



CITY OF CHARLESTON BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW - LARGE

MEETING RESULTS

SEPTEMBER 28, 2022

4:30 P.M.

2 GEORGE STREET

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

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Tory Parish (via Zoom), Lawrence Courtney

MINUTES

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 14, 2022 MEETING

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Approved as submitted.

MADE BY: White SECOND: Brown

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0
(Karo Wheeler recuses.)

APPLICATIONS

2. 54 ST. PHILIP STREET (SIMONS CENTER FOR THE ARTS)

TMS # 457-04-02-043 | BAR2020-000139

N/R and New Construction | Height District 4-6 | Old and Historic District

Request final review of the sample panel.

Owner: Brad Weiland / College of Charleston

Applicant: Robert Ryan / Whiting-Turner Contracting Co.

NOTE: The Board convened at this address on Tuesday, September 27, 2022 at 4:30 p.m. for a site visit.

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Final Approval with Board and Staff comments with Final Review By Staff.

MADE BY: Brown SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR 3 AGAINST 1

(Jay White recuses.)

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. Staff has worked with Applicant to smooth out some of the rougher aspects of the Sample Panel which primarily included parapet coping and the uniformity of brick joints.
2. Due to the unavailability of getting the special mortar mix used on the Mock-up, a separate brick panel was constructed with a different, more standard mortar, but which shows the proposed workmanship for the brick. The mortar color shown on the Mock-up will be used on the building rather than that on the additional brick panel.
3. It is understood that some of the Mock-up elements such as at the glazed brick inside and outside corners will be solid on the building but are presented here in two pieces since these are specialty items.
4. The color of sealants at around windows and doors, control joints, at lintels, and other elements need to be a better generalized brick/mortar blended color than what is currently on the brick sample panel. Staff can work with applicant to find a better match.
5. Staff wonders if the single column at the entry canopy may be better painted to match the other metal elements for consistency.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with Board and Staff Comments.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- During questions for the Applicant, confirmation that the varying thicknesses of joints where the walls meet the concrete base will be uniform in the final application and the top of the bench will be level. Additional questions related to the column.
- Appreciate the glazed bricks even if not the final beveled product. One detail not on or clearly defined on the mock-up is how the glazed brick meets the standard red brick. It is important to see this detail as it will be prevalent. Column and railing connection. Soffit wood wasn't installed flush with the canopies per the final detail. Coping, brick coursing, placement of plastic weeps inconsistent. Many items not yet approvable.
- Agree with previous. Quality of the work was not its finest. Understand issues with supply chain. Respect the Applicant to work with Staff to make sure all reconsidered or up to quality.
- Agree with Staff comments and some previous Board comments. Would not oppose Staff's recommendation as it can easily be worked out in the field.
- Supply chain issues have not been a reason to have a less than first class mock-up. Difficult to discern this to be our finest work and what the rest of the project will look like. Clear of intent with exception of critical areas, such as how materials will fit, where otherwise great attention given to the mock-up. Applicant confirms that specialty brick expected to be available in November. In this saturation, comfortable with follow-up as staff review.
- Supply chain issues but also craftsmanship. Send the wrong message to issue an approval For full Board comments, please visit the City of Charleston's YouTube Channel.

3. 838 MORRISON DRIVE

TMS # 457-07-00-010 | BAR2020-000171

New Construction | Height District 4-12 | Historic Corridor District

Request after-the-fact approval for fresh air hooded intake covers.

Owner: Mike Schwarz / Woodfield Investments

Applicant: Marija Kerlin / Housing Studio

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Approval

MADE BY: White SECOND: Wheeler

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

STAFF COMMENTS:

- ~~1. Staff has asked Applicant to request an After-The-Fact Approval from the Board for hooded air intake grille covers after exploring and exhausting other options. (not adopted)~~
- ~~2. Fresh air intake grille hoods were specified by the mechanical engineers to provide fresh air intake for the corridors and read as the same as dryer vents on building elevations at each floor level in certain locations. (not adopted)~~
- ~~3. A good deal of information in Staff Comments regarding the avoidance of hooded vent and grille covers as well as discussions on site during installation of dryer vent covers failed to reveal the existence of the hooded covers until they were in place. (not adopted)~~
- ~~4. In the sizable set of drawings on this rather large project, these were not noticed by Staff and the design team until they started appearing on the building. (not adopted)~~

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff is satisfied that Applicant has attempted to find alternative solutions to these hooded covers without success and regretfully recommends After-The-Fact Approval.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Based on Staff comments and Applicant presentation, not sure of after-the-fact request as it was in the approved final documents, and as these are air-intake with no other option.
- Comfortable with this as they are not directly on Morrison Drive and are in a recessed area. For full Board comments, please visit the City of Charleston's YouTube Channel.

4. 838 MORRISON DRIVE

TMS # 457-07-00-010 | BAR2020-000171

New Construction | Height District 4-12 | Historic Corridor District

Request final approval for design of the Water Veil Kinetic sculpture to be located in the central courtyard at monumental stairs.

Owner: Mike Schwarz / Woodfield Investments

Applicant: Marija Kerlin / Housing Studio

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Approval

MADE BY: White SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

STAFF COMMENTS:

- ~~1. Although initially presented as a water feature, this was changed to a sculptural piece to be designed at a later point, which was approved by the Board at Final Review. (not adopted)~~
- ~~2. Applicant is proposing a kinetic sculpture which would mimic the flowing of water. And has engaged an artist specializing in kinetic sculptures to design one. (not adopted)~~
- ~~3. The workings of the sculpture are all passive, and its composition is such that it should satisfactorily resist harsh environmental conditions. (not adopted)~~
- ~~4. Staff is unclear as to how this kinetic sculpture will be resolved at its base and has spoken with Applicant about providing a similar kinetic sculpture at this base to mimic a "pool" effect. (not adopted)~~

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

While somewhat disappointed that a real water feature was not used here, Staff finds this to be an interesting and engaging solution and recommends Approval with Board and Staff comments with Final Review by Staff.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- During questions for the Applicant, confirmation that feature to be designed by same artist as one previously reviewed for 860 Morrison Drive, more subtle movements will occur with lighter conditions, any reflection to be less concerning due to landscaping and recessed placement from Morrison Drive, and panels and art to be stainless steel while frame may be aluminum. Also, Applicant confirms that the artist has installations in areas with severe corrosive salinity.
- Very comfortable with it exactly as presented. Related to Staff comment regarding a pool at the base, this is an abstraction of the idea and would hate to make it more literal than the artist intends. Would support as proposed.
- More interesting than water. A mix of technology and public art. Not a water feature so doesn't need a pool. Comfortable as proposed.
- More interesting than a water feature and refreshing to see.

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

5. 29-35 GEORGE / 306 KING / 84-88 SOCIETY STREETS

TMS # 457-04-04-007/008/017/025/113 | BAR2022-000749

New Construction | 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 XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments including additional height.

MADE BY: White SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

STAFF COMMENTS:

- ~~1. At Building A, encroachment permits are required for the proposed canopies. (Response to previous Staff comment 1a) (Voided during the meeting by Staff)~~
- ~~2. At Building A, encroachment permits are required for any out-swinging doors, which would further pinch down the available usable space on this sidewalk. (Response to previous Staff comment 1b) (Voided during the meeting by Staff)~~
3. At Building A, Staff suggests simplifying, lightening, or reducing the cornice of the top floor.
4. At Building A, as the first-floor detailing wraps the corner of the ground floor, the material and color of some of the trim elements change. Specifically, the top of the recess and the horizontal mullion bar change material. While nicely detailed, consider if revisions to these would bring more consistency to the overall ground floor.
5. At Building B, Staff continue to encourage additional offset between the front elevation planes at the Society Street elevation. As massing is determined at conceptual review, it would be best to lock this in place soon. (Response to previous Staff comment 2a)
6. At Building B, sound mitigation is reviewed for aesthetic and architectural impact. However, amplification of music in the outdoor area as well as hours for its operation are to be informed by Zoning and/or Livability. (Response to previous Staff comment 2d)
7. At Building B, the additional images indicate that the additional half story will not be visible, making for an ideal application of architectural merit if the Board finds the project to meet the facets for a finding of architectural merit and context. This includes exemplary architectural and urban design, the use of highest level of materials and finishes, and contribution to the public realm.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments, including extra height at Building B through architectural merit and context.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Even though critical of the Ordinance provision for extra height through architectural merit and context, spoke highly of project last time and am very supportive of it. It is meritorious for the additional height especially considering how little at the top floor is added. Addresses context because the additional height can't be seen. Find that it meets the test for additional heights as currently outlined in the Ordinance. Staff suggestions regarding detailing can be studied, but the project is on a strong trajectory, and design team should continue their work.
- Same perspective: the additional story hardly has a visible impact on the street or on the architecture of the building. Next level will be more developments. Support Staff on recommendation of Conceptual Approval.
- Wasn't at last two reviews of the project but have followed it. Very pleased with latest rendition. Compliment the Applicant on the redesign and the circulation for these two attractive and nicely detailed buildings. Project meets architectural merit and context requirements - is pushed back, is of Charleston and context, materials, and detailing meet those requirements. Approve extra partial story.
- Two biggest concerns are first 306 King Street which remains on the site plan as part of the project, but we are not given an indication of what is to occur. Second, the visual impact of the building on Meeting Street is not addressed or revealed. Previously indicated not a fan of

height as don't believe it's appropriate for the city. Don't think what this Board has approved in the past in historic settings is necessarily precedent setting. Do find the architectural distinction on this project good and the setback of the sixth and top floor to be reasonable enough to move the project forward. Otherwise agree with colleagues.

- Agree with colleagues. Appreciate the visual impact studies responding to the Board's request. Like previous Board Member, do not see a study from Meeting Street. Applicant confirms that the visual impact on Meeting Street is less than that on King Street. Appreciate commitment to the project and response to the Board. Applicant confirms estimate of costs and not expecting design changes.

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

6. 74 PRESIDENT STREET

TMS # 460-15-01-043 | BAR2022-000908

New Construction | Height District 85/125 | Old City District

Request conceptual approval for new construction of 6-story 89,189 s.f. classroom building for the MUSC College of Health Professions.

Owner: Medical University of South Carolina

Applicant: Margie Longshore / SMHa, Inc.

APPROVED XX

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: Brown SECOND: Wheeler

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0
(Jay White recuses.)

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

While contemporary, the proposed project depicts a base, middle, and top, as recommended by the BAR 2017 Principles. The massing utilizes a smaller footprint than some of its neighbors, and the height nods to its neighbor directly to the south. While referencing the educational program this building will house, the facades utilize vertical fins which, through their placement, enliven an otherwise very ordered façade. The architectural design honors its context through material and detailing. The proposed project will maintain the historic wall, with minimal, if any, changes.

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. While limited in visibility from the most adjacent streets, reduce the height of the mechanical penthouse as much as possible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

BOARD COMMENTS:

- During questions for the applicant, height of historic wall is indicated to be 5.5' tall and height of penthouse is assumed to be 20' with desire by Applicant to lower and pull it back from the

exterior edge if possible. Penthouse to be metal panels with some louvers that will be as minimal as possible.

- Some perspectives show the building to be top heavy. At north elevation, the tall window feels very narrow compared to the adjacent large mass of brick. At east elevation, the material reflections make the actual representation hard to discern. The planes and blocking of the wall are nice especially with the curtain wall breaking up the facades, but the upper section feels heavy. Pedestrian bridge will require great care in its development.
- Appreciative of the model, very helpful. Creative concept and sensitive site planning. Building in the spirit of MUSC. Nice material palette and mix. At northeast corner, visible on page 28, the brick massing hangs over the two-story curtain wall and doesn't seem to be supported. Making the lower volume the same height as the base, would bring balance. Like the bold moves, but some simplification would make it stronger. For example, the panoramic window, at page 29, doesn't relate and could be omitted for consistent treatment. Otherwise, agree with Staff recommendation.
- MUSC has certainly developed an architectural branding, and this compliments the rest of campus nicely. Like previously mentioned, the east and west facades are different with concrete wrapping the building base which is almost lost on street view. Consider public art or mural on the space at northwest corner.
- Will be nice addition to complex. Creates a recessed pedestal which carries the rest of the building. Light enough massing. In some ways the east and west facades are disconnected from each other but understand why and, in some ways, they talk to each other. North façade does not need to change as the solid and glass work nicely together as solid and punched glazing. Not necessarily heavy.

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