CITY OF CHARLESTON
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW - LARGE

MEETING RESULTS

AUGUST 10, 2022 **4:30 P.M.** **2 GEORGE STREET**

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

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Tory Parish, Lawrence Courtney

---

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JULY 27, 2022 MEETING**

APPROVED WITHDRAWN

DENY DEFERRED

MOTION: Approval

MADE BY: Meadors SECOND: Brown VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

---

2. **40 LINE STREET**
TMS # 459-06-03-136/108/107/106/105/104/103/102/101/100 /092/093/094/090
BAR2021-000484
New Construction | Cannon-Elliottborough | Old and Historic District
Request final approval for mock-up panels.
Owner: East Line, LLC
Applicant: Richard Gowe / LS3P

NOTE: The Board convened at this address on Tuesday, August 9, 2022 at 4:30 p.m. for a site visit.

APPROVED WITHDRAWN

DENY DEFERRED

MOTION: Final Approval for the mock-up panels with Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: Meadors SECOND: Brown VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. It should be noted that this mock-up took an inordinate amount of time to complete. Therefore, Staff has requested a five minute re-introduction to the exterior materials of this large mixed-use project as it has been quite a while since the Board saw this project, and the composition of the Board has changed.
2. Staff has asked the Applicant to prepare a comparison of what materials were initially approved and those for which the applicant is now asking for substitutions or modifications. (received on 08.10 and shared with Board Members via email)
3. Although it would have been ideal to see how the window elements work in the bridge building, one can fill in the gaps, as the palette is simple.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Final Approval with Board and Staff comments. If not approved, Staff recommends approval of the Graham windows in a color to be determined by the Board.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Highest quality of mock-up.
- Color can be handled by Staff.
- Regarding placement behind locked gate, would be best to make the panels available to the public for review with additional time prior to the meeting or all the time.
- Much of the building exteriors are precast/premanufactured leaving little to field construction. Build quality of the mock-up is high.

---

3. **678 KING & 666 KING STREET**
   TMS # 460-40-04-118 / 034 | BAR2021-000672
   New Construction | Westside | Height District 5 | Historic Corridor District
   Request preliminary approval for construction of a 55-unit affordable housing project.
   Owner: Robinson Villa / Lowline Housing Partners LLC
   Applicant: Brian Fessler / McMillan Pazdan Smith Architecture

APPROVED WITHDRAWN

DENY DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral with Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: Meadors SECOND: Brown VOTE: FOR 2 AGAINST 1 (1 abstention)

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. The height of the parapets has increased. To mitigate the additional height at the five-story portion, the design has used a larger profiled Kynar aluminum cornice. There was a simplicity on the previous parapets and wall caps that has been lost. For this more contemporary building language, this increased ornamentation seems too much, and we suggest restudy.
2. Of note related to the use of green in the project and how the color might tie into the Lowline. Green is one of the colors chosen for the Lowcountry Lowline identification. However, it is not the green depicted at this time. And, per previous Board meeting on

the project, the accent green will be determined at the mock-up review. The use of the color under the bridges, which will require DOT approval, should be coordinated with the Lowline so as to comfortably integrate or transition to the Lowline.

3. The plaza at the east side facing the Lowline is now a gravel recreation area. The cool and dark tones of the brick and siding on the building and gravel present a cold perhaps unfriendly aspect to this area. The green tone, which is to be determined at the mock-up review, could be used to warm up the space. Additionally, BAR suggests revising the backless benches and their locations to be something friendlier and used in locations which won't interrupt the areas which could be used for programmed events. Consider how benches might be used as a delineator between open space and picnic area. Moveable seating is encouraged as it allows for gatherings of different sizes more easily.

Several of the site elements will fall within DRC review and a cursory glance and feedback only should be understood by BAR as a cursory glance and feedback. These will compose the remainder of the comments.

4. BAR Staff have encouraged an edge treatment between the parking lot and the street at 666 King Street. The use of raised planter boxes will provide an edge, protect plantings from being trampled and provide a porous edge for easy access between. The materials, color, and size of the planters should be studied. The plant species will need to be carefully selected, and maintenance and upkeep will need to be determined as part of the overall solution.
5. There are examples of painted raised roadway columns in Charleston. The art, height, and location will require DRC review prior to obtaining or approaching the Department of Transportation. In general, however, BAR Staff is not opposed to public art on the columns. We do question whether the color should be so closely tied to the new building, as to appear as a branding element, rather than public art.
6. The parking lot at 666 King will be reviewed by the DRC, and this will include design and materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Preliminary Approval with Board and Staff comments

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Opportunity to engage the public in meaningful way at the ground and at the cornice. Detailing at ground floor is positive, nice, and comfortable. Series of brick planes interacting with infills behind. Also a powerful experience when on elevated interstate coming in to the city, of which there are few of these points, so there is a great responsibility to put an appropriate structure here. Do not have the same feeling with what's visible from the elevated road. Meeting Street corridor has many buildings that look similar to this one. Not positive about the impact from the interstate.
- Project progressing well. Agree with cornice and parapet comment by staff. Previous design was more appropriate for this type of building. Cornice is more traditional, and remainder of building is not. Appreciate the celebration of the ground floor and through landscaping. Amenity will be engaged and great for residents. Not viewed so much as a gateway building.
- Agree with first Board Member. In order to be a gateway building, it needs to be handsome. In context of immediate surroundings and at preliminary stage, not sure this is achieved.
- Many of the buildings tend to end up with similar effect but this may be easily address by treatment of cornice which is already a staff comment. Much attention has been lavished on the ground floor, which is appropriate, and now time to work on the cornice, which is very visible. This can be resolved between preliminary and final.

4. **15 RADCLIFFE STREET**
   TMS # 460-16-02-033 | BAR2022-000879
   Category 4 | Radcliffeborough | c. 1890 - 1905 | Old and Historic District
   Request conceptual approval for the relocation of the residence at 15 Radcliffe Street to 120 Saint Philip Street.
   Owner: 15 Radcliffe Street LLC
   Applicant: Joe Schmidt / Evans & Schimdt Architects

   NOTE: The Board will convene at this address on Tuesday, August 9, 2022 at 4:00 p.m. for a site visit.

APPROVED WITHDRAWN

DENY DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral for additional study and creation of preservation and feasibility plan for moving the structure and Board and Staff comments.

MADE BY: Meadors SECOND: Brown VOTE: FOR 2 AGAINST 1 (1 abstention)

STAFF COMMENTS:
1. The lot on which the structure sits is 30'x54', primarily the footprint of the structure.
2. While the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties does not recommend relocation of historic structures because this can destroy the historic relationship that existed with the landscape, we find the existing context of surface parking lot to the property lines on three sides to be considerably altered from the original context, and that the proposed relocation will provide the structure a residential building context like it once had.
3. Relocation would maintain appropriate orientation for the front and rear porch.
4. Relocation may offer a quicker opportunity for repairs and restoration to the structure.
5. While it is a concern that, once relocated, one might imagine that the residence always existed in this new location, Staff finds that the benefits of doing so at this time outweigh this potential negative. Historians will be able to easily discern the relocation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

BOARD COMMENTS:
- Why is this application being reviewed at this board? Staff indicates that the BAR-L typically does review demolitions and relocations when the remaining property or when the newly relocated structure is known to be proposed into an impending larger project. Additionally, relocations are rare, and they are treated, in relation to advertising and site visits, as demolitions. The Ordinance allows demolition applications to be reviewed at BAR-L or BAR-S, as determined by staff, and this relocation was determined to go to BAR-L.
- The concept of relocating the house to the other two houses is understandable, helps to save it, and is a workable idea. The situation as presented, solely and simply to move a house, ties my hands. Confident there is a method to move forward.

- As point of clarification, when three of more Board members meet, it is a public meeting and part of the public record. Not comfortable with ultimatum of restoring if the house is moved and not restoring if the house is not moved. Many of my concerns at the site visit have been reflected in public statements by PSC. Neighbors have provided a lens from the neighborhood, and we look at the proposed through the lens of the ordinance. However, moving the house for the sake of moving it doesn't seem appropriate.
- Regarding relocating the house, relocating it gives it residential context and gives it purpose. We know the house can be restored but there is no land to it which challenges it being a single-family building. The twelve houses that were on this street are not being rebuilt and likely will not be. Will support.
- Regarding the Secretary of Interior's Standards, relocation is discouraged but not forbidden. Prior decisions by others left this house on an extremely compromised site. To consolidate the historic structures on the block to St. Philip provides an improved context for the house as its historic context was paved. Precedent does exist in Charleston – 0 George assembly of buildings, 77 Washington house, 40 Line structures. Decision to restore or not depending on relocation may simply be a reality of decision to invest based on what's left of the property. The greater good for the block and preservation, is to relocate. Would support.
- Relocating the house nicely fills a void on the street.
- Missing information in the proposal What is the plan for the proposed relocation? How will it be moved? Fact-finding to be shared. What is the condition? Can it all be moved? How will parking for adjacent owners be improved? How will this house be restored?

---

5. **145 CALHOUN STREET**
   TMS # 457-04-02-022 | BAR2021-000545
   Not Rated | c. 1955 | Old and Historic District
   Request preliminary approval for minor addition to existing steel trellis.
   Owner: King and Calhoun LLC
   Applicant: Kevan Hoertdoerfer

NOTE: **Withdrawn by Applicant**

---

6. **186 CONCORD STREET**
   TMS # 459-00-00-091 | BAR2022-000880
   Not Rated | c. 1942 | Old City District
   Request final approval for modifications to front entry and to storage area on southwest side.
   Owner: SC State Ports Authority
   Applicant: Kevan Hoertdoerfer

NOTE: **Withdrawn by Applicant**

---

7. REVISED BAR SIGN POLICY STATEMENT (GENERAL)

APPROVED WITHDRAWN

DENY DEFERRED

MOTION: Approve as submitted

MADE BY: Meadors SECOND: Sobchuk VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

STAFF COMMENT:
1. This amended Sign Policy Statement reflects the thoughts of the Board and Staff discussed over the last few months.

---

8. NEW BAR SIGN POLICY STATEMENT (HISTORIC CORRIDOR DISTRICT)

APPROVED WITHDRAWN

DENY DEFERRED

MOTION: To adopt as submitted

MADE BY: Brown SECOND: Sobchuk VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

STAFF COMMENT:
1. This new Sign Policy Statement reflects the thoughts of the Board and Staff discussed over the last few months in this rapidly evolving area of the city.

---

9. PRESENTATION BY STAFF ON THE STATUS OF ORDINANCE CHANGES AND POLICY PROPOSALS AFFECTING BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW RELATED REVIEWS.

Policy Statement Historic Materials Demolition Purview North of Line Street:
BAR Staff have drafted a policy statement for the area of Historic Materials Demolition Purview in which we hope to provide clarity for repair and appropriate replacement, allowance for flexibility for property owners in both material replacement and review process, protection and prevention of the loss of historic building fabric and character, and the balance of preservation and affordability. This policy is applicable for the area north of Line Street and south of Mount Pleasant Street excluding the Historic Corridor District.

The proposed policy:
- Applies to historic materials visible from the public right-of-way on buildings 50 years or older.

- Utilizes the Upper Peninsula historic architectural survey data and building ratings previously adopted by the City.
- Defines character-defining features and encourages repair and restoration rather than demolition and replacement, per the Secretary of the Interior Standards.
- Lists replacement materials related to windows, roofing, shutters, siding and columns, which in lieu of repair or restoration, would be suitable and treated as in-kind replacement.
- Gives clarity for Staff and Board to make a knowledgeable and informed decision, and allows more applications to be handled by Staff rather than Board.
- Includes stricter standards for the more significant buildings (National Register, buildings rated 1 or 2) and provides additional flexibilities for buildings rated 3 or 4 or un-surveyed.
- Provides information to homeowners regarding standards, options, and an improved review process.
- Includes accommodations for legacy owners, heirs property, and affordability while maintaining the historical and cultural significance of the City's neighborhoods.

Old City Height Districts Proposed Ordinance Amendments:

- The provision to earn extra height through architectural merit creates a lack of certainty for development teams, citizens, and the City. Additionally, its inferred implication is that projects not seeking extra height through merit can be of a lesser quality and/or ignore the public realm.
- The Old City Height Districts were substantially revised in 2017 after an 18 month- long contextual analysis that included many public meetings.
- The 2017 changes included opportunities for applicants to seek additional height through rezoning or architectural merit, however many applicants are seeking additional height through both rezoning and architectural merit, potentially reaching two height districts beyond the original height district that was adopted in 2017 after detailed analysis.

The proposed amendments:

- Remove options for additional height based on architectural merit.
- Keep rezoning for additional height but incorporate additional and enhanced criteria.
- Include a provision for allowing affordable housing projects (50% units or more) to rezone up to two height districts.
- Will provide more certainty to development teams, architects, owners, and the community on projects when they are being planned, designed, and financed.

John E. Robinson, Chairperson date

Tory J. Parish, BAR-L Administrator date