

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: JOHN ROBINSON (CHAIR), EDDIE BELLO (ALTERNATE),
LUDA SOBCHUK, LEON SCOTT, JAY WHITE
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: TORY PARISH, LAWRENCE COURTNEY



MEETING RESULTS

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

October 13, 2021

4:30 P.M.

virtually via Zoom Webinar

1. 518 East Bay Street - - TMS # 459-13-02-011 BAR2021-000620

Request approval of demolition of one-story showroom/warehouse.

Ports Area | Old and Historic District

Owner: Morris Sokol, LLC

Applicant: Luda Sobchuk / SGA Narmour Wright Design

NOTE: The Board convened at the address on Tuesday, October 12, 2021 at 4:00pm for a site visit.

MOTION: Approval of demolition including Staff and Board comments.

MADE BY: White

SECOND: Bello

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

(Luda Sobchuk recuses.)

Staff Observation:

1. The existing building was the Morris Sokol warehouse with a showroom and was constructed around 1948 with a later addition around 1954.

Staff Comments:

1. The building has no real special character-defining features, is not unique to Charleston, and is a utilitarian building that might be found anywhere across the country.
2. Salvage materials as much as possible.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval for demolition.

Board Comments:

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

2. 95 Cannon Street (89 Cannon Street) - - TMS # 460-15-02-008 BAR2021-000619

Request approval for demolition of metal building and site wall.

Cannonborough-Elliottborough | Old City District

Owner: Josh Page / 95 Cannon LLC

Applicant: Stephen Ramos / Cannon Row LLC

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

October 13, 2021

Page | 2

NOTE: The Board convened at the address on Tuesday, October 12, 2021 at 4:30pm for a site visit.

MOTION: Approval for demolition with Staff and Board comments.

MADE BY: Bello SECOND: Scott VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comment:

1. Many appreciate the quiriness of this building, but the building is only minimally visible from the public ROW and the historic portions have been enveloped by renovation leaving no historic elements visible.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval for demolition.

Board Comments:

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

- 3. 480 East Bay Street - - TMS # 459-13-04-005&016 BAR2020-000325**
Request approval of maritime flagpole in lieu of previously approved tower, and seeking approval of mural location.
Ports Area | Old and Historic District
Owner: Huguenot Square LLC
Applicant: Evans and Schmidt Architects

MOTION: Approval of the maritime flagpole incorporating Board comments as well as approval of a mural in the designated space on the wall.

MADE BY: Sobchuk SECOND: White VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 1

Staff Observation:

1. Applicant presented the tower element as a tie back to the Owner's family history and site context. The Applicant is now proposing a nautical theme and promoting its appropriateness because the sunshades are sails.

Staff Comment:

1. This is viewed by Staff as a downgrade of design and materials possibly due to value engineering.

Staff Recommendation:

Denial on grounds that this is a downgrade and no objection to the location of the mural.

Board Comments:

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

4. 93 Society Street - - TMS # 457-04-04-039, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269 BAR2021-000621

Request preliminary approval for exterior modifications to 93 Society Street including façade and east elevation; modifications to adjacent alley; and rear three-story addition to 284 King Street, for hotel/restaurant development.

Downtown | Height Districts 3 & 6 | Old and Historic District

Owner: 93 Society LLC & 284 King St Com LLC

Applicant: Tara Romano / Neil Stevenson Architects

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

MADE BY: Scott SECOND: White VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Observations:

1. This project received conceptual approval in December 2019 and includes the previously approved work on the façade of 284 King Street.
2. Generally, the materials and details are well thought out and coordinated.
3. Applicant has confirmed that while the second, third, and fourth floor plans at 292 King and 95 Society are shown in plan, no exterior materials are changing. These plans are included for egress purposes only.
4. The activation of this alley space makes for a playful and dynamic space and a subtle transition between exterior and interior.
5. While gas lanterns are typically not approved on new projects, this project is a mix of old and new, the proposed lanterns are contemporarily styled, and the proposed locations are within the alley courtyard.
6. While no historical photos of 93 Society have surfaced, Staff has communicated with the Applicant regarding the proposed grid pattern for the replacement windows and finds the proposed 2-over-2 grid to be appropriate and to likely be the original pattern.

Staff Comments:

1. The marquis canopy at the entry portal to the alley feels heavy for the proposed metal brackets. Decrease its projection and perceived weight by narrowing the opening and coordinating the canopy's width. The profile of the marquis canopy matches the cornice at the adjacent storefront, and this raises the question of whether the canopy should be in line with the storefront cornice, lower, or higher. Applicant prefers to keep the canopy higher to give it prominence and to indicate the main entrance to the hotel.
2. Regarding the marquis canopy, tape lighting is proposed behind the fluted glass to give a warm glow. While lighting would not typically be part of an awning-like structure, this should be studied in a mock-up panel. If handled well, this could be interesting.
3. Regarding the marquis canopy, Applicant will submit for sidewalk encroachment.
4. For final submittal, provide head, jamb, and sill details.
5. For final submittal, verify the spacer bar at the windows to match the color of the muntins via note.
6. All mechanical elements are to be screened if visible from a public ROW. We understand the Applicant to have studied the viewpoints from the ROW carefully and placed the equipment out of sight. Screening will be required if site conditions reveal visibility.

Staff Recommendation:

Preliminary Approval with Staff and Board comments and Final Review By Staff

Board Comments:

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

- 5. 19&21, 9, 20 Iron Forge Alley - - TMS # 45905-04-237/242/247 BAR2021-000622**
Request final approval of previously approved designs (now expired) at Iron Forge Alley, incorporating select refinements of materials and details.
East Side | Height District 2.5-3 | Old City District
Owner: Southwind Land Company LLC
Applicant: JFM Architects

MOTION: Final Approval with Board and Staff comments incorporated.

MADE BY: White SECOND: Bello VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Observation:

1. The buildings included in this application earned preliminary approval August 10, 2016 as Foundry Alley lots 1&2, 7, and 12. This approval has expired, and Applicant has made minor material and detail adjustments in the resubmittal.

Staff Comments:

1. Proposal utilizes a hybrid approach of Galvalume standing seam metal roof with 1" seams and hand-crimped ridges. This method seems permissible as long as the joints are tight and minimized.
2. While railing might meet code, a slight tightening of pickets would be more visually appropriate.
3. Civil drawings to be reviewed separately for the overall project.
4. A color palette for the entire PUD needs to be submitted and reviewed.
5. The Final "for Permit" drawings with Revisions have been reviewed by Staff.

Staff Recommendation:

Final Approval with Board and Staff Comments.

Board Comments:

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

- 6. 102 President Street - - TMS # 460-11-04-023 BAR2020-000376**
Request final approval for new construction of seven-story mixed-use student housing development.
Cannonborough-Elliottborough | Height District 5 | Old City District
Owner: Josh Fogle
Applicant: Clark Batchelder / Goff D'Antonio Associates

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT.

- 7. 578 Meeting Street - - TMS # 459-01-03-031 BAR2021-000560**
Request conceptual approval for new Mixed-Use Structure with 231 residential apartment units, parking, retail, and incorporating a small remnant historic structure.
East Side | Not Rated, x<1929 | Height Districts 3.5 and 5 | Historic Corridor District
Owner: Flournoy Development Group
Applicant: Ross Kirby / Dynamik Design

MOTION: Denial based on Board comments and additionally that the massing is not appropriate, the height is not appropriate, there is not sufficient architectural merit warranting an additional floor, and denial for general architectural direction.

MADE BY: Bello SECOND: White VOTE: FOR 3 / AGAINST 1

(Luda Sobchuk recuses.)

Staff Observations:

1. The proposed new color palette of warm greys and whites will harmonize with the existing structure and will provide a differentiation from other buildings that have been constructed in this area.
2. The project, while incorporating a large footprint, exhibits verticality in its language and façade treatments.
3. The proposal makes better use of the existing structure than the previously proposed, by incorporating it into interior space.
4. The massing steps down towards the smaller scale of Nassau Steet and beyond. While this is a zoning condition, the handling of the facades continues to emphasize vertical language.
5. This project is seeking an additional half story for the portion which sits in Height District 3.5 and an additional full story for the portion with sits in Height District 5, via architectural merit and context.
6. While interior arrangement is out of purview for the Board and Staff, to ensure the success of the retailers, we would encourage easy access to the retail spaces from the parking garage.

Staff Comments:

1. At several locations, the brick exterior turns a corner and then abruptly stops, such as on pages BAR0021, BAR0041, and BAR0047. These visible transitions should be eliminated by extending the brick to a point not visible from the public ROW.
2. While the base along Meeting Street has been made more substantial, it may need additional consideration. The stone base at the grade level columns might be extended to wrap continuously along the recessed storefronts. Also, there is no base, of stone, brick, or stucco depicted at the stucco hyphens. This should be added or studied.
3. The tower element is articulated through a material change and in height. However, it is not articulated in terms of massing in the horizontal plane at its base. The tower's massing should be extended to the ground plane.
4. The top of the tower needs further study and refinement.

5. At the Meeting Street façade, an anomaly exists in which the building corner extends over to the exterior corner of the balcony. The building corner shall be pulled back at the location to the opposite side of the balcony. (BAR0022 and BAR0036)
6. The material palette includes horizontal lap siding that is treated in a clean and simple manner with no trim elements, including at corners and wall openings. To achieve this clean and crisp look and to keep the detailing minimal, shiplap “nickel gap” profile should be used instead.
7. To achieve architectural merit, limestone should be used. As an alternative, cast stone which is acid-etched might be used to simulate limestone.
8. The project includes a complex palette of architectural languages, materials, and elements. For example, there are many fenestration types on the project. And within those, some of the fenestration elements include spandrel panels, and some do not. An overall tightening up of various languages and corresponding elements is needed to bring uniformity and consistency to the project.
9. Applicant shall express to the Board how the project achieves architectural merit and context.

Staff Recommendation:

While there are several successful languages on the project, Staff has concern with the general architectural direction finding the proposal lacking a coherent and consistent language. Staff is generally ok with the height, scale, and mass, but we do not find that the project meets all facets for a finding of architectural merit and context, and for this reason, we recommend deferral.

Board Comments:

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