

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: JOHN ROBINSON (Chairperson), JAMES MEADORS, LUDA SOBCHUK,
KARO WHEELER (ALTERNATE)
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: TORY PARISH, LAWRENCE COURTNEY



MEETING RESULTS

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

February 23, 2022

4:30 P.M.

virtually via Zoom Webinar

1. 26 & 28 Cumberland Street - - TMS # 458-05-03-091 BAR2022-000721

Request conceptual approval for construction of a new multi-family building on a property having facades along Cumberland, State, and Linguard Streets. New building incorporates existing historic building along Cumberland Street.

French Quarter | Height District 3.5 | Old and Historic District

Owner: LP Cumberland South LLC

Applicant: Eddie Bello / Bello Garris Architects

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments incorporating additional height for architectural merit

MADE BY: Wheeler / SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 3 / AGAINST 0

(Luda Sobchuk recuses.)

Staff Observations:

1. Staff and Board comments which were incorporated into the previous Motion for this project have been addressed into the project or discussed with Staff. These include the elimination of the column at the corner entry in lieu of a cantilevered condition and the elimination of the framework around the pool deck on Linguard Street.

Staff Comments:

1. While still somewhat skeletal in its expression, the south elevation now has a more colonnaded form which lends a feeling of greater opacity and less void to the project. This elevation has improved with the addition of the brick pilasters to break the spans of the wide balconies and to harmonize with the rhythm of the east elevation. This addition, in combination with the addition of shutters at the side walls of the south-facing balconies, create the impression of a solid mass behind the balconies with the balconies divided by lighter shutter partitions. This better conforms to the language of Charleston piazzas and to that of a recessed piazza similar to referenced precedent of the Old Marine Hospital.
2. The project is headed in the right direction, being more compatible with general language of greater wall surface and punched openings of the French Quarter.
3. Adequate space is provided around the Martschink Building to allow for it to retain its separate identity while a nod to the building is placed in a recessed manner above the building.
4. The vehicular Entry, Exit and Parking areas remain well developed, being visually downplayed and hidden as much as possible.

5. The wall panels to the east of the pool will be seen from Linguard Street and need to be restudied. These should be made less prominent or should be made into more of a masonry feature wall, limited in width, that could feature an amenity to the pool deck, such as a simple wall fountain or trellis.
6. Staff agrees that the existing Martschink Building language should not be changed.

Staff Recommendation:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff Comments.

Board Comment:

- State Street façade looks great. Appreciate the removal of the column at the corner. Consider making the metal third floor porch deck match the second-floor porch. This thicker porch deck would align with the solid portions of the proposed building behind the Martschink Building. An opportunity exists for an additional or different material at the ground floor at Linguard to engage the street since these are very large panels.
- Interesting how minimal change to the façade changed the proportions in a very positive and impactful way. Simple substitution of steel with brick columns has basically solved the issues brought up previously. Fits very well. To respond to previous comment, I see this building as two stories over one with second and third floors combined. Adding brick to third floor line would make the southern elevation more gridded while it looks very good right now. The only element that stood out to me is the facade over the Martschink building where language is broken to nod to the Martschink. The four single windows here could receive more detail at preliminary or final review. This is a good example of a project that is of Charleston and uses the cues and takes inspiration in forms of Charleston and relates very well to the Martschink including being stepped back enough to respect it. Building appears as a three-story building, and the additional floor space is warranted. A good example for massing. Colors suggested in proposal helps to distinguish old from new but also is compatible together.

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

Background: Conceptual Review – February 9, 2022:

02/09/2022 Board Motion: Deferral incorporating Board and Staff comments

02/09/2022 Staff Comments:

1. *The east-facing State Street facade is the most successful of the project incorporating vertical proportions, a taller ground floor, a recessed penthouse, and detailing which includes fluted metal panels, brick reveals, and a rhythmic layered framework which harmonizes with its neighbor to the north, the Loutrel Hotel.*
2. *At the east façade, incorporate a similar recessed frame about the fixed panels at the first floor in order to visually thicken the pilasters to match the appearance of these at the second and third floors.*
3. *While the indented corner at the southeast evokes traditional Charleston corner storefronts, the scale of this project and the corner column do not match. The corner column should be omitted in lieu of a cantilevered corner or made more robust.*
4. *The south-facing Cumberland Street façade is a language of voids, created by an abundance of balconies. This skeletal language is out of character with surrounding Charleston buildings which are more solid or opaque with punched openings and it may be too much in contrast with the saved Martschink Building.*

5. *The wide spans of the balcony porches on the south elevation, while interrupted with a single column, read horizontally rather than with good proportions. The brick pilasters are pulled apart and provide minimal solid surface and mass to this elevation.*
6. *Continue the band between the second and third floors at the east façade and southeast corner by incorporating it into the south façade to better tie these elevations together.*
7. *At the north-facing Linguard Street portion, the extended framework to encompass the pool deck, feels like a different expression, especially with closing the curtains. Structure to encompass the pool deck should be recessed and lightened instead.*

02/09/2022 Staff Recommendation:

Deferral with Board and Staff comments for massing of solid/void language and for more cohesiveness in the architectural language between elevations.

02/09/2022 Board Comment:

- *Recognize the architectural motif of using masonry but pursuing lightness, and this is not inappropriate for this location. Solid heavy masonry might be overwhelming. The egg crate effect that comes about from the balconies is hard to work with in Charleston, and this is an area that needs study. Considering the extent of Staff and Public comment, which can be resolved, this most likely points to a deferral.*
- *No additional comment*
- *The eastern elevation is very successful. Like the stepping down to the neighborhood. Will look at perspective from Philadelphia Alley. Street is so narrow that there is some question about visibility of some portions when at street-level.*

02/09/2022 Board Motion: *Deferral incorporating Board and Staff comments*

2. **332 & 334 & 336 King Street and 36 George Street - - TMS # 457-04-02-006/007/008/009**
BAR2022-000736

Request for additional alley lighting between 332 King Street and 36 George Street.

c. 2021 | Old and Historic District

Owner: King & George Street LLC

Applicant: Kyra Brower / LS3P

Deferred by Applicant.

3. **115 Meeting Street - - TMS # 457-12-02-001** **BAR2022-000733**

Request conceptual approval for exterior alterations.

Category 1 | c. 1970 | Old and Historic District

Owner: Ash Patel / RLJ Lodging Trust

Applicant: Jonathan Handel / architecture incorporated

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff Comments for hardscape elements in front of the Loggia and in the Courtyard, Denial of up-lighting on the building and changes to the historic balconies, and Deferral for clarification of any elements being removed or relocated, such as the fencing to be relocated, and to give final details for hardscape elements to Staff.

MADE BY: Wheeler / SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0

Staff Observation:

1. This application, while perhaps minimal in scope related to visibility, is brought before the Board as this is a Category 1 building.

Staff Comments:

1. The proposed work on the balconies includes raising the existing panel and adding a horizontal member above and beneath the panel in order to develop a 42-inch-tall guardrail for the balconies. The Secretary of Interior Standards recommends the identification of character-defining features so that code-required work will not result in their damage or loss. However, there appears to be no demonstrable or compelling reason to alter the balconies. In combination with the cornice, the balconies are salvaged elements of the original Mills House Hotel which was constructed in 1853, and these are the character-defining features of this building. The proposed work will alter the proportion of the balcony bay openings and will diminish the ornate and intricate scrollwork which dominates the balconies. Therefore, altering them is not recommended.
2. The proposal includes in-ground up lighting (N7 on A1.01) to illuminate the columns at the Loggia on Meeting Street. BAR traditionally has discouraged the use of up lights on non-civic buildings, and these should be eliminated.
3. The proposed work in the Courtyard is somewhat visible from the public right-of-way through the Loggia and via an alley corridor between the Mills House and Hibernian Hall. However, Staff finds these changes to be appropriate and takes no issue with the exception of clarification needed on any relocation of building elements.

Staff Recommendation:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff Comments for hardscape elements in front of the Loggia and in the Courtyard, Denial of up-lighting on the building and changes to the historic balconies, and Deferral for clarification of any elements being removed or relocated, such as the fencing to be relocated.

Board Comment:

- Agree with Staff comments.
- Same, in agreement comments and recommendations.
- Alternation to balconies, while well-intentioned, are a hard sell as building effectively is a replica of its predecessor of which there is little remaining historic elements.
- Lacking detailed information for the balcony work, and proportionally will not work.
- Agree with Staff recommendation. Issue of railing height comes up often with historic renovation, but BAR and City Staff have denied the request if they are character-defining features. Hardscape elements, which Staff has recommended to be conceptually approved, if recommendation holds, could be reviewed by Staff for development and final review.

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

4. 677 King Street - - TMS # 460-04-04-074

BAR2022-000735

Appeal of BAR Staff Denial of Final Certificate of Construction Completeness, in accordance with Appendix D, Article III, Appeals Procedure.

c. 2021 | Old and Historic District

Owner: Atlantic South Development

Applicant: Nathan Schutte / McMillan Pazdan Smith Architecture

Deferred by Applicant.
