



City of Charleston
Design Review Board
Minutes
June 20th, 2023
4:30 p.m.

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held at 4:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 20th, 2023, over video conference call and adjourned at 5:31 p.m.

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

Board members present: Erin Stevens, Acting Chair, Dinos Liollo, Ben Whitener, Ashley Jackrel, and Stephanie Tillerson

Staff members present: David Meeks, and Patrick Carlson, recording

Chair called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m., introduced Board members and Staff, and explained protocol for the meeting.

Applications

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. 1754 Savannah Hwy.– TMS # 350-02-00-015 | DRB2022-000160**
Requesting approval for the demolition of two, one-story brick homes

Owner:	White Gate, LLC
Applicant:	Andrea Limehouse
Neighborhood/Area:	West Ashley

Presenter: Barry

Project Detail: Barry said that the two structures were developed a number of years ago that had not been utilized for some time and wanted to have them demolished in support of several redevelopment plans for the West Ashley region. He said the buildings were considered to have conventional layouts and materials for their construction period around 1969.

Public Comment: None

Staff Recommendation: Approval

Board Comments/Action: Dinos said that he was aware of the plans for this property and moved to approve the demolitions outlined in **Applications (1.) and (2.)**

MOTION: Approval

MADE BY: DL SECOND: ST VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

2. 1756 Savannah Hwy.– TMS # 350-02-00-017 | DRB2023-000161

Requesting approval for the demolition of a one-story commercial building

Owner: White Gate, LLC
Applicant: Andrea Limehouse
Neighborhood/Area: West Ashley

Presenter: N/A

Project Detail: N/A

Public Comment: N/A

Staff Recommendation: N/A

Board Comments/Action: N/A

MOTION: Approval

MADE BY: DL SECOND: ST VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

3. 3166 Maybank Hwy. (Just west of Angel Oak Animal Hospital)– TMS # 313-00-00-306, 307, 031 | DRB2023-000162

Requesting conceptual approval for a new medical office development consisting of three, one-story buildings and three, 2-story buildings

Owner: JI South Station, LLC
Applicant: HLA, Inc.
Neighborhood/Area: Johns Island

Presenter: Amy Chico and Losse Knight

Project Detail: Ms. Chico said that she was a landscape architecture with HLA, Inc. and her team had created a plan to address the property and environmental constraints. She said Phase 1 of the site would include the development of two city roads to connect the various sites, while adhering to the Johns Island community plans and expectations for creating various gathering places. The side facing Maybank Highway would include a 15ft buffer zone that included a multi-use path and various landscaping installations. The intention was to create an integrated economic development office park that focused on medical office space and also included smaller commercial and restaurant offerings. They wanted to create an accessible community that reflected the Johns Island aesthetic while preserving the existing variety of grand trees and wetland environments. Her team prioritized the natural elements of the site while still planning for drainage effects and keeping a local, monochromatic landscaping plan between the buildings.

Losse Knight said that he would be presenting about the civil landscape plan and, in the interest of time, would focus on the overall strategy and master plan while reserving the 2-D detailed plans and proposed elevations for later in the discussion. He said the existing trees had guided the layout of the property and specific building locations with three single-story buildings oriented along Maybank Highway and three larger two-story set along the proposed street, Beer Garden Drive. Across a total of six buildings, the proposed square footage was 58,000 sq. ft. with consistent architectural elements and color schemes. Each building would also have its own plaza, courtyard or garden in order to incorporate as much natural and designed landscaping elements as possible. He said they could also install some synthetic turf in a few areas to make those spaces more useable and function with less maintenance expectations. By defining some of the landscaped areas with walls and edging

they could protect the greenspaces while creating a more pedestrian friendly defined region that included benches. The proposed building architecture was very simple that reflected the local vernacular. Mr. Knight said that the proposed exterior materials included light-colored vertical board and batten siding, fiber cement lap siding, and brick. By designing roof lines that began around 14ft off the ground, recessing larger windows, and including canopies and functional dormer windows, they sought to control and enhance the amount of natural light to serve the core of each building.

Dinos said that the submittal was very comprehensive and appreciated all of the details and overall vision included in the application. He asked if the proposed signage had been designed in accordance with the local signage ordinances. Mr. Knight said that it had not been expressly approved, they had just allocated space for potential signage and would ensure its compliance in future plans.

Dinos asked about the material that was shading the exterior mechanical units. Mr. Knight said that it changed between buildings, but overall the intention was to use an actual or simulated wood to visually shield all of the units which will be placed on top of each building.

Dinos said that the mechanical space on proposed 'Building C' seemed exaggerated and gave the appearance that the entire roof line would be taken up by mechanical systems. Mr. Knight said that it was intended to be a graduated feature of the building but they could study how to proportion the space as needed.

Dinos asked if the third level window on proposed 'Building D' was connected to occupiable space and Mr. Knight said that it was an aesthetic application for the attic level.

Dinos asked why the façade materials on the ending elevations of proposed 'Building E' differed. Mr. Knight said that it was because they wanted to create a sense of difference for separate tenets or occupants.

Public Comment: None

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval

Board Comments/Action: Ben said that it was a great submittal and agreed with staff that future applications should be broken up to separate each individual building for future consideration.

Erin agreed and said that it would provide more flexibility to address individual issues and not hold up the entire project over a single building.

Ben said that the applicant should check the brackets extending from the canopies to ensure that they did not impede pedestrian paths and pose a danger to visually impaired individuals.

Stephanie said that it was often to helpful to conceptualize a site by looking at multiple buildings and asked if they could group the smaller buildings together for review and the larger buildings together for a second review.

Erin said that there was a lot of shared greenspace and parking areas and asked staff how they envisioned breaking up the proposals and applications.

David said that, based on similar past projects, they had applications that submitted an application for the site followed by separate proposals for individual buildings.

Dinos asked Mr. Knight about the anticipated bidding and building process. Todd said that there were several groups interested in developing all of the buildings but the intention was to develop one side of the proposed Beer Garden Way at a time in order to create the most streamlined process and build the entire site in two phases.

Erin said that it made sense to split the site into two applications by using the proposed road as a divider in order to streamline the DRB approval process.

Dinos asked the applicant about proposed stormwater retention accommodations. Ms. Chico said that a good portion of Maybank Highway would drain onto the site so there was detention pond at the back of the site to hold that runoff and proposed to create several channels to connect it to drainage systems. Dinos asked if there were any proposals to build aboveground water collection systems in an effort to project sustainability. Mr. Knight said there were several proposals to establish rain gardens and water collection systems that they would include in the next application.

MOTION: Approval, with the following board comments:

1. Closely examine the water management and consider the possibility of above grade water retention systems as a demonstration of sustainability
2. Study the signage ordinance as it relates to façade signs
3. Study the mechanical systems screening to minimize appearance and possibly break up large area screenings into smaller components
4. Restudy the east elevation parapet on Building E

MADE BY: DL SECOND: BW VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Minutes

1. Approval of minutes from the 5/15/23 and 6/5/23 meetings

MOTION: Approval

MADE BY: AJ SECOND: DL VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:31 p.m.

Patrick Carlson
Clerk of Council's Office