

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: JOHN ROBINSON (CHAIR), LEON SCOTT, JAMES MEADORS,
KARO WHEELER, JAY WHITE
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: TORY PARISH, LAWRENCE COURTNEY, FRANKIE PINTO



RESULTS

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

July 14, 2021

4:30 P.M.

virtually via Zoom Webinar

1. 99 South Market Street - - TMS # 458-05-03-064

BAR2021-000529

Request Final Approval of Revised Courtyard with new awnings, ramp, walks, planter, wall extensions and renovated outdoor bar structure.

Category N/A (French Quarter) c. Demolished 2021 Old and Historic District

Owner: First Citizens Bank and Trust

Applicant: John Crouch iii, Architect

MOTION: Final Approval of courtyard renovations with Board and Staff Comments with Final Review By Staff of exterior lighting and paint and paint mock-ups.

MADE BY: Wheeler

SECOND: Scott

VOTE: FOR 4

AGAINST 0

Jay White recuses.

Staff Observations:

1. Related work received After-The-Fact Approval for Demolition at the June 23rd BAR-L Meeting.
2. Previously shown artificial turf has now been replaced with appropriate specialty pavers and other surfaces.
3. Details on the new planter atop the extended wall at the sidewalk and lighting have been provided to a cursory degree. Staff requests additional clarity on the proposed lighting.

Staff Comments:

1. Construction has already begun although a Stop-Work Order should be in place. Applicant is advised that work is not to begin until Approved by the Board.
2. Existing trees are to be protected during construction.
3. Provide manufacturer's cut sheets or information on all proposed exterior lighting and include photometric data for each fixture type as well as for the whole courtyard area.
4. Provide clarity on the proposed color scheme. The south courtyard wall is connected to or is part of 182 Meeting Street (First Citizens Bank). The east courtyard wall is part of the building that fronts South Market Street (Five and Dime General Store) and looks to be painted like the proposed body color, 'Rhinestone'. Confirm the extent of the proposed painting.

Staff Recommendation:

Final Approval of Courtyard Renovations with Board and Staff Comments with Final Review By Staff of exterior lighting and paint.

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

July 14, 2021

Page | 2

2. 284 Meeting Street - - TMS # 458-01-03-044 BAR2021-000546

Request Final Approval for new construction of commercial and residential building.
(Ansonborough) Old and Historic District
Owner: 284 Meeting Street Associates
Applicant: Joseph D. Schmidt, Architect

MOTION: Final Approval with Board comments and Staff comments excepting #4 with north wall as depicted on prior proposal, and submit mock-up panel drawings for Staff review.

MADE BY: White SECOND: Meadors VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Observations:

1. This project was well received by the Board and Staff at Preliminary Review and has changed little since then.

Staff Comments:

1. Applicant has apparently not addressed Preliminary Review Staff Comment #5 regarding the widening of planting areas along the drive.
2. The rustication at the base at the front portion as noted in Preliminary Review Staff Comment #7 should include recessed bands between what reads as blocks of approximately 1 1/2" in height and 1/2" deep. Staff will work with applicant to achieve an appropriate spacing and pattern in the stucco.
3. The cap at the wood fence should be sloped to drain and the fence composition should be similar to our typical double sided 6' urban privacy fence.
4. Staff has no problem with the Southern Lumber Elite Pressure Treated wood being used at the rear painted portions of the project. Additionally, Staff has no issues with this product being used at the painted storefront due to the difficulty of tracking Sustainability Certifications through harvesting, production, delivery and replanting chains. A "sustainable tropical hardwood" is acceptable if its sourcing and delivery chain can be verified and documented.
5. Shutters are called out to be "stained cedar." Staff recommends a painted Southern lumber Elite material as noted above or a similar KDAPT product instead.
6. Cast stone window heads should be used at the front four story portion of the building while stucco heads may be used at the rear, lower portions.

Staff Recommendation:

Final Approval with Board and Staff comments with Final Review by Staff of "For Permit" drawings.

3. 578 Meeting Street - - TMS # 459-01-03-031 BAR2021-000560

Request New Mixed-Use Structure with parking, incorporating a small remnant historic structure.
Category – Not Rated (East Side) c. <1929 Historic Corridor District
Owner: Flournoy Development Group
Applicant: Dynamik Design - Ross Kirby

WITHDRAWN BY STAFF

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

July 14, 2021

Page | 3

4. 250 Spring Street - - TMS # 460-10-02-004

BAR2021-000562

Request Conceptual Approval for renovation of existing hotel.

Category - Not Rated (Westside) c. 1977 Old City District

Owner: Spring Street Holdings, LLC

Applicant: Robert W. Ponder

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Staff comments and with Board comments pertaining to colors and materials.

MADE BY: White

SECOND: Scott

VOTE: FOR 3

AGAINST 2

Staff Observations:

1. In conjunction with planned interior renovations, the Owner is planning to replace the low efficiency PTAC units with higher efficiency VTAC systems and to replace the 44-year-old sliding glass doors with energy efficient impact rated windows. The proposed work should allow the building to operate more efficiently.
2. The proposal also includes a new color blocking paint scheme.
3. The submittal package includes some items which are found to be confusing or lacking explanation. The project description describes the windows to be 3'-8" wide by 6'-4" tall and references the overall elevations. The windows on the provided elevations are of a nice vertical proportion with an interesting grid pattern. However, the horizontal muntin seems to be at eye level. For purposes of review, the 4'-4" wide by 5'-0" tall window on sheet "Scheme A" is considered to be an old proposal and is being ignored for this review.
4. Additionally, while the project description indicates all exterior work to be confined to the balconies, the color renderings for the proposed exterior color blocking indicate the removal of trim elements and the addition of trim elements, most notably around the penthouse level where the exterior looks to be simplified and at the south façade where the red stripe runs up and down the building and there is a physical manifestation of it above the parapet on the southwest corner.
5. While there is some conflicting information, Staff believes that the project is simple, and the overall direction of the proposal can be understood and therefore are comfortable making a recommendation other than deferral for lack of clarity.

Staff Comments:

1. Overall, the H/S/M are unchanged and enclosing the balconies will create more positive variation in the building plans than currently exists.
2. While the color blocking proposal for the exterior facades will freshen up the building, adjustments must occur, and proposed changes must be clarified. Better articulate the exact locations for the new colors and what, if any, trim elements will be altered.
3. Additionally, regarding the proposed color palette, adjust the colors to be more in harmony with each other. Staff is prepared to help with selections for harmonizing the hues and shades while understanding the existing context of newer buildings.
4. Paint the exterior vents or grills for the new VTAC units to match the adjacent exterior wall color.
5. Provide clarity in the follow-up submittal for all elements including proposed window size and placement and color blocking details. Provide color renderings that depict the proposed pre-finished white metal windows. This may need to occur within an enlarged elevation detail.
6. Recess the windows as much as practically possible.

Staff Recommendation:
Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff Comments
