



# CITY OF CHARLESTON

## BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – LARGE

---

### MEETING RESULTS

APRIL 26, 2023

4:30 P.M.

2 GEORGE STREET

---

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: John Robinson (Chairperson), James Meadors, Luda Sobchuk, Jay White

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Tory Parish, Lawrence Courtney, Linda Bennett

---

#### A. Minutes

##### 1. Review of Minutes from the April 12, 2023 Meeting

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approval

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

---

#### B. Applications

##### 2. 155 Meeting Street

TMS #457-08-02-011 | BAR2023-001080

Not Surveyed | Harleston Village | Height District 4 & 6 | Old and Historic District

Request final approval for full demolition of existing motel structure.

Owner: Pinnacle Mountain Holdings LLC

Applicant: Stephen Ramos, AIA

**Note: The Board convened on Tuesday, April 25, 2023, at 4:30 p.m. for a site visit.**

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: To approve Demolition incorporating Board and Staff comments.

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

#### STAFF ANALYSIS:

1. While Charleston is a "living museum", which is evolving over time, and this was an interesting part of its history, the motor lodge was regrettably ill suited to its much more urban and historic context and is increasingly out of place in this location.

2. The building was constructed at a time when the automobile was given priority over the pedestrian, street, or context as evident by the surface parking lots and blank street walls. The arrangement is certainly not urban or fitting for Meeting Street.
3. The facility is largely prototypical with hundreds if not thousands of better or more distinctive examples likely scattered across the region. This particular example simply has outgrown its usefulness in this location and is doing little to contribute to the urban fabric of the city.
4. It was pointed out by a Board Member that the cast iron railing and vertical sections are in good shape and might be salvaged for reuse elsewhere.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Final Approval for Demolition.

---

**3. 1 Barre Street (The Charles Townhomes, 200-223 Passerelle Court)**

**TMS # 457-07-01-030 | BAR2023- 001098**

**New Construction | Harleston Village | Height District 3 | Old and Historic District**

Request conceptual approval for new construction of a condominium project.

Owner: The Beach Company

Applicant: Joseph Antunovich / Antunovich Associates

**DECISION: APPROVED**

**MOTION:** Conceptual Approval of height, scale, mass and general architectural direction with Board comments and Staff conditions and highlighting Board comments regarding the use or non-use of siding as well as rooftop features. Application is contingent on working out any remaining zoning or code related issues.

**MADE BY: White SECOND: Sobchuk**

**VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0**

**CONTEXT:**

1. A similar three-building proposal was reviewed and approved by the BAR. The buildings' size and orientation were very similar the currently proposed.

**STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:**

1. The rooftop enclosed appurtenances and the two-part railing contribute to a feeling of clutter at the rooftop. Clean up, simplify, and/or minimize these elements.
2. The application of a dark color to the rooftop forms make them feel foreign to the project rather than downplaying them visually. Consider matching these to the color of the base or trim elements.
3. For preliminary: Brick is applied to the front and side elevations on the buildings which face each other, but not continuously around. At the south corners, the brick stops abruptly with no logical place or internal corner to conclude. This will be visible through the gates on Barre Street ~~and between the building gap from Board Street~~ (struck by Staff; viewed with physical model at meeting). Revise the massing at these locations for preliminary to conclude the brick if not using it continuously.

4. For preliminary: The mews-facing elevations of the buildings which face each other are pared down using siding and minimal to no trim. At the minimum, for preliminary, provide window trim and consider other upgrades. These will be visible through the gates on Barre Street ~~and between the building gap from Board Street~~ (struck by Staff; viewed with physical model at meeting).
5. For preliminary: Extend window lintels at second and third floors beyond the window opening by the length of a half brick.
6. It has very recently come to Staff's attention that a new code revision related to LIMWA, which is defined as the Limit of Moderate Wave Action, may impact the building design at the ground level in some places. Consult your civil engineer and the floodplain manager to confirm and address potential impacts. Should substantial changes be required from this or other code applications, applicant will need to reapply for BAR review.

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Conceptual Approval for height, scale, mass and general architectural direction with Board comments and Staff conditions, and Applicant to work out any remaining Zoning or BID issues.

#### BOARD COMMENTS:

- Board member question regarding roof enclosure and how zoning regards this in relation to floor count.
- Board member concern of ground floor windows at storage rooms.
- Board members concern as to visibility and reasonableness of siding.
- Agree with staff comments. As the architectural language and material palette generally follow the Jasper, it's natural to expect a certain level of quality here. Caution against stucco on frame and the use of siding. Agree with staff regarding the abrupt transition. This is highly unusual for buildings in Charleston and for a building of this smaller size.
- Would be best and make sense with brick fully around. Much railing at the roof, which is atypical for Charleston. Could mitigate potentially with a taller parapet. With the proposed roof trellis, could the rooftop masses be designed to look more like a garden structure rather than blocks? This would be some unity, as these masses are disconnected.
- Must consider durability and context of this harsher environment. Applicant confirms stucco to be on block. Minimize and simplify rooftop elements so they are not a distraction from an otherwise harmonious project. Consider restudy of scale of parapet as an increase may resolve the issue. Elevations are nice, and good precedents exist in the neighborhood. More successful and harmonious with Charleston than previous iteration. Minor concerns mostly related to rooftop.
- Panels between the second and third floor windows are an opportunity but somewhat off-the-shelf currently (page 16); Study. If visible from a street, against the use of siding.
- Siding diminishes the quality of the design.

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

---

4. **30 - 34 Race Street (Greek Orthodox Church of the Holy Trinity)**

**TMS #460-04-01-061 | BAR2021-000455**

**Category 2 | Westside | c. 1952 | Height District 2.5 | Landmark Overlay District**

Request final approval for the installation of a 5' tall aluminum fence along Congress Street including a pair of 7' wide swing gates at existing curb cut.

Owner: Greek Orthodox Church of the Holy Trinity

Applicant: Brien Bethards / Aspen Fencing

**Note: At meeting, Applicant withdrew fencing from the application and presented after-the-fact review of masonry piers only.**

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: to Approve piers and defer fencing.

MADE BY: Sobchuk SECOND: Meadors VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 0

(Jay White recuses.)

CONTEXT: (struck by Staff; related to fencing)

- ~~1. Property is a category 2 in the Upper Peninsula Architectural Inventory and also resides in the Landmark Overlay. BAR Policy requires landscape elements on category 1 and 2 properties be reviewed by the Board.~~
- ~~2. Per BAR's Policy Statement for Hardscaping
  - a. Materials used shall be of a quality commensurate with Charleston's architectural heritage.
  - b. Metal fences are to be hot rolled steel or wrought iron with welded joints and concealed fasteners. Premanufactured aluminum fences are generally not acceptable for use in a historic district. Some exceptions may be made on a case-by-case basis for commercial properties.~~
- ~~3. Precedent images of aluminum fencing in the neighborhood are of properties which are not under BAR purview, and therefore these are not required to adhere to this standard.~~

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

- ~~1. While the proposed fencing is adjacent to the new building on the property, Staff believes that the properties within the Landmark Overlay should be held to a high standard and that aluminum fencing with exposed fasteners would be inappropriate on this property. Additionally, the proposed does not adhere to established BAR standards. A wrought iron fence with a simple design to compliment the existing fencing on Race Street would be most appropriate. At a minimum, the fencing should be a welded steel design in a similar pattern. (struck by Staff; related to fencing)~~
2. The brick piers were not reviewed by BAR. However, their size and design compliment those existing on the property against Race Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Final Approval for the brick piers and Denial on the aluminum fencing. (struck by Staff; related to fencing)

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Responding to column layout question, Applicant indicates piers were placed in position following a landscape masterplan with dimensions close to that of piers and fencing along Race Street.

---

*James C. Meadows*  
Chairperson

*May 10, 2023*  
date

---

*Tory J. Parish*  
Tory J. Parish, BAR-L Administrator

*5.10.2023*  
date