



CITY OF CHARLESTON BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW - LARGE

MEETING RESULTS

JANUARY 25, 2022

4:30 P.M.

2 GEORGE STREET

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

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

MINUTES

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JANUARY 11, 2023 MEETING

APPROVED X

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Approve

MADE BY: Meadors / SECOND: Brown

VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0
(Jay White abstains due to absence.)

APPLICATIONS

2. 431 MEETING STREET

TMS #459-09-01-049 | BAR2021-000431

New Construction | Cannon/Elliottborough | Height Districts 5 & 8 | Old and Historic District

Request first one-year extension of conceptual approval of hotel with 22' ground floor with one additional story based on architectural merit and context, originally granted on February 10, 2021.

Owner: OMS Charleston, LLC

Applicant: Capers G. Barr, III

APPROVED X

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Approval of extension.

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. This is an extension of Vested Rights and is to be automatically approved if received in a timely manner, pursuant to Article 9, Section 540962 of the Zoning Ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the first one-year Extension of Conceptual Approval to expire on February 10, 2024.

3. 266 ST. MARGARET STREET (LOWNDES GROVE)

TMS # 463-13-04-030 | BAR2023-001022

Category 1 | Wagener Terrace | c. 1786 | Height District 5 | Landmark Overlay District

Request final approval for the removal of the existing in-ground pool to fill with soil and top with sod to match adjacent lawn.

Owner: Patrick Properties Hospitality Group, LLC
Applicant: Glenn Keyes Architects

APPROVED X

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Approval for filling pool

MADE BY: Meadors / SECOND: White

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

STAFF NOTE:

This property lies within the Landmark Overlay Zone. Therefore, whether the proposed work is visible or not from a public street or right-of-way, a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Board of Architectural Review is required. In reviewing these, the BAR is to utilize the criteria of the Old and Historic District. This Landmark Overlay project is brought before the Board out of an abundance of caution only

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. Aerial photographs indicate the pool was constructed in the early 1990s. The pool is not historic and does not relate to the era which this structure represents.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Final Approval of removal of the existing pool to fill with soil and top with sod to match the existing lawn.

4. 214-216 SPRING STREET

TMS # 460-11-01-017 | BAR2022-000925

New Construction | Westside | Height District 6 & 3 | Old City District

Request preliminary approval for new construction of 134 multi-family micro dwelling units with 45 parking spaces.

Owner: MCZ Spring St. Acquisitions

Applicant: William Rodon Hornof / 2rz Architecture

APPROVED X

WITHDRAWN

DENIED

DEFERRED

MOTION: Preliminary Approval with Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0
(Seaton Brown abstains.)

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. Changes to the base and site wall are welcomed, and the newly proposed design uniquely provides a texture, pattern, and visual interest to these walls. The base is still reliant on the success of living green wall panels for relief as a break from solid. Green wall panels must be irrigated to be viable.
2. Fenestration at the southeast corner facing Spring Street has been expanded, as seen on page 21. Staff recommends a return of the previous framed singular openings which were more impactful and balanced the opposite mass. However, the current proposed arrangement at this location might be more impactful if the frames are removed. A two-dimensional elevation without the frame's shadow lines can be seen on page 10, for reference.
3. Staff appreciates the color change at the lower north portion and the recesses/hyphens.
4. Staff finds the balcony "shields" for the railings at the southwest corner to be potentially unnecessary. As part of a final review, would like to see the elevation with these omitted.
5. The proportions and sizes of the elements that compose the elevations are attractive. Noticeably, however, the panel seams work out cleanly on the southeast mass with corners, edges, and openings more so than on than the southwest mass. Please explain intent or alternate studies performed.
6. Staff and Board have seen issues with the workmanship of the ATAS metal panel system in the past and caution the developer and architect that it may be challenging to find a local team that can install this material satisfactorily.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Preliminary Approval with Board and Staff comments.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Appreciate the material palette and how the project is developing. Echo comment about workmanship; this direction relies on precision, which can be a challenge. Understand the solid panels on the south-facing balconies to be an aesthetic device and don't see a problem. Agree with staff comments otherwise and with recommendation for preliminary approval.
- Considering compatibility between aluminum and zinc or other materials. Applicant confirms exploration and use of solid pigmented zinc panel rather than zinc-coated steel panel. Attachment components ideally would be same material also or could create a problem.

- Western wall looks to be 28' wide by five stories tall, a very visible large solid area, which. Applicant responds this area to be distinguishable with a different zinc pattern, and the idea it will appear lighter because of its floating condition. Additionally, applicant desire is to use this mass to provide balance for all the glazing and a clear understanding of the volumes.
- Same concern with solid western wall. A matte finish, but will there be a reflection at sunset that distracts or could impeded drivers? Applicant response that the matte finish does not have a reflectance and should over time, wear like a copper wall.
- A primary concern, visible on page 3.02, relates to the assembly and corners where railings extend beyond, proud of the buildings. Should these turn in or be recessed.
- A concern related to the success of the vegetative green walls. What is the proposal for the brick behind these green wall panels? Important to understand for when the vegetation is dormant or if it dies. Applicant responds that brick at these locations to be flat running bond which will provide a break from the brick accordion-style wall, if revealed.
- Second Mr. White's positive observations and Mr. Meadors' concerns.
- Seems like project is progressing nicely, including the changes made related to fenestration and glazing. Concerned over solid west-facing wall. The size is quite large, and it doesn't work proportionately with the rest of the building and glazing.
- Brick accordion detail confirmed to be at 90 degrees which will give a straight edge. Black brick is not typically colored throughout and yet many facets of each may be visible. Applicant confirms use of specialty brick.

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

5. EHRHARDT & BEE STREET (43 BEE STREET)

TMS # 460-15-01-023 TO 027 | BAR2021-000651

Medical District | Height District 85/125 | Old City District

Request conceptual approval of a new heat and power cogeneration facility to serve the existing (and planned) MUSC campus with steam and electrical power.

Owner: Medical University of South Carolina

Applicant: Jake Beck / LFK Architects

DEFERRED BY APPLICANT

6. 295 CALHOUN STREET

TMS # 457-02-02-001 | BAR2021-000480

Harleston Village | Height District 7 | Old City District

Request conceptual approval for new construction of seven-story mixed-use development.

Owner: SE Calhoun, LLC


Applicant: Davis Carter Scott / DCS Design

DEFERRED



John E. Robinson, Chairperson

2/8/2023
date



Tory J. Parish, BAR-L Administrator

2/8/2023
date