



City of Charleston
Design Review Board
Minutes
March 21st, 2022
4:30 p.m.

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held at 4:35 p.m. on Monday, March 21st, 2022 at 2 George Street and adjourned at 5:59 p.m.

Notice of this meeting was sent to all local news media.

Board members present: Erica Chase (Chairperson), Andy Smith, Dinos Liollo, Erin Stevens, Stephanie Tillerson, Ashley Jackrel, and Ben Whitener

Staff members present: David Meeks & Andrea Derungs

Chair called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m., introduced Board members and Staff and explained protocol for the meeting.

The following applications were considered:

(NOTE: Unless otherwise remarked, Chair voted all items, Copy of complete staff comments/recommendations are attached. Copies of all recusals/letters/emails/petitions mentioned during this meeting are on file.)

- 1. 3486 – 3492 Maybank Hwy. – TMS# 279-00-00-055, 056, 057**
Request preliminary approval for a new multifamily development.

Owner:	Hamlet at Maybank, LLC
Applicant:	Steve Farmartino
Neighborhood/Area:	John's Island

Presenter: Laura Helminski, Steve Farmartino

Project Detail: Laura said that, since their last presentation, they had updated the plant material palette to be more native, indigenous, and drought-tolerant. They'd also provided MEP drawings, so the board could see where the electrical and mechanical equipment was. The mechanical units were screened from the access roads. She said they would use fiber cement siding and/or fiber cement board and batten and have asphalt shingle roofs with metal accents. They increased the trim depth on the windows to provide a deepened shadow line. Dinos asked how they planned to screen the electrical meters on the building. Laura said they were situated to the rear of the buildings, so they weren't seen from the street. Dinos asked what they would be screening with. Laura said they were using dense plantings. Dinos asked why there were no fenestrations on some of the three story buildings. Laura said that was a combination of fire separation, the fact that a lot of those spaces were bathrooms and closets, and to provide privacy so that neighbors weren't looking right into those windows. Dinos confirmed that the plans were detailed for single-home windows and that the windows were mounted on the face of the exterior wall. Ben asked why they were introducing brackets at the mailroom. Laura said there was a deepened overhang at the mailroom, so the brackets mimicked those on the side elevations of the units. Ben asked about the

shutters only being on some of the units. Erica asked if they were operable. Laura said they were not operable, and they were sized to be half the width of the window unit.

Public Comment: N/A

Staff Recommendation: Preliminary Approval.

Board Comment(s)/Action: Dinos asked how the Board felt about the lack of intentional screening. Andy said it was their precedent and requesting it would keep with their direction. He mentioned that people liked to take ownership of rental spaces and could change the landscaping, whereas structural things were harder to move/change. Stephanie said her only concern with structural vs. landscaping was that sometimes people didn't take care of structural screenings and they could end up looking worse. Steve Farmartino noted that Middleburg would be responsible for the landscaping and upkeep/maintenance of the full site. Dinos said they pushed for windows to be as deeply recessed as possible. He noted that they typically required double-hung windows, too. Andy said there were several elements that were façadal, and the Board was against that. Dinos encouraged the applicant to review DRB's policy statements online. He also said the divisions on the garage doors seemed busy in comparison to the simplicity of the rest of the site. Ben said he agreed about the windows needing to be recessed. He said the shutters didn't have any context, and they weren't operable. He was also bothered by the brackets on the mail building and said they seemed large for such a small building. Andy said there was a large area of non-irrigated sod, so further irrigation study was warranted. He said the river rock mulch was a non-starter, and he would prefer to see pine straw mulch or a hardwood mulch. Erin said she agreed. Andy said he wanted to see the Pittosporum, Burford Holly, and False Cypress substituted. He agreed with the comments about the windows, shutters, and brackets.

MOTION: Preliminary approval, with staff comments # 1-7. Board comments: 1) to review and comply with the DRB window policy statement for windows to be deep set/recessed. 2) to screen the mechanical units (all sides) and electrical meters. 3) to simplify the garage door design to be more consistent with the simplicity of the buildings. 4) Shutters to be operable or sized appropriately for the window where proposed. 5) Omit brackets on the mailroom. 6) Substitute the river rock mulch for a natural mulch. 7) Expand the irrigation or provided temp irrigation where currently not shown. 8) Substitute different plant choices for the: Pittosporum, Burford Holly and the False Cypress.

MADE BY: DL SECOND: AS VOTE: FOR 7 AGAINST 0

2. SW corner of Bee's Ferry Rd. and Sanders Rd. – TMS# 286-00-00-001

Request preliminary approval for a new multi-family development with 358 units in seven buildings (two, 3-story buildings and five, 4-story buildings).

Owner:	Davis Development
Applicant:	Thomas Hutton Engineering Co./ Brian Riley
Neighborhood/Area:	West Ashley

Presenter: Brian Riley, Brian Kempton, John Winters

Project Detail: Brian Riley said one of the condition for conceptual approval was to break up the driveway area and add some landscaping. He said there was less than 3ft. between the garage door openings, so they were worried about creating a landscape that would survive over time. They instead decided to create a paver accent band along the drywall between the garage doors to break up the asphalt. The Board had also previously requested that they use pervious pavement for parking over the required amount. They decided to concentrate that at the entry of the community, which helped create a better

sense of arrival. He noted that their electrical units were fully screened. Brian Kempton said a previous comment had been to lengthen the pair of windows directly above the entry canopy, which they had done. Based on the previous comment to study the entry, they had added a cupula directly above the entry to the amenity area. They had sunk the condenser wells into the roof, which completely hid them from view. They had simplified the dormers to all be shed dormers. Andy asked what the material was for the dog park. John Winters said it was hardwood mulch. Dinos said it was an interesting approach placing all the pervious pavers at the entry, and that it was a successful and innovative approach. He asked how important the cupula was. Brian Kempton said it was used to address a previous board comment, but it wasn't essential. Several board members said it was too small for the size of the building. Dinos asked what the little triangles on the roof plan were. Brian said they were the roof vents. Ben asked if you would be able to see the access door to the roof well. Brian said they would all be painted the color of the roof. Dinos asked how they were screening transformers, meters, and anything mechanical on the ground. Brian Kempton said they would be screened with landscaping. Andy asked what material they would be using in the transmission area. John said it would be a native mix, but they didn't have it specified in the plan. Andy asked if it was a private entrance off Evening Star Road. Brian Riley confirmed it was and that they owned the area on either side of it. Ben recommended making sure the windows were deeply recessed since they looked flush with the exterior.

Public Comment: N/A

Staff Recommendation: Preliminary Approval.

Board Comment(s)/Action: Ben suggested using a vertical feature at the entrance rather than a cupula to achieve the sense of arrival. Andy noted that the mounting heights for the parking lot lights ranged from 20-25ft. Ashley noted that DRB policy said they were not to go above 18ft. Andy said that high lights made it look like a mall. Erica said the policy statement was generous and said that the heights were not to exceed 18ft., which allowed them to go lower. Andy said he liked what staff suggested with the sidewalks and recommended putting a band further up the throat to demarcate where it started. He said they needed clarification on what seed mix would be used. He also suggested engaging the pond bank more. He said the access road to Evening Star didn't have a lot of overhead plantings. He knew the power lines ran across there, but adding something that aligned with Dominion Energy standards would keep it from looking so desolate. He also recommended further study for the cherry trees, keeping Saw Palmettos away from pedestrian areas, and substituting the Boxwood, Laura Pendulum, Driftwood Rose, and Riverbirch.

MOTION: Preliminary approval with staff comments 2-7. Board comments 1) to look at making the front façade of building 1000 more vertical in look and feel. 2) to reduce the height of the light poles to less than 18 ft. 3) to list the seed mix types and rate. 4) to engage the pond banks more with plantings. 5) Expand the demarcation line of the entry pavers to include the throat of the entry drive. 6) Consider replacing the Cherry trees, 7) Keep Saw Palmettos away from pedestrian areas. 8) Substitute other plant choices for: Boxwood, Laura Pendulum, Driftwood Rose and Riverbirch. 9) Screen the ground mechanical units and electric panels with a physical screen. 10) Deep set windows into the wall cavity. (see DRB window policy statement.) 11) Omit the cupula on Building 1000.

MADE BY: ST SECOND: DL VOTE: FOR 7 AGAINST 0

3. Approval of the minutes from the 2.7.22 DRB meeting.

MOTION: Approval.

MADE BY: AS SECOND: ST VOTE: FOR 7 AGAINST 0

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:59 p.m.

Submitted by Andrea Derungs
Clerk of Council's Office