to neighborhood; nice park for the residents and the students.
- Concern over the challenge of ensuring the prefabricated metal fencing will match the wrought iron such as the detailing of attachments. Will be difficult and would be cautious.
- No mock-up perhaps needed but be forewarned on compatibility of materials.
- Suggest forgoing mock-up (cost) and go with full wrought iron.
- Staff charged with making sure they understand the differences between the wrought iron and aluminum and factor this into decision to approve or not.
- Challenge school board, as the likelihood of the aluminum fencing lasting the life and use of the park is not high.

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

4. 860 MORRISON DRIVE

TMS # 459-02-00-005 | BAR2022-000899

Not Rated | N/A | Height District 4-12 | c. 1950 and c. 1995 | Historic Corridor District

Request final approval for total demolition of two structures.

Owner: DSM Real Estate Partners

Applicant: Eric Garris / Bello Garris Architects

NOTE: The Board convened at this address on Tuesday, September 13, 2022 at 4:30 p.m. for a site visit.

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Final Approval of demolition

MADE BY: Meadors SECOND: White

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. While the 1995 pre-engineered building may technically not be in BAR purview, the Demolition Application describes two structures which are conjoined and Staff appreciates Applicant's caution in presenting them both.
2. Neither of the structures is rated, has known significance, or exhibits unique character-defining features. Both are representative of many common utilitarian buildings of their times.
3. Their site context, while never favorable to the small, utilitarian aesthetic, is rapidly changing to structures of quite different uses, much larger in size.
4. The buildings do nothing to contribute to the City's building fabric.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval for total demolition of both structures.

BOARD COMMENT:

- Board member request to make a motion if no one in attendance is in opposition, if there is no public comment, and if fellow Board members have no objection. Chairman confirms, and motion is made.

5. 237 MEETING STREET (THE RYDER HOTEL)

TMS # 457-08-01-003 | BAR2022-000898

Not Rated | N/A | Height District 6 | c. 1964 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for alterations of building elements beyond existing porte cochere for a new lobby entrance.

Owner: Rockbridge

Applicant: Clark Batchelder / Goff D'Antonio

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Final Approval with Board and Staff Comments with Final Review by Staff of "For Permit" drawings.

MADE BY: White SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. The project was initially approved with a provision for the green walls without the wire "lattice." A sidewalk encroachment easement will be required for these and they should be irrigated to be successful.
2. Applicant is confident that queuing of vehicles caused by valet parking can be worked out with the City's Traffic and Transportation Department, a critical next step. The Zoning Division has no issue with what is proposed, and there is no TRC review required due the small size of the addition. We understand this has been resolved.
3. The new Lobby, situated behind the porte cochere and significantly lower than the current entry, will have a minimal impact on the street presence of the project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Final Approval with Board and Staff Comments with Final Review by Staff of "For Permit" drawings.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Agree with Staff's recommendation
For full Board comments, please visit the City of Charleston's YouTube Channel.
-

6. 900 KING STREET (HUGER STREET PUMP STATION)

TMS # 463-16-01-001 | BAR2022-000765

New Construction | North Central | Height District 2.5 | Historic Corridor District

Request final approval of a new stormwater pump station and community area.

Owner: City of Charleston

Applicant: Luda Sobchuk / SGA Narmour Wright Design

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Final Approval with Board and Staff Comments with Final Review by Staff of "For Permit" drawings.

MADE BY: Brown SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 3 AGAINST 0

(Jay White recuses. Luda Sobchuk is applicant.)

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. This interesting project marries the functions of a much-needed storm water pump station with a public park. As a reminder from the Conceptual Review, the project will use different materials and a contemporary parti while the color palette, scale, and massing of the primary structure will be compatible and sympathetic to the nearby historic Enston Homes. Much of the housing for the sizable equipment will be below grade resulting in a building height that is approximately the same as the Enston Homes. The project has continued to be refined with revisions including an opening up of the plaza space on Huger Street which will provide more space to access and use the park.
2. The park area has gone through several iterations, resulting in a comfortable public space around a pond which, Staff is assured, will retain roughly the same level of water year round. It is noted that the interior lining of the pond will be painted with black epoxy paint. Although this is not reflected on the segments in the middle of the pond.
3. While Staff is appreciative of Applicant's decision to replace the "brick textured" CorTen panels with real brick and to replace the board-formed concrete with a smooth concrete, we do believe that the exterior concrete should be textured or finished in some manner.
4. Noise mitigation has not been addressed outside of confirming the location of the pumps to be underground. The perceived need for or lack of need for sound mitigation should be confirmed.
5. Lighted bollards, while normally not acceptable, are likely appropriate here due to the public and institutional nature of the project.
6. Applicant to provide photometric information for each type of fixture as well as site photometric data.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Final Approval with Board and Staff Comments with Final Review by Staff of "For Permit" drawings.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Was brick color chosen to match that at Enston Homes? Appreciative but not sure this is necessary. Color could be distinctly different.
- Does the building function in the same way as the pump stations at Concord and between the Ashley River bridges? Applicant confirmed it serves the same purpose generally but incorporates that park. Structures and function are very similar to the Concord Street station

- Concern over the visibility and impact of such a large amount of concrete. Can it have color?
 - Is the fountain for aesthetics or function? Applicant confirms for aeration.
 - Appreciative of public comment regarding suggestion of interpretive/educational signage.
- For full Board comments, please visit the City of Charleston's YouTube Channel.
-

7. 584 MEETING STREET

TMS # 459-01-03-045 | BAR2021-000581

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

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

Owner: Meeting Street Acquisitions LLC

Applicant: William Rodon Hornof / 2RZ Architecture

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Final Approval with Board and Staff comments.

MADE BY: White SECOND: Sobchuk
(Seaton Brown abstains.)

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. The design has continued down a very similar path as before, but comparison drawings, as noted in the submittal requirements, would be beneficial and necessary for any additional reviews.
2. The clear distinction between a strong base, a somewhat truncated middle of a different material and color and a strong top are an interesting abstraction of the traditional layering on this decidedly contemporary building.
3. The materials and detailing are consistent with what the Board has been led to expect with a relatively simple palette with enough variation in the materials, colors and textures to make it visually interesting.
4. As a consistent Staff concern, metal flashing should be minimized, have hemmed edges and have ends placed vertically on the surface behind them and held as tightly as possible while still creating a drip edge.
5. Board should weigh in on any unique conditions which they will need to see in the mock-up panel.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Final Approval with Board and Staff comments.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Appreciative of the attention to detail and material investigations.
- Responsibility of the Applicant to make the materials work. Their being manufactured can be a benefit over on-site quality conditions. Advised to make it work and to let Staff know of any problems.
- Comparison drawings are critical to see what the changes.

- Mock-up panel to include the main and most difficult details. Applicant has self-represented the challenge in getting them right.

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

8. 860 MORRISON DRIVE (MORRISON YARD PHASE THREE - HOTEL)

TMS # 459-02-00-005 | BAR2022-000900

New Construction | N/A | Height District 4-12 | Historic Corridor District

Request conceptual approval for new construction of a hotel building at Morrison Yard.

Owner: DSM Real Estate Partners

Applicant: Eric Garris / Bello Garris Architects

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: White SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

STAFF OBSERVATIONS FOR AGENDA ITEMS 8 AND 9:

1. Staff has worked with the Applicants since earlier this summer, and Applicants have been responsive. Therefore, Staff has more observations than comments, which we would like to reiterate. The project handles the massing of the hotel and multi-family portions as four distinctively separate buildings of similar language, thereby answering to the concern which we often struggle with of inserting massively large buildings to the landscape. The concept handles another challenge of larger projects by burying parking and utilitarian services. Shifting these functions out of view allows for the vehicular entry to be a plaza space that is seamless and open for people supported by textures and landscaping, and not restricted for vehicles only. The concept of the plaza is carried all the way through the project via a series of terraced gardens with adjacent amenity spaces.

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. While not substantial in the traditional sense, the building's base is tall and graceful and provides cover at the ground level. The building's top is similarly slightly subtractive.
2. Vertical proportions are evident in the framework which is proud of the glazing and metal panels and also in the window patterns.
3. The ceiling with wood grain at the ground floor colonnade provides warmth. The corner windows provide a flourish. The tapered fin against Morrison is a nod to the streetscape. These playful elements help to enliven the crisp and rhythmic lines of the building. These should continue to be enhanced and studied.
4. As noted, while the vehicular plaza is very open and porous to people and activity, consider additional tightening through relocating the flush curb and bollards to make this more pedestrian-friendly over vehicles and to encourage access to the terrace gardens.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Appreciate the depth of study on the site plan especially for this narrow site. No concern about the height. The proportions and scale are perfect. Appreciate care and concern to facades. UP Zoning implied the introduction of a contemporary and new breath of architectural fresh air, not necessarily the replication of 18th or 19th century building patterns. H/S/M of this building is what zoning ordinance is asking for, and general architectural direction is exactly right for dealing with the zoning implications. Supporting.
- Most successful application seen at Upper Morrison. As noted by previous Board member, many site constraints exist. Base is attractive, and proportions are right. Zoning not within purview of Board. Unique part of the city. Could be a great success.
- Success will be when done and built well, but like it. Attention to frame which is gentle, feels good, and provides a nice and visible contrast.
- Stunning. Appreciate the contemporary route. Proportions well done. Speaks of Charleston in contemporary way through verticality and ratio of openness. Ground level is inviting. Entry/exit of vehicles handled well. A continuation of the development along Morrison. Maybe a gateway building. Ability to have surface parking has helped.
- Agree with much said previously. Elegant building. Appreciate the engagement of the streetscape and plaza. Too high; understanding context of ground slope. Expectation that it be unnoticed in the future, but it will be and it should be as it is architecturally interesting. Bothersome in that it disengage the people from the landscape, which the height does. Overall a nice project.

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

9. 860 MORRISON DRIVE (MORRISON YARD PHASE THREE – MULTI-FAMILY)

TMS # 459-02-00-002 | BAR2022-000901

New Construction | N/A | Height District 4-12 | Historic Corridor District

Request conceptual approval for new construction of a multi-family building with structured parking garage.

Owner: Mike Schwarz / Woodfield

Applicant: Chuck Travis / Housing Studio

APPROVED

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED XX

MOTION: Deferral for restudy of general architectural direction particularly the middle and top of the building also incorporating Board and Staff comments.

MADE BY: White SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. As noted on the previous agenda item, the overall project is articulated as four separate buildings with activation elements along Morrison, into the vehicle plaza, and all the way through the project. The multi-family portion occupies three buildings, which makes each mass each smaller than many of its peers. The height is contextual with its Morrison Yard neighbors. The project carefully pulls height and mass back to protect the viewshed of the bridge from the Septima Clark Parkway. The relationship between the multi-family

buildings is driven by the overall concept of connected terraced gardens and public spaces from Morrison Drive all the way through the project. These are tied together via the gardens as well as bridge elements.

2. Related to Morrison Drive, the project's elements are placed at a slight angle to the street which creates a stepping condition, giving interest to the streetscape.
3. The language of the multi-family portions compliments the hotel with a much more vertical and less blocky language than Morrison Yard Phase 2. The chamfered corners have reason and purpose, recognizing that the view between buildings is important.
4. The chamfered corners are purposeful, the angled bridge elements and corner windows are flourishes, the zinc panels provide warmth, and the sculptural kinetic wall provides movement and interest for the visible north side. All of these elements enliven the crisp and rhythmic lines of the buildings. These elements are important and should continue to be enhanced and studied.
5. As noted, while the vehicular plaza is very open and porous to people and activity, consider additional tightening through relocating the flush curb and bollards to make this more pedestrian-friendly over vehicles and to encourage access to the terrace gardens.
6. For purposes of giving guidance for the next review, Board should provide feedback on the element which includes the sculptural kinetic wall. This element, while housing amenity space, may be viewed as public art or as part of the overall composition or as both. This determination may influence the level of connection to the project and any revisions to its exterior.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Applicant confirms the mock-up was assembled for this project, not another application.
- Breaking down the massing and connecting the parts is successful. Massive masonry base isn't bothersome as it will face the river. The middle and top feel very heavy and dark. Height is an opportunity to be very expressive with the top. Like the overall premise and direction. Trending towards deferral for those two items.
- Similar feedback. H/S/M is right with building mass broken down. Concern with GAD in particular the fenestration and darkness dark concerning. Project needs to compliment the previously approved project at this site; visual aesthetic needs to be tied more closely together. Not so concerned about base, and like concept of kinetic sculpture. Middle tier needs simplicity in fenestration and to be lightened.
- Similar view on previous points. Disconnect between lower/middle and upper levels; seems a different language. Middle portion not working. Rhythm of vertical and horizontal divisions needs more study.
- Different heights and relationships as well as parti are working well. Feedback relates to vocabulary and proportions in some areas.
- Repetition is very obvious, maybe more so because of the height. Masonry wall at outside of parking area could be successful. However, because of its size, it may need a step or an offset or two. Kinetic element seems to be a good idea, but need more information to understand how it will age in our environment.
- Visible reflection of stainless steel is interesting.

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

10. SIGNAGE POLICY: OLD & HISTORIC AND OLD CITY DISTRICT

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Approval as submitted

MADE BY: White SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 1

STAFF COMMENTS:

- Proposed policy was reviewed by BAR-S. Their edits have been incorporated. Staff then met with Legal for review. The resulting policy wording is proposed for adoption.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Related to #3, still object to “and the minimum amount of information”. Who defines? If the policy already includes omitting “extraneous information”, why include it? Has been in the policy since adoption. Perspective is good, but willing to give Staff discretion and latitude to determine what beyond a business name might be included but not be extraneous information. For full Board comments, please visit the City of Charleston’s YouTube Channel.

11. SIGNAGE POLICY: HISTORIC CORRIDOR DISTRICT

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Approval as submitted

MADE BY: White SECOND: Brown

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 1

STAFF COMMENTS:

- Proposed policy was reviewed by BAR-S. Their edits have been incorporated. Staff then met with Legal for review. The resulting policy wording is proposed for adoption.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Related to #1, why don’t we require a comprehensive design package instead of encouraging?

- Related to #3, still object to “and the minimum amount of information”. Who defines? If the policy already includes omitting “extraneous information”, why include it? Has been in the policy since adoption. Perspective is good, but willing to give Staff discretion and latitude to determine what beyond a business name might be included but not be extraneous information.
 - Related to #4, “external sign illumination is to be a neutral white”. External illumination means that a light source is projecting light onto the sign. Allowed on a case-by-case basis. However, directed to #1, which indicates signs are to respect the architectural character of the building and surroundings, which includes the skyline.
 - Related to #6, approval authorities are subjective, even with guidelines in place.
For full Board comments, please visit the City of Charleston’s YouTube Channel.
-

John E. Robinson, Chairperson

date

Tory J. Parish, BAR-L Administrator

date