

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: JOHN ROBINSON (Chairperson), EDDIE BELLO (Alternate),
JAMES MEADORS, LUDA SOBCHUK, JAY WHITE
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: TORY PARISH, LAWRENCE COURTNEY



MEETING RESULTS

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

January 26, 2022

4:30 P.M.

virtually via Zoom Webinar

- 1. 135 Meeting Street (Gibbes Museum of Art) - - TMS # 457-08-04-004 BAR2022-000707**
Request final approval for installation of a wrought iron fence along the south property line.
c. 1905 | Old and Historic District
Owner: Carolina Art Association of Charleston (Gibbes Art School Trustees)
Applicant: Evans and Schmidt Architects

MOTION: Final Approval

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. The fencing is coming from the site of 284 Meeting Street, which was given BAR Approval for Demolition last year. The gate was fabricated less than 50 years ago to serve in the interior of the Gibbes Museum. It was removed from this location some time ago and is being repurposed with slight modifications here.
2. The gates, in combination with the donated and new fencing to match, will be located to be operable and to function as a service entry, and for this reason, Staff takes no issue with the proposed installation.
3. Although it might be thought to be unnecessary here, due to the narrowness of the passageway and the conditions for mounting, Staff agrees with the use of wrought iron here.

Staff Recommendation:

Final Approval with Staff to Review Installation as required.

Board Comment:

- Were these the gates fabricated by Mr. Simons for the interior gift shop? (Applicant responded that the team has investigated and don't believe these were.)
- Repurposing this quality work on site is in the best interest and in the vein of making do, typical of Charleston
- Agree with the comparison of make-do attitude of our forebearers

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

2. 145 King Street -- TMS # 457-12-02-041

BAR2022-000708

Request conceptual approval for exterior renovation to the first-floor portions facing King and Queen Streets.

Harleston Village | c. 1976 | Old and Historic District

Owner: King & Queen Co

Applicant: Simons Young + associates

MOTION: Preliminary Approval with consideration of changes to soffit material at the entries and wall material at the building entry, to work with Staff on further recessing the storefront entries, and leaving additional details to Staff.

MADE BY: Bello / SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. The newly proposed ground floor storefront systems combine a traditional footprint with modern glazing making this transitional building more dynamic and interesting.
2. The previous scheme incorporated a wood soffit to warm and soften the composition. Wood could still be used at the main Entry (in lieu of metal panels for the same reasons).

Staff Recommendation:

Final Approval with Final Details to Staff

Board Comment:

- Will make a huge change to this block on King Street. Building is so flat, monotonous and devoid of detail, anything to add richness in a contemporary way is a positive. At the bays, if these could be recessed, would be better. If possible, at the windows, would look better and work better if made equal and not worry about the composite joint above determining the window divisions. Agree with City, if possible, to have a better material, that than metal panel, which may read very flat still; big panels aren't as good as a richer material or even a smaller panel. Butt-glazed storefront or curtain wall is great but proposal has one horizontal expressed muntin at top and one at bottom which may, after all the work, leave a horizontal façade while everything in Charleston and on King is vertically-proportioned. Suggest studying to have a vertical, with Staff.
- Appreciate the modifications to the building. At main building entry, where the walls in the recess are stucco, consider what else may be done to add interest, such as using wood here.
- Agree with previous comments about the recessed entry. If looking at ceiling material, would be appropriate to look at wall materials. Supporting Staff and previous Board comments.
- Work on the first-floor elevation of this building is a big improvement - opens up nicely and flows to nearby retail facades. Revisions and repurpose of first floor will make the building fit in much better at the street. Can work with Staff to look at some material improvements to embellish without going overboard.

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

3. 244 St. Philip Street - - TMS # 460-08-02-117/118/119/120/121 BAR2021-000612

Request conceptual approval for a 50-unit apartment building.

(Courier Square Phase 2, Building 3)

Cannonborough/Elliottborough | Height District 2.5-3 | Old City District

Owner: Ron Owens / Evening Post Industries Inc.

Applicant: Dylan Towe / LS3P

MOTION: Deferral of Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments.

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Sobchuk
(Eddie Bello recuses.)

VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. The revised rhythm and the composition of repetitive elements on the west elevation are appropriate for the streetscape.
2. The gabled portions on the north end of the building seem as if they should anchor the building. However, they are too small to serve as an anchor. For this reason and for consistency with the rest of the building, the gables should be omitted so as to not call attention or focus to this portion as an anchor. Additionally, the gables are of different depths, which is problematic because the gables will not be equal in either height or slope. Omit the gables in lieu of a flat roof for these portions.
3. Consider resetting the rhythm of projections along the west wall to incorporate the north mass. Perhaps an ABABABA pattern would work with slightly more narrow balcony features.
4. Enlarge or pair the columns on the west elevation balconies to improve the proportion of the balcony bays unless, as more narrow they begin to work better proportionally.
5. At the south, east, and west elevations, the standard windows appear to be of the same size, but the grid pattern vacillates between six-over-six and four-over-four. These should be made consistent, and six-over-six is more successful.
6. The windows appear as if they may be out of scale with the standard windows on adjacent buildings. Please confirm the size and resize as necessary to better fit the typical scale of windows at the nearby existing houses.

Staff Recommendation:

Deferral of Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

Board Comment:

- Agree with staff perspective. Seems to be a rigorous commitment to some arbitrariness especially with the roof lines. Staff comments on massing are appropriate as well. Appears there are architectural pieces in collision with one another in a way that doesn't meet the street, fit the program, or fit the site well. Feel it deserves deferral with staff comments.
- Agree with discussion and comments, particularly the gable end colliding with the porches; seems like a hyphen is in order there and reworking that corner altogether most appropriate. Otherwise, window sizes and other elements can be simplified. The parapet jump in projection is unnecessary. In support of staff recommendation as well.

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