



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
January 11, 2017 1:00 P.M.  
Meeting Minutes

**JANUARY 11, 2017 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING**

**HDRB Members Present:** Stephen Merriman, Jr., Chair  
Justin Gunther, Vice-Chair  
Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian  
Debra Caldwell  
Jennifer Deacon  
Keith Howington  
Becky Lynch  
Andy McGarrity  
Tess Scheer

**HDRB Members Not Present:** Dr. Betsy Dominguez  
Kellie Fletcher

**MPC Staff Present:** Ellen Harris, Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation  
Alyson Smith, Historic Preservation Planner  
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

1. [Call to Order and Welcome](#)

**Mr. Merriman** called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. He outlined the role of the Historic District Board of Review and explained the process for hearing the various petitions. Staff will present each application with a recommendation. The petitioner will have the opportunity to respond to the recommendation. The petitioners are asked to limit their presentation to 10 minutes or less and only address the items identified as inconsistent with the ordinance and questions raised by the Board. The public will have the same allotted time, ten minutes, to comment. The petitioner will be given the opportunity to respond to the public comments.

The Board will then go into Board discussion at which time no further testimony is received

unless specifically requested by the Chair. Each Board member will be given two minutes twice to provide comments, if they so desire.

## II. SIGN POSTING

## III. CONSENT AGENDA

### 2. [Approval of Consent Agenda January 11, 2017](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval of Consent Agenda for January 11, 2017. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Andy McGarrity

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Not Present

Justin Gunther - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

Becky Lynch - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Andy McGarrity - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

### 3. [Petition of Canady Signs | 16-006536-COA | 214 West Boundary Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a freestanding sign at 214 West Boundary Street, because it meets the standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Andy McGarrity

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Not Present

Justin Gunther - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

4. [Petition of Jonathan Rhangos | 16-006853-COA | 222 East Huntingdon Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Revised submittal.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the proposed fence and partitions at 222 East Huntingdon Street with the condition that a specification is provided - PASS for staff approval for the custom rolling gate, because otherwise it meets the standards and is visually compatible.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Andy McGarrity  
Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

5. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 16-006854-COA | 539 East Liberty Street | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for signs at 539 East Liberty Street with the condition that the under-awning sign is a minimum of one foot from the outer edge of the awning, because otherwise they meet the standards and are visually compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Andy McGarrity

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

6. [Petition of Eric Walsnovich | 16-006857-COA | 660 East Broughton Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a fence at 660 East Broughton Street with the condition that the finish of the precast concrete elements is approved - PASS by staff prior to installation, because otherwise the work meets the standards and is visually compatible.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Andy McGarrity

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

7. [Petition of John Nakelski | 16-006871-COA | 309 West Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve an under-awning sign at 309 West Broughton Street with the condition that it is a minimum of one foot from the outside edge of the awning, because otherwise the sign meets the standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Andy McGarrity

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

**IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

8. [Adoption of Agenda for January 11, 2017 Meeting](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the adoption of the agenda for January 11, 2017 Meeting. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

**V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

9. [Approve December 14, 2016 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [12-14-2016 Minutes.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve December 14, 2016 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Debra Caldwell

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

**VI. ITEM(S) REQUESTED TO BE REMOVED FROM THE FINAL AGENDA**

**VII. CONTINUED AGENDA**

10. [Continue All Items to Next Regular Meeting](#)

**Board Action:**

Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue all items to the next regular meeting. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye

Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

11. Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 15-001384-COA | 600 East Bay Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition as requested. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.  
Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

12. Petition of Gary Sanders | 16-003487-COA | 305 West Wayne Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition as requested. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.  
Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye

Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

13. [Petition of Wubben Architects and Design and Liberty Townes, LLC | 16-006295-COA | 529 East Liberty Street | Demolition of a Non-Contributing Building and Part I: New Construction Height and Mass](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition as requested. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

14. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 16-006847-COA | 405 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. | Demolition and New Construction Part 1 Height and Mass](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition as requested. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye



Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

## VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

### 15. Petition of Hall Smith Office, Inc. | 16-005621-COA | 23 West Gordon Street | Alterations, Additions, and New Construction: Part II, Carriage House

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Monterey Ward.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Previously Approved Drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Context Photos.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Mass Model.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Materials and Specifications.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Renderings and Color Samples.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Site Photos.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Petitioner's revised drawings in response to staff recommendations 1-9-17.pdf](#)

**Mr. Joseph Smith** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Alyson Smith** gave the report. The petitioner is requesting approval for Part II: Design Details for new construction of a carriage house and additions and alterations to the main buildings at 23 West Gordon Street. Alterations to the main house consist of replacing the asphalt shingle roof with a new standing seam metal roof, repair and repainting windows, shutters, and other woodwork; and virtual demolition and reconstruction of the two-story rear addition and side porch that wraps the east façade of the main building. The east half of this addition will be reconstructed at three-stories high. The addition of a two-story hyphen, with a roof deck, between the main building's rear addition and the new carriage house is proposed. This addition also has an attached deck structure extending into the east courtyard.

**Ms. Smith** explained that at the November 9, 2016 HDBR Meeting, the Board approved the demolition of all the non-historic lane buildings, Part I Height and Mass of the carriage house with conditions, and provided initial comments on alterations and additions to the main house as follows:

#### Part I Conditions:

1. Ensure that the "garage doors" within the 4<sup>th</sup> vehicular opening extend the full height of the door opening.  
*The condition is met. The doors are full height.*
2. Ensure that door frames and window sashes are inset a minimum of 3 inches from the face of the building.  
*The condition is met. The doors and windows are inset 3 inches minimum.*
3. Ensure that the sloped apron to the garage openings are not erected on the public right- of-way.  
*The condition is met. The apron is within the garage.*

#### Applicant Amendments to Part I from Previous Approval:

1. The carriage house roof shape has changed from a hip with parapet to flat with

parapet. The parapet height has increased from 3'-6" to 4'-3".

*The change is visually compatible and meets the Part I design standards.*

2. The floor-to-floor heights of the carriage house have been modified to more accurately represent the relationship between the historic main building first floor finish elevation and existing grade at West Gordon Lane. This has resulted in an overall building height reduction of approximately 18 inches (including the elimination of the hip roof).

*The change is visually compatible and meets the Part I design standards.*

3. Carriage house windows and door sizes and head heights have been revised to reflect the adjusted building height.

*The change is visually compatible and meets the Part I design standards.*

4. Three double-hung windows on the rear façade of the carriage house (facing Gordon Street) have been replaced with two oval accent windows.

*This change is not visually compatible. Accent windows are not historically used in this manner. Staff recommends that this be revised to the previous design or a new design.*

5. The carriage house's south elevation will connect to a wall with an eight foot vehicular opening. The opening will be enclosed with a steel garage door to match the three additional garage doors. A wooden deck will be constructed over the vehicular opening and will attach to the second story of the carriage house. The deck will be screened by a parapet to match the carriage house.

*The change is visually compatible and meets the Part I design standards.*

6. A steel gate has been added to the man door on the lane façade of the carriage house.

*The change is visually compatible and meets the Part I design standards.*

Alterations and Additions Comments from Previous Approval:

1. Set the hyphen further than 2 feet back from the Whitaker Street façade of the historic building to further distinguish it from the historic building and to be more in keeping with the historic development pattern of "main house, courtyard, and carriage house."
2. The design of the hyphen is too "high style" in comparison with the historic building; redesign to be simplified and modified to appear more contemporary in nature.
3. The window proposed to be removed be retained on site to allow for a future restoration.
4. The new column on the side porch be changed from fiberglass to wood.
5. Samples, specifications, and colors have not yet been provided for the addition and the hyphen.
6. Ensure that all railing standards are met.
7. Reduce the pergola and deck in size, scale, and visibility from the front elevation.
8. Lower the height of the hyphen to be more differentiated from the main house addition and the new carriage house.
9. Provide "before" and "after" exterior elevations on the same drawing sheet for better comprehension of the proposed project.

**Ms. Smith** said the following additional items were discussed by the Board but a recommendation not provided:

- The open space below the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the hyphen and above the existing brick wall.
- The new stucco parapet on top of the historic brick wall at the rear addition.
- Wood siding versus stucco on the rear addition.

**Ms. Smith** reported that staff recommends:

1. Approval of Part 2: Design Details for new construction of a carriage house at 23 West Gordon Street with the following condition to be submitted to staff for approval:
  - a. Revise the two oval accent windows on the rear façade of the carriage house facing West Gordon Street because they are not visually compatible. Staff recommends that they be revised to the previous design of three double-hung wood windows or redesigned.
2. Approval of the proposed additions and alterations to the main building at 23 West Gordon Street with the following conditions:
  - a. Restudy the partially open space below the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the hyphen and above the brick wall;
  - b. Retain the extracted windows on site to allow for a future restoration;
  - c. Ensure that the door frames and window sashes are inset a minimum of 3 inches from the face of the building;
  - d. Ensure that the metal roof's standing seam does not exceed a height of one inch;
  - e. Wood siding is proposed on the 3-story portion of the addition and stucco on the 2-story portion of the addition; however, staff recommends material continuity throughout the whole addition;

Because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Smith** explained that they have changed their design to reflect the staff recommendations. The third floor addition will be finished in stucco with a solid parapet at the top rather than oak rail. The non-historic brick yard wall on the Whitaker Street elevation was raised from six feet to eight feet. This obscures the view. The windows on the rear elevation of the carriage house has been converted to double hung as they were in the original application.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they have reviewed the revised drawings and agree with restudying the oval windows. The HSF believes this was discussed in the last meeting about whether the shutters were bi-fold or trifold. They believe that the hyphen is more appropriate as it is set back. They also agree with the treatment of using stucco on the addition and using wood on the hyphen. The HSF has some concerns about the visibility of the deck and how extensive it is. In their opinion it will be visible from the courtyard. Therefore, they suggest reducing the visibility as much as possible.

**Ms. Meunier** said the HSF would like for the petitioner to reconsider the light color of the propose stucco. They are looking at how much the light color will contrast with the color of the brick. She said they believe that on historic buildings the color is pale grey or a whitish color.

**Mr. Smith**, in response to public comments, confirmed that the shutters on West Gordon Lane are operable. There are no shutters on the rear windows of the carriage house.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the visibility of the large deck from the sidewalk. Color samples need to be placed on site. The Board agreed with the staff recommendations.

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

1. Approve Part 2: Design Details for new construction of a carriage house at 23 West Gordon Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for approval prior to construction:
  - a. Revise the two oval accent windows on the rear façade of the carriage house facing West Gordon Street because they are not visually compatible. Staff recommends that they be revised to the previous design of three double-hung wood windows or redesigned.
  - b. Reduce the size of the carriage houses decks located on the north elevation and restudy the railings so that they are not so visible from Gordon Street.
  - c. Add shutters to the carriage house windows where visible from the public right-of-way.
  - d. Provide an onsite sample of the “Pure White” color proposed for the stucco treatment, so that staff may evaluate its visual compatibility with the existing historic brick.
2. Approve the proposed additions and alterations to the main building at 23 West Gordon Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff prior to construction:
  - a. Restudy the partially open space below the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the hyphen and above the brick wall;
  - b. Retain the extracted windows on site to allow for a future restoration;
  - c. Ensure that the door frames and window sashes are inset a minimum of 3 inches from the face of the building;
  - d. Ensure that the metal roof’s standing seam does not exceed a height of one inch;
  - e. Wood siding is proposed on the 3-story portion of the addition and stucco on the

- PASS

2-story portion of the addition; however, staff recommends material continuity throughout the whole addition;

f. Provide an outside sample of the "Pure White" color sample proposed on stucco treatment, so that staff may evaluate how visually compatible it is with the existing brick.

Because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Jennifer Deacon

Second: Keith Howington

Justin Gunther	- Aye
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

#### 16. [Petition of Nathan Pollard | 16-006293-COA | 601 MLK, Jr. Blvd | New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass and Part II: Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Package - Drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Package - Specifications.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Minis Ward.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Gaston Ward.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Garden Ward.pdf](#)

**Mr. Nathan Pollard** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Harris** gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for Part I, Height and Mass and Part II, Design Details for the new construction of a two-story commercial building located at 601 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. The building is surrounded by streets on three sides; MLK to the east and Morris Brown Drive to the north and west. The Part I, Height and Mass, was continued on December 14, 2016, and allowed to be brought back with Part II, Design Details. The conditions were as follows:

- 1. Enlarge the second-floor windows throughout; their overall size, for the large scale of these facades, is too small and not compatible.**

The windows have been enlarged to 3 feet by 5 feet.

- 2. Add more voids to all facades. Ensure that the distance between windows is not less than for adjacent historic building, nor more than two times the width of the windows.**

Voids were added on the south façade.

- 3. Add a wall of continuity to the property lines of both MLK and Morris Brown Drive to create a sense of enclosure. Ensure that the wall/fence meets the design standards.**

A brick and iron fence has been added to the site to create a wall of enclosure.

- 4. The main entrance should be located on the front façade, beneath the vehicular canopy. Secondary entrances can be located on the side facades.**

A main entrance was added on the front façade under the canopy.

- 5. Simplify the roof line; eliminate the variety of heights and elements. Ensure that the building has a string course, cornice, or other elements toward the top of the building.**

Some of the towers were removed from the building and a string course added to the lower parapet.

- 6. Increase the exterior expression of the height of the ground floor to a minimum of 14'-6".**

The exterior expression of the ground floor was increase to 14'-6".

- 7. Ensure that door frames and window sashes are inset a minimum of 3 inches from the face of the building.**

4 inch insets were specified for all frames and sashes.

- 8. Reduce the number of driveway access points into the property, reduce the curb cuts to a maximum of 20 feet wide, and redesign the sidewalks to serve as continuous uninterrupted pathways across all driveways in materials, configuration, and height.**

The number of access points remains the same, but the curb cuts were reduced to a maximum of 20 feet. The sidewalks were also redesign to serve as continuous uninterrupted pathways across all driveways.

- 9. Provide HVAC unit locations and ensure that they are screened from all public rights-of-way.**

The HVAC is located on the roof but screening details are not provided.

- 10. Provide additional information regarding the refuse storage area indicated in the southwest corner of the property.**

A detail is provided for the refuse storage area screening.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends:

Approve Parts I and II for new construction at 601 Martin Luther King Jr Blvd with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Revise the proposed fiber cement siding;
2. Screening details are provided for the HVAC;
3. Remove the proposed LED light band;
4. Revise the mortar color to something that will provide more contrast;
5. Provide a color specification for the wood element of the dumpster screening wall and a specification for the gates;
6. Provide a height for the proposed wall/fence;
7. Provide a mural wall on south façade;

Because otherwise the work meets the standards and is visually compatible.

**Ms. Deacon** asked if the signage will be submitted in a separate submittal.

**Ms. Harris** explained that signage is shown, but the petitioner will submit an application later for the signage.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Pollard** said they agree with all of staff's recommendations with the exception of #3- "Remove the proposed LED light band." They will submit the details to staff and show a horizontal band. They will use smooth stucco. The fiber cement will have a different color.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the cement siding. Staff explained that the cement siding color and patterns are not visually compatible. There is not a prohibition against cement siding, but staff is requesting that it be revised. The fiber cement is a visual compatibility factor and is not a specific design standard. Therefore, it does not require a variance. The Board discussed whether the setback is in relationship to the historic buildings and the streetscape. Ms. Harris explained that there are very few historic buildings in this ward. Staff looked at the building across the street which is set forward. A church is here and is setback. Therefore, staff felt the setback is compatible.

The Board discussed if the LED lighting is prohibited. Staff said the LED lighting is not prohibited, but they feel that it is incompatible. The LED lighting needs to be toned down. They have no problem with the three entrances.

#### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for Parts I and II for new construction at 601 Martin Luther King Jr Blvd with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Revise the proposed fiber cement siding to an alternative material, though not stucco;
2. Screening details are provided for the HVAC;
3. Reduce the voltage on the proposed LED light band to the minimum possible and remove from the rear portion of the building; - PASS
4. Revise the mortar color to something that will provide more contrast;
5. Provide a color specification for the wood element of the dumpster screening wall and a specification for the gates;
6. Provide a height for the proposed wall/fence;
7. Provide a mural wall on south façade;

Because otherwise the work meets the standards and is visually compatible.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Andy McGarrity

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

[17. Petition of LS3P Dawson | 16-006335-COA | 401 East Bay Street | New Construction Part 2 Design Details](#)

Attachment: [16-006335-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Narrative and Materials.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Drawings reduced.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)



**Mr. David Moore** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of Part II Design Details of a new four story building at 401 East Bay Street. The project anchors the corner of East Bay and Habersham Streets, with the primary elevation facing Habersham. Building materials include brick, steel and glass to reflect early twentieth century industrial buildings in the vicinity. Signage, while indicated on the drawings, is not part of this submittal.

**Ms. Harris** explained the Historic Review Board approved the demolition of the existing building and New Construction Part I: Height and Mass with the following conditions:

1. A building permit for demolition not be issued until the permit for new construction is issued.
2. On the ground floor of the north façade at the tower element, incorporate additional voids.

*Complete. Additional voids have been incorporated.*

3. Redesign the East Bay Street entrance be more prominent.

*The East Bay Street entrance has been recessed into the building.*

4. Revise the Habersham Street elevation, particularly the entrance, to be more prominent.

*The Habersham Street elevation has been revised to increase prominence, including the entrance which features a significant awning.*

5. Redesign the proposed valet parking drop off area to be accommodated within the existing street, rather than the sidewalk, and without a curb cut.

*Complete. Valet parking drop off is within the existing street rather than the sidewalk and without a curb cut.*

**Ms. Harris** stated additionally that a roof monitor has been added to the center of the roof and will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

**Ms. Harris** said that the Board also recommended approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a lot coverage variance to allow 100% lot coverage. 50% is the maximum permitted in the RBC zoning district.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of Part II: Design Details with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards:

1. Ensure all doors and windows are inset not less than three inches from the façade. Ensure the storefront glazing is inset a minimum of four inches from the façade.
2. Select a window which meets the standard requiring 7/8" wide muntins.
3. Revise the storefront base to be a contrasting material to meet the standard.
4. Provide additional details on the awning, steel balconies and mechanical screening.
5. Should the HVAC units be visible from Bay Street, screening will be required.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Moore** said they will ensure that all the doors and windows will be inset four inches. He explained that they want to say yes to the 7/8" muntins, but the way the manufacturer devises the 7/8 inch, there is a problem with the insulated glass. If they use the 7/8" profile with the window, the space will be visible because the depth of the two windows is actually greater than the width. The steel bar will actually be greater than the 7/8". Therefore, a silver line will be seen at the top and bottom. This is why they went with a larger profile. They like the character of the window in terms of the portions. The manufacturer manufactures a one inch spacer and it will be right on the edge. Consequently, they rather stay with the 1.25 profile.

**Mr. Moore** stated that they have no problem with the staff recommendation regarding the storefront base. They want to use the metal handrails. He said as far as the details on the awning, steel balconies and mechanical screening, they will provide more additional detailing to staff. Mr. Moore said they do not anticipate that the HVAC units will be seen on the Bay Street side, but if they are, they will install barriers so that the units will not be seen.

**Mr. Moore** said they selected a brick choice that mimics the overall old look to go along with the remaining building.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** reported that they agree with the staff's comments. They are concerned about the brick and, therefore, believe the brick needs to be restudied. Because of the industrial aesthetic it would be better to have a more true square rectilinear brick rather than a rustic brick. They are in favor of the brick that is being used below the storefront because of the industrial aesthetic of the building. They have questions about the metal screening in the northwest corner. They are trying to see how this fits in the overall design. They understand the steel that is being used, but what is the inspiration of the metal screening?

**Mr. Moore** in response to the public comments, stated that in their design of the building, they were trying to come up with a soft feel. They were trying to differentiate the building from the adjacent building while trying to design something in color ranges. They are now looking for a straightforward molding single color brick. He explained as far as the metal screening, Bay street is a very active street. Therefore, they wanted something for the windows. In opening up the windows, they wanted a screening effect that allows for the view of natural light to come into the room. They plan to have natural vegetation here.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board is appreciative that the petitioner changed the valet. The Board discussed the windows and had concerns about the brick. They believe that a more contemporary industrial brick would be more appropriate. They believe this brick would give the petitioner the variation that they are looking for.

The Board discussed the variance request. They are in agreement to recommend the variance request to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) to allow a window muntin width greater than 7/8" because the variance criteria have been met.

#### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve Part II: Design Details with

the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards:

1. Ensure all doors and windows are inset not less than three inches from the façade. Ensure the storefront glazing is inset a minimum of four inches from the façade.
2. Select a less distressed brick to be more in keeping with the industrial character of the building. - PASS
3. Provide additional details on the awning, steel balconies and mechanical screening.
4. Should the HVAC units be visible from Bay Street, screening will be required.

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review recommends approval of a variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals to allow a window muntin width greater than 7/8" because the variance criteria have been met.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Becky Lynch

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Abstain
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

18. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 16-006848-COA | 501 Montgomery Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Gaston Ward.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Aerial View.pdf](#)

**NOTE: Mr. McGarrity recused himself from participating in this petition.**

**Mr. Patrick Shay** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Alyson Smith** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass for a six unit, four story multi-family building with commercial uses on the first floor. The building will have a corner entrance orienting towards both Gaston and Montgomery Street. Two additional entrances will orient towards Gaston Street. The property will not feature on-site parking.

**Ms. Smith** reported that staff recommends:

Approval of Part 1 Height and Mass for new construction at 501 Montgomery Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part 2:

1. Increase the height of the first floor to 14'-6";
2. Increase the number of voids on the north elevation;
3. Provide the height of the rooftop elevator for review;
4. Increase the number of voids on the south and west elevations where visible from the public right-of-way;
5. Add an entrance on the east elevation to address Montgomery Street;
6. Reduce the height of the second, third and fourth stories to reduce the overall height of the building;
7. Ensure that the parapet has a string course and coping;
8. Reduce the depth of the balconies on the east elevation to three feet to meet the standard;
9. Ensure that the window sashes and door frames are inset not less than three inches, and that the storefront be inset no less than four inches from the façade;

Because otherwise the development is visually compatible and meets the standards.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Shay** came forward and introduced the persons accompanying him. Mr. Shay stated that in general, they concur with most of the staff recommendations. He stated that #5 of the staff's recommendations states "Add an entrance on the east elevation to address Montgomery Street." Mr. Shay explained that the building is approximately 45 feet wide with a corner entrance. Sometimes historic buildings have additional entrances. This will be a second entrance on the same corner. But if the Board says they have to have the entrance, they will certainly do so. The staff's recommendation #6 says "Reduce the height of the second, third and fourth stories to reduce the overall height of the building." Mr. Shay stated that he got confused because the commercial building standards are being applied to the lower level. But, they are transitioning to the residential standards to the upper level. Consequently, he misinterpreted this the first time he read the staff's report. They modeled this in the office as 14'6"; 12 and smaller for the third and fourth floors. However, as he heard the staff's presentation today, the recommendation is that they need not make the second story 12 feet as this is what it is for commercial buildings. They can keep this somewhat lower. He said they will find a way to reduce the floor-to-floor heights on each of the upper three stories. Mr. Shay said he would like to keep 9' ceilings. On the ground floor they will have 14'6." If it is the wish of the Board that they comply with all nine of the

staff's recommendations, then they will do so.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** stated that they agree with all of staff's recommendations. Ms. Meunier said based on what Mr. Shay said, they are okay with what Mr. Shay offered for the 14'6" ground floor and the other floor-to-floor heights. They believe this would be more appropriate and a little taller than the adjacent building.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Ms. Lynch** stated that she was sympathetic to the petitioner's explanation of the building heights in meeting the commercial standards throughout the floors. She believes that there should be some latitude in building height.

**Mr. Gunther** was okay with the corner entrance. He agreed with the rationale of the floor to ceiling height. He is a little concern about how proud the building stands out towards the street. He is concern about the urban wall that will be created along Montgomery Street.

**Mr. Howington** believes that a second entrance is not necessary along Montgomery Street. This is a strong, proud corner. It would be good if the building was in align with the other property. He wanted the petitioner to respond to this.

**Mr. Shay** explained that this is their fault in the sense that they did not understand that the Bowery property was allowed to build their little courtyard to the right-of-way. The model showed that they were on the property. After they reread the minutes approving the Bowery project, they were able to figure out that the courtyard was in the front.

The Board was in agreement with the staff's recommendations, excluding recommendation number 5. They agreed that the corner entrance is sufficient and does not need to be changed.

### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve Part 1 Height and Mass for new construction at 501 Montgomery Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part 2:

1. Increase the height of the first floor to 14'-6";
2. Increase the number of voids on the north elevation;
3. Provide the height of the rooftop elevator for review;
4. Increase the number of voids on the south and west elevations where visible from the public right-of-way;

- PASS

5. Reduce the height of the second, third and fourth stories to reduce the overall height of the building;
6. Ensure that the parapet has a string course and coping;
7. Reduce the depth of the balconies on the east elevation to three feet to meet the standard;
8. Ensure that the window sashes and door frames are inset not less than three inches, and that the storefront be inset no less than four inches from the façade;

Because otherwise the development is visually compatible and meets the standards.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

19. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 16-006849-COA | 607 Drayton Street | New Construction: Part I Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [16-006849-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Forsyth Ward.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Photos.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Petitioner's revised drawings- response to staff recommendations 1-9-17.pdf](#)

**NOTE: Mr. McGarrity recused himself from participating in this petition.**

**Mr. Patrick Shay** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the report. The applicant is requesting approval of Part 1: Height and Mass of a new four story building on a vacant lot with Drayton Street to the west, Huntingdon Street to the north, and Goodwin Street to the east. The building forms and “U” shape, with a courtyard along Goodwin Street. Entrances face both Forsyth Park and Huntingdon Street.

**Ms. Harris** explained that the petitioner has drawn from nearby Mid-Century Modern buildings within the vicinity for architectural inspiration, including the Chatham Apartment Building to the east and the additions to the Candler Hospital Building (now the Savannah Law School) to the north. She stated that similar petitions (16-002196-COA and 16-003492-COA) were reviewed by the Board in 2016. The current petition is considered a new petition and does not include a request for the “bonus story.”

**Ms. Harris** said staff recommends:

Continue Part I: Height and Mass in order for the petitioner to restudy the following:

1. Reduce the height of the taller parapets and consider utilizing other massing elements to meet the large scale development standards such as the recess standard.
2. Redesign the roofline variations to incorporate other variations besides a change in the parapet height.
3. Redesign the fenestration of the rounded corners to extend to the ground floor at the southwest, northwest, and northeast corners.
4. Incorporate voids into the blank spaces on the ground floor flanking the central entrances on the north and west facades.
5. Restudy the asymmetry of the Huntingdon Street façade bays and openings. Center the doors within the glazing.
6. Add additional fenestration to the blank wall adjacent to the service entrance on the Goodwin Street elevation.
7. Revise the front yard setback to match the adjacent contributing buildings to the south.
8. Reduce the depth of the canopy on the Huntingdon Street elevation.
9. Restudy the benches along Drayton Street, particularly at the corner of Drayton and Huntingdon, to better provide a wall of continuity.
10. Redesign the bay spacing to meet the requirement of bays which are larger than 20 feet and less than 15 feet.

**Ms. Harris** explained that the petitioner has submitted revised drawings to address all of staff's conditions. The revised drawings were posted to the agenda on Monday. She said that the petitioner will present the revised drawings to the Board today for their consideration.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Shay** came forward and recognized the team members accompanying him. He said they are not asking for a height bonus today. This is a four story building. They want to present something that is compatible with the overall surrounding area and also something that is an eccentric modern building.

**Mr. Shay** stated that regarding the staff's report, they do not take any exception with the items presented to the Board. They restudied the staff's recommendations and sent their revisions on Monday, January 9. They want to move to the next level. Mr. Shay stated they agree with the fenestration request. However, on the ground floor area they want to restudy the materiality that reads as a void as presented by staff. They want to restudy the materiality in Part II which is the translucent and all the items that are listed in the ordinance. As far as the setback, they will match the setback of the building adjacent to them to the immediate south. This will be in line with the main façade.

**Mr. Shay** pointed out that the big thing that is different with the revisions than what was original submitted had to do with the issue of meeting the standard of the roofline variations, but not using parapets. He said the volume where they added to the guest rooms does not mean that there will be a fifth story. They want to ensure that they meet the letter of the law with their base spacing; it is exactly 20 feet and 15 feet. It only requires some adjustment in inches in all these cases, but they are not asking for a variance from this standard. There are two pair of doors on Drayton Street. They will reduce the projection canopy to be in line with the tree lawns that they are adding to that particular street. It is a projection of eight feet rather than ten feet.

**Mr. Shay** showed the Board where the guests will arrive and get out of their cars. They will make the changes that the staff has requested. Mr. Shay stated that since they have revised the drawings already, that they not be forced into a continuance. They will refine the drawings as they go forward into Part II - Design Details.

**Mr. Shay** said instead of having a square finish with a solid paired corner, they have decided to carry the rounded shape all the way down to the ground floor. Benches are now low levels instead of only being 18 or 20 inches, they are a little taller. Benches will be on the inside. He said they have done everything that the staff requested that they do.

**Mr. Gunther** asked Mr. Shay if the central pilaster that interrupts the ground front façade is the only solution so that it will be centered on the streetscape.

**Mr. Shay** answered that due to the interpretation of what constitutes a bay, they would cherish the opportunity to meet with staff and figure out another way to express this. The massing of the building has been watered down; therefore, it does not have a clear center.

**Mr. Howington** asked what is the purpose of the translucent railing on the top of the roofline.

**Mr. Shay** answered that the idea is to exaggerate the roofline variation.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they believe that the scale in term of both height and mass is more appropriate than what they saw previously. They have reviewed the petitioner's revised submittal to staff. It appears that the aesthetic on mid-century influence is in conflict with the other elements and design. Ms. Meunier said mid-century buildings tend to have a more typical horizontal nature and this building tends to have a vertical expression. However, the base spacing changes may resolve this. The translucent railing needs to be explored further in Part II. Ms. Meunier questioned the pilaster that has been added to create the bay spacing on the upper floors. It does not appear to be continuous. She said regarding the staff's recommendation about restudy of the asymmetric of the Huntingdon Street, it appears to be okay to the HSF.

**Ms. Meunier** said staff in their recommendations suggests the redesign of the roofline variations to incorporate other variations besides a change in the parapet height. The HSF understands that now they are using architectural volume. So, they ask staff if using the architectural volume meets their first recommendation.

**Mr. Shay**, in response to public comments, thanked the HSF for their comments. He said they are committed to finding more horizontal spacing. Bay spacing is very descriptive. They will restudy the translucent railings. It does not have to be glass. It may be something that they choose to do out of ornamental metal or something else. They like having each of the segments be designed asymmetric where they can. He is hopeful that staff agrees that turning this into architectural volume meets the standard.



**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board reminded Mr. Shay that his project was approved by the Review Board, but was overthrown. Some of the Board members received some criticisms. The current revisions reflects most of the staff's recommendations. They discussed the benches. The concept and volumes could be better emphasized by moving the handrail back from the front wall, which would give the volume precedent on the street. They discussed the verticality versus horizontality. The tall proportion of the windows appears to be very narrow. The roofline variations could be better viewed if the railings were pushed back. Is there a way to work the central bay spacing to eliminate the central element interpreting the principal façade of the building?

**Mr. Gunther** appreciated HSF comments about the overall stylistic concern of the building. It is a bit confusing for the petitioner to say he is building directly to the mid-century more international style buildings as it appears to be more Art Deco. The asymmetric on the Huntingdon Street is okay.

The Board asked the staff their opinion about approving Part I with the petitioner bringing back the conditions along with their Part II -Design Details.

**Ms. Harris** stated that she believes that what the petitioner has presented today along with the comments from the Review Board, there is a good understanding of the revisions that need to occur in order for the petitioner to comeback with the conditions in Part II. If Part I conditions are not met, then it is not binding that the Board hear Part II.

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve Part I: Height and Mass with the following conditions which must be addressed and brought back to the Board for approval with Part II: Design Details, because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards.

1. Reduce the height of the taller parapets and consider utilizing other massing elements to meet the large scale development standards such as the recess standard.
2. Redesign the roofline variations to incorporate other variations besides a change in the parapet height. Restudy the configuration and materiality of the lower parapet walls.
3. Redesign the fenestration of the rounded corners to extend to the ground floor at the southwest, northwest, and northeast corners. - PASS
4. Incorporate voids into the blank spaces on the ground floor flanking the central entrances on the north and west facades.

5. Add additional fenestration to the blank wall adjacent to the service entrance on the Goodwin Street elevation.
6. Revise the front yard setback to match the adjacent contributing buildings to the south.
7. Reduce the depth of the canopy on the Huntingdon Street elevation.
8. Restudy the benches along Drayton Street, particularly at the corner of Drayton and Huntingdon, to better provide a wall of continuity.
9. Redesign the bay spacing to meet the requirement of bays which are larger than 20 feet and less than 15 feet.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

20. [Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 16-006855-COA | 301 Tattnall Street | Demolition and New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Ward map.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Mass Model Photos.pdf](#)

Attachment: [General Development Plan.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial View.pdf](#)

Attachment: [303 Tattnall - Staff Photos.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Liberty Street Hotel-Project Narrative.pdf](#)

Attachment: [16-006855-COA Staff recommendation revised.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Public Comment\\_Rolfes.pdf](#)

**NOTE: Ms. Becky Lynch recused from participating in this petition. She is an employee of Lynch Associates Architects.**

**Mr. Andrew Lynch** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Smith** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for demolition and Part 1: Height and Mass for new construction of a hotel. The demolition plan includes one non-contributing building and a surface parking lot. The hotel's primary entrance is on Tattall Street with secondary elevations facing Liberty and Jefferson Street. The 8,527 square foot large-scale development is split between the four and five story height districts and seeks a bonus story. The proposed building steps up from the buffered area of an adjacent historic duplex and increases in height from the four-story district to the five-story district along Liberty Street.

**Ms. Smith** reported that staff recommends:

Approval for the demolition of the two-story non-contributing building at 303 Tattall Street and the surface parking lot as requested with the condition that a demolition permit not be issued until a new construction permit is issued.

Continue Part 1: Height and Mass for new construction of a hotel at 301 Tattall Street in order for the petitioner to address the following:

1. Reduce the height of the first story to reduce the overall height;
2. Provide the dimension for the proposed awnings' vertical clearance above the public right-of-way;
3. Provide dimensions for the screen wall located at the roof garden;
4. Provide dimensions for the roof's overhang;
5. Add voids to the south facing recessed wall at the primary entrance along Tattall Street;
6. Ensure that the curb cut does not exceed 20 feet in width and that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration and height;
7. Reduce the length of continuous height on the central mass along the west and east elevation;
8. Revise the bay widths to be between 15 and 20 feet to meet the standard;
9. Ensure that the parapet feature a string course and coping;
10. Ensure that the window sashes, door frames, and storefronts are inset not less than four inches;
11. Revise the following uses: laundry, delivery center, and office. Proposed uses should be active and accessible to the general public;
12. Submit the percentage of space the mezzanine will encompass.

**Ms. Smith** said the petitioner submitted some revised drawings to reflect some of the conditions that he wants to present. She stated that staff received two letters of opposition. One of the letters is attached to today's agenda and the other is being distributed to the Board as staff received this letter today.

**Ms. Deacon** asked for clarification if the mezzanine would only be located on the first floor.

**Ms. Smith** answered yes.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Lynch** thanked the staff for their review of the project. He explained that when they started this project, they were sympathetic to the neighborhood and, therefore, were concerned about the size of the project. They were cognizant about the lot coverage so they ensured that they were under the 75% requirement. Since they were going to be asking for the bonus story they wanted to be sure that they were mitigating the height as much as possible.

**Mr. Lynch** stated that first thing they did was to set the building back as far as possible from the adjacent row homes. They changed the material on the upper floor to mitigate the height. In the bonus story, they will put different materials thereby trying to mitigate the height as much as possible. The middle section of the elevation was setback on both Tattnall and Jefferson Streets. In looking at the surrounding context of the adjacent buildings, there is a one story with a mezzanine building and parking garage is large. Mr. Lynch said they took queues from the base spaces of those building and then tried to match them as much as possible.

**Mr. Lynch** said they have gone through the staff's recommendations. He said that recommendations 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, and 12 are primarily dimensional issues. They have addressed all of those issues. They do not have a curb cut. They talked about having a garbage area, but it has been eliminated. The parapet will have a string course and coping which is shown permanent in their elevation. The windows will be inset four inches and is shown on their drawings. Mr. Lynch said pertaining to the percentage of the mezzanine space, they are at 33 percent.

**Mr. Lynch** stated that he believes the biggest issues are numbers 1, 5, 7, 8 and 11. He said the staff asked them to reduce the height of the first floor, but with the mezzanine and the first floor, they are at a minimum height of 8 1/2 feet of clear space. Therefore, they cannot reduce the height any further. Mr. Lynch asked if staff and the Board would consider taking six inches from the upper floor. The model shows that the height is reduced more than 2 feet which they believe would be better if they gave a little more offset from the corner mass to the larger section. He said they can add voids to the south facing the recessed wall at the primary entrance along Tattnall Street. Mr. Lynch said regarding reducing the length of continuous height on the central mass along the west and east elevation; they believe that especially on Tattnall Street, there are offsets, plains and voids between the central mass area. The same is true for the Jefferson Street elevation. In their new proposal they added two pilasters for each one of the bracketed areas. Therefore, they believe that with the offset and roof plains this achieves the intent of trying to break this down. It is not as this is one single roofline. Also, Jefferson Street is very narrow. He said regarding revising the bay widths from 15 to 20 feet, they looked at the adjacent buildings. They tried to play more off of these opening sizes and the height of the overall bays. Mr. Lynch explained that they believe most of these bays are within 20 feet. Therefore, they believe they meet this standard already. He stated regarding revising laundry, delivery center, and office so that these proposed uses be active and accessible to the general public; their lot is narrow and they talked about doing surface entrances back in the courtyard. They discussed this with their next door neighbor, an attorney's office, who were set on them moving all of the surfaces as far north on the property as they could. Street access has to be somewhere. Therefore, they are still looking for alternatives with this issue. They can discuss options; however, they think having this location is better. It is across the street from the garage's entry. Tattnall Street is a larger right-of-way, but putting it on Jefferson will be a better use.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Susan Hargrove** said she lives around the corner from this proposed hotel. She has concerns about the many cars that will be here. Ms. Hargrove is also concerned about the height. The garage sticks out boldly. The hotel needs to 2, 3, or 4 stories.

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they agree that a demolition permit not be issued until a new construction permit is issued. Ms. Meunier said in reference to the new construction design, they believe the building is too tall. The building needs to be reduced. They agree with staff to reduce the first story. She said regarding the bay spacing, they believe that there is quite an expansive use of the glazing. They believe that the openings could be reduced. Ms. Meunier said they agree with staff regarding the laundry, delivery center, and office. These proposed uses should be active and accessible to the general public to qualify for the bonus story. They are aware that it is a challenge to make everything fit, but all street fronting facades should have that active use for the public.

**Mr. John Gennuso** resides at 327 Tattnell Street. He was surprised of the attractiveness of the building. However, he disagrees with the bonus story. The hotel has to have a laundry and a service area, but an exception cannot be made for this. Mr. Gennuso said unless the entire first floor is retail, a bonus floor should not be granted. The bonus story does not fit the context of the neighborhood. The scale of the building does not fit the neighborhood either.

**Mr. Lynch**, in response to public comments, stated that they tried to push the building height down as much as possible. They were at 20 feet originally with the first floor and they have mitigated this as much as they could. He believes that having the reduction in the upper floors by six inches will allow the building to align and give some variation. Mr. Lynch said regarding the service area, they must have access to the street for service. They have tried to minimize this as much as they possibly could. He believes they are now down to 25% of that one elevation. They have tried to do the storefront glazing and utilitarian roll up doors.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board asked the staff to restate the standard for the active uses. Ms. Smith read that the ordinance defines multiple ground floor active uses permitted in the zoning district as follows: "including, but not limited to retail office, lobby, restaurant, extend the length of the façade on all streets fronting elevations, not including lanes and maintaining individual primary exterior entrances." The Board was concerned about the height, the overall scale, uses on the ground floor, the bonus story, and the interpretation of the mezzanine. The Board discussed that there are 12 conditions associated with this petition. The Board agreed that a continuance would be appropriate. The revisions were presented today.

**Mr. Merriman** asked Mr. Lynch that after hearing the Board's discussion, if he was in favor of asking for a continuance or vote.

**Mr. Lynch** stated that he would agree to a continuance if they would be allowed to bring Part I and II together at the same time. He felt that they have addressed the height issue. He believes the bonus story is a by right issue. Mr. Lynch said he is aware that there are 12 conditions, but, he believes that some of the conditions can be consolidated. They have addressed some of the conditions and the remaining conditions are small issues.

**Mr. Merriman** informed the Board that it will require a great amount of time for the Board to review Part I and Part II together because of the many conditions associated with Part I. However, he entertained a motion to grant the petitioner's request or a motion to continue Part I only.

**Ms. Deacon** said the main concern appears to be about the extra story. A bonus story is not a guarantee; it is site specific. If the Board decides at the next meeting that this project does not need a bonus story, then they will not be able to approve anything beyond that point because the building would be changed. Therefore, the height has to be reconciled.

**Mr. Merriman** stated that the petitioner requested that he be allowed to bring Parts I and II together. But, what he hears is that the Board does not agree with this. He asked the petitioner what is his choice.

**Mr. Lynch** asked for a continuance.

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

Continue the petition for Part 1: Height and Mass for new construction of a hotel at 301 Tattnall Street in order for the petitioner to address the following:

1. Reduce the height of the first story to reduce the overall height;
2. Provide the dimension for the proposed awnings' vertical clearance above the public right-of-way;
3. Provide dimensions for the screen wall located at the roof garden;
4. Provide dimensions for the roof's overhang;
5. Add voids to the south facing recessed wall at the primary entrance along Tattnall Street;
6. Ensure that the curb cut does not exceed 20 feet in width and that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration and height; - PASS
7. Reduce the length of continuous height on the central mass along the west and east elevation;
8. Revise the bay widths to be between 15 and 20 feet to meet the standard;
9. Ensure that the parapet feature a string course and coping;
10. Ensure that the window sashes, door frames, and storefronts are inset not less than four inches;
11. Revise the following uses: laundry,

- delivery center, and office. Proposed uses should be active and accessible to the general public;
12. Submit the percentage of space the mezzanine will encompass.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

**Board Action:**

Approve demolition as recommended. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

21. [Petition of Ryan Claus | 16-006856-COA | 128 Habersham Street | Rehabilitation and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Ward Map.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [128 Habersham Street - Sanborn Map.pdf](#)

Attachment: [128 Habersham 08\\_1966 MPC Photo.pdf](#)

**Ryan Claus** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Alyson Smith** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for rehabilitation and alterations at 128 Habersham Street. The following work is proposed:

1. Brick repair and replacement of cracked brick as necessary;
2. Color change;
3. Repair, reglaze, seal and paint all existing windows;
4. Replace existing shutters with raised-panel wooden shutters;
5. Replace non-historic siding at the rear of the building with cedar shiplap siding;
6. Construct a new covered portico over the existing front steps;
7. Rebuild the existing rear wood stair in-kind;
8. Construct a new covered porch over the existing rear roof deck;
9. Repair and replace downspouts as necessary;
10. Replace the security panels at the garden level of the north elevation with new panels to match the design of the existing panels on the west elevation; replace the existing rear awning.

**Ms. Smith** reported that staff recommends denial of the proposed portico, because the portico alters the historic character of the building, creates a false sense of historical development, and has not been substantiated by historic documentation.

**Ms. Smith** additionally reported that staff recommends approval of the rehabilitation and alterations as proposed at 128 Habersham Street with the following condition:

1. Provide a color sample of the replacement awning to staff for review prior to installation;

Because otherwise the work meets the design standards and is visually compatible.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Claus** said they agree with staff about everything they reported about the rehabilitation and alterations. They will provide the color sample of the replacement awning to staff for review for prior to installation.

**Mr. Claus** stated that they could not find any evidence of the portico being on the stoop. There is a lot of damage caused by the leaking. They found a reasonable amount of evidence of something being over the stoop at least above the door. They found two bolts. They are not sure what was here.

**Mr. Claus** said they are asking to continue the study to see if there is something that could be appropriate to be added to the stoop. He said they have done multiple reiterations. They looked at some contemporary ideas, canopy ideas, etc. They are pulling from other ideas around the city. He asked to hear the Board's idea of whether they believe it is a possibility for them to explore their options. He asked the Board if they may explore a temporary



option.

**Mr. Claus** stated that if their request is denied, the owner will not be able to put anything over the stoop. He was hopeful that they would be able to find a solution for the owner.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** stated that they were contacted by the petitioner to try to help him in their research efforts to possibly identify some photographs or proof of evidence regarding the portico. However, they could not find anything. Mr. Carey said while they recognize that the two bolts are here, this could have been anything. It might have been an awning. They understand the dilemma and are sympathetic, but they are not comfortable with speculating about what was here. There is no hard absolute evidence that something was here prior. Consequently, this is the difficulty that they are facing.

**Mr. Carey** said there is some value in continuing to probe into this, but there is the risk of damaging historic material. Therefore, they would rather leave the stoop as is. They are aware that there are problems with the elements as he as talked with the tenants about it. But, maybe some of the other treatments and repairs might help this situation.

**Mr. Claus**, in response to the public comments, stressed that it might seem pointless to further study this, but the owners want to put the time and study into this exploration. Therefore, they should be allowed to do so.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board was concerned about the portico. There is insufficient evidence to substantiate that a portico was here. They discussed and approved the rehabilitation and alterations as recommended by the staff.

#### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the proposed portico, because the portico alters the historic character of the building, creates a false sense of historical development, and has not been substantiated by historic documentation.

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the rehabilitation and alterations as proposed at 128 Habersham Street - PASS with the following condition:

1. Provide a color sample of the replacement awning to staff for review prior to installation;

Because otherwise the work meets the design standards and is visually compatible.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Andy McGarrity

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

**IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION**

**X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS**

22. [Petition of Helen Morgan for SCAD | 16-006569-COA | 229 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard | Staff Approved - Windows](#)

Attachment: [doc00652720161205162503.pdf](#)

Attachment: [COA - 229 MLK Jr. Boulevard 16-006569-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Amad Pendergrass | 16-006576-COA | 220 West Lower Factors Walk | Staff Approved - Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 220 West Lower Factors Walk 16-006576-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 220 West Lower Factors Walk 16-006576-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Alessandro Vitello | 16-006580-COA | 618 Drayton Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 618 Drayton Street 16-006580-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 618 Drayton Street 16-006580-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of Weimar Construction Company, LLC | 16-006631-COA | 123 East Charlton Street | Staff Approved - Roof](#)

Attachment: [COA - 123 East Charlton Street 16-006631-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 123 East Charlton Street 16-006631-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Daniel Carey for Historic Savannah Foundation | 16-006632-COA | 321 East York Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 321 East York Street 16-006632-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 321 East York Street 16-006632-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Chris Vickery | 16-006637-COA | 245 Lincoln Street | Staff Approved - Tankless Water Heater](#)

Attachment: [COA - 245 Lincoln Street 16-006637-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 245 Lincoln Street 16-006637-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Peter Sparagna | 16-006640-COA | 420 East Gordon Street | Staff Approved - Fence, Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 420 East Gordon Street 16-006640-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 420 East Gordon Street 16-006640-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Stewart Dohrman | 16-006645-COA | 222 East Gordon Street | Staff Approved - Repointing](#)

Attachment: [COA - 222 East Gordon Street 16-006645-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 222 East Gordon Street 16-006645-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Joseph LaMagna | 16-006678-COA | 101 West Oglethorpe Avenue, Unit 301 | Staff Approved - Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 101 West Oglethorpe Avenue, Unit 301 16-006678-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 101 West Oglethorpe Avenue 16-006678-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Eric Sean Kennedy | 16-006732-COA | 611 West Jones Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 611 West Jones Street 16-006732-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [COA - 611 West Jones Street 16-006732-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Richard "Lawson" Stewart for Sealtight of South Carolina, LLC | 16-006810-COA | 700 Drayton Street | Staff Approved - Brick Repointing](#)

Attachment: [COA - 700 Drayton Street 16-006810-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 700 Drayton Street 16-006810-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Kevin Hobgood for Hobgood Construction Group, LLC | 16-006843-COA | 218 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Color Changes and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 218 West Broughton Street 16-006843-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 218 West Broughton Street 16-006843-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Tim and Lynda Mellin | 16-006846-COA | 307 East Gordon Street | Staff Approved - Replace Front Stairs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 307 East Gordon Street 16-006846-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 307 East Gordon Street 16-006846-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Doug Patten for City of Savannah | 16-006859-COA | 115 East River Street | Staff Approved - Repair Wall](#)

Attachment: [COA - 115 East River Street 16-006859-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Preservation Brief 2\\_ Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 115 East River Street 16-006859-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Brian Felder for Felder & Associates | 16-006879-COA | 218 West State Street | Staff Approved - Concrete Ramp](#)

Attachment: [Application and Submittal Packet - 218 West State Street 16-006879-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [COA - 218 West State Street 16-006879-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Margaret Mary Russell for Savannah Area Chamber of Commerce | 16-006884-COA | 105-107 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Awnings](#)

Attachment: [COA - 105-107 East Bay Street 16-006884-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 105-07 East Bay Street 16-006884-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Paul Hoover | 16-006951-COA | 406 East McDonough Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 406 E. McDonough Street 16-006951-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Picture.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of Susie Bell for Dohrman Construction | 16-007005-COA | 20 West Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 20 West Taylor Street 16-007005-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 20 West Taylor Street 16-007005-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Petition of John Clegg for Barnard Architects | 16-007052-COA | 460 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard | Staff Approved - Mechanical Equipment](#)

Attachment: [COA - 460 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard 16-007052-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 460 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard 16-007052-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

## **XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

41. [Report on Work Performed Without a Certificate of Appropriateness](#)

Mr. Merriman stated that staff has provided the Board the report on the work performed without a COA.

## **XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF**

## **XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

### **Notices**

42. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, January 12, 2017 at 3:30 p.m. in the Meyer Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

43. [Special Called Meeting - Wednesday, January 18, 2017 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

Attachment: [January 18, 2017 Tentative Agenda.pdf](#)

**Mr. Merriman** reminded the Board about the Special Called Meeting scheduled

for Wednesday, January 18, 2017.

44. [Next Regular Meeting - Wednesday, February 8, 2017 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

#### **XIV. OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **XV. ADJOURNMENT**

45. [Adjournment](#)

**Ms. Harris** informed the Board that Leah Michalak had a baby boy on January 1, 2017. They both are doing well. Leah will return to work in a couple of months

The Board congratulated Leah and her husband, Seth, on the birth of their son.

\*\*\*

There being no further business to come before the Review Board, Mr. Merriman adjourned the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen Harris, Director  
Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem