



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
November 12, 2009 - 2:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

NOVEMBER 12, 2009, HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Dr. Malik Watkins, Chairman
Reed Engle
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Gene Hutchinson
Richard Law, Sr.
James Overton
Linda Ramsay
Joe Steffen

HDRB Members Not Present: Ned Gay
Sidney J. Johnson
Brian Judson

MPC Staff Present: Thomas L. Thomson, P.E., AICP, Executive Director
Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director, AICP
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner, LEED AP
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

City of Savannah Staff Present: Mike Rose, City Building Inspector
Randolph Scott, City Zoning Administrator

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. Dr. Watkins called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

Dr. Watkins welcomed Mary E. Mitchell, new board assistant.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting - October 14, 2009

Attachment: Minutes 10-14-09.pdf

Board Action:

Approve October 14, 2009 meeting minutes - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: W James Overton

Second: Gene Hutchinson

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Joe Steffen - Aye

Malik Watkins - Abstain

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

IV. SIGN POSTING

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

3. Continued Petition of BWBF, Incorporated - Richard Guerard - H-09-4118-2 u - 342 Drayton Street - New Construction Part II - Design Details - Continue to December 9, 2009, at the request of the petitioner.

4. Continued Petition of Thomas Sign & Awning - Dominic Nelson - H-09-4168-2 - 111 West Congress Street - Sign - Continue to December 9, 2009, at the request of the petitioner.

Board Action:

Continue to December 9, 2009 - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Joe Steffen	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Abstain

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

5. Amended Petition of Cummings, Inc. - Laura Scott-Adkins - H-09-4131-2- PIN 2-0016 -36-015 - 533 West Oglethorpe Ave (148 & 150 Montgomery Street)Supplemental Identification Sign.

Attachment: Recommendation November 12, 2009.pdf
Attachment: Submittal Package.pdf

Board Action:

Approval to add a supplemental identification sign and directional sign next to the Montgomery Street auto entrance. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Joe Steffen	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Abstain

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

6. Petition of Phillip R. McCorkle - H-09-4179-2 - PIN 2-0031 -15-007 - 319 Tattnell Street - New Construction Part I - Height and Mass

Attachment: Submittal Package 1.pdf

Present for the petition was Mr. Tom Olson (architect) and Mr. Mat MCoy (McCorkle and Johnson).

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

Mr. Engle asked if the cornice on this historic building is the same as the present drawings. He wanted to know if the cornice on the new building would match the existing cornice. If so, then it is not drawn correctly. This is only height and mass and will be

considered when they come back with details, but he believed this should be looked at before it comes back.

Mr. McCoy said they will be happy to look at this.

Ms. Ramsay wanted to know where the condensing units would be located.

Mr. Olson stated that he believed they will be located behind the fenced area.

Ms. Ramsay stated that her concern is that the building looks a lot like the building that is across from the police station where the tall parapet was built because the HVAC unit had to be located behind the parapet on top of the building.

Mr. McCoy said he could not answer specifically Ms. Ramsay's concern because they have not finalized all of the mechanical designs. However, he believed they were looking at locating them on the ground.

Ms. Ramsay said the Historic Review Board does not address code issues, but there are code issues that need to be addressed on the building and the layout of it.

Mr. McCoy said there will be some issues of walls in proximity to other walls and ratings of these walls.

Mr. Engle stated that the issues raised by Ms. Ramsay are very serious because if they end up having to raise the parapet by three (3) feet to conceal the air conditioning unit, they will end up with the same kinds of things they found on other units. Therefore, he believes this is a critical issue that should be addressed. He did not understand how they could approve the height and mass and then the next time the petitioner comes back, they will want to raise the parapet four (4) feet because they cannot put the HVAC on the ground.

Ms. Ramsay stated that there is no cover over the entry. Therefore, if someone was trying to get into this building during pouring rain, they would be stuck in the rain trying to get to their keys.

Mr. McCoy said Mr. McCorkle could not be present today. He will discuss the issue with him. They have been working closely on what is desired for the building function. He believed the door is a secondary entrance for the facility. A covering might be appropriate, but he has not discussed this with Mr. McCorkle. If Mr. McCorkle wants to add this, then they will come back with the details.

Mr. Olson stated that he did not believe it was necessarily appropriate to mimic the cornice that is here, but they will try to look at some of the details involved and be somewhat compatible. The depth may not be the same, but they will look at it and deal with it in detail.

Mr. Engle said he was not asking that it mimicked, but he was questioning that if the cornice is not drawn correctly what is the correct elevation. If the building is shown 8 or 10 inches shorter than it is, then the mass of the building to the new addition will not be the

same.

Mr. Olson said they could verify the depth of it. It looks like there might be a foot or more of fascia on the roof edge, but their drawing elevation could be drawn a little less. The intention of the drawing was to try to get them as close to the existing as possible.

Randolph Scott, City Zoning Administrator, stated he communicated with Mr. McCorkle about the parking and they will have remote parking which is allowed and the lease agreement will be checked every year. This will be obtained for the garage on Liberty Street.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation stated he had a few comments which are intended in a positive spirit. The proposed addition to 319 Tattnell Street may be acceptable in terms of height according to what is allowed by the height map, but after review by their architectural review committee, they wanted to express some of their concerns with respect to mass. The addition is nearly equal in size to the original historic building. The proposal in their opinion overwhelms the existing southern exposure to the building. This changes the balance of the block by weighing down the southern tip of the lot. They believe that the heavy massing dominates the streetscape and will block the view of the southern facade of the original building. On Tattnell Street side, they suggest that the petitioner consider recessing the addition even further off of Tattnell Street roughly to the existing downspout. They recognize that building to the lot lines is encouraged, but given the odd shape of the lot and the size of the addition, they believe this will shrink the building and make it work better on the site. Likewise, recessing the addition to the rear, to the west along Jefferson Street, so that it is more in line with the existing building rather than building to the lot line and perpetuating the step pattern of adding to this building. They believe that this will also help reduce the mass. The proposed Tattnell facade is a little troubling in that it mimics the existing building to the north, yet claims to be a different stand-alone structure by virtue of the hyphen. To achieve the goal of the stand-alone, they believe it should have a more formal and proper entrance door with a transom and sidelights. The corner store entry on Jefferson Street is peculiar because this is not a corner store and the opening appears that it was just put there without adequate framing. This results in the upper portion of the porch not having any apparent support as it is built over the lower level entrance. The diagonal, in their opinion, should be eliminated and the entrance door placed under an upper window or an arch of support should be constructed to at least appear to support the upper levels. In their opinion this could be resolved with a setback. This would allow for a more proper stoop for the entrance.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Carey what were his thoughts on the cornices.

Mr. Carey responded that he believed the perfect analogy had already been discussed which is the condos by the police barracks. The comments from Mr. Engle and Ms. Ramsay regarding the cornice being a part of the shrink wrap portion of the building needs to be considered before they go too far. If the hyphen is 4 feet wide and they don't know where the HVAC will be located, this needs to be addressed.

Mr. Engle said there is no question about it, this building will become the

primary elevation on this corner. What is bothersome for him is that the building tries to appear to be paired with the original building. This building does not cut off at the vertical face, it looks modern and this is a part of the problem with a lot of the new townhouse construction. There is no overhang at the cornice. This does not need to mock or mimic the the historical cornices, but it should be of the same mass and scale if the pretense is going to be it's an old building. Therefore, he is troubled by the mimicing of the historical architectural without going into the details that make it appear real. He believed that the Review Board needs to ask the petitioner to go back and restudy this further because with the present situation he cannot vote favorably for it .

Dr. Henry was in agreement with Mr. Carey's concerns and also as pointed out by Mr. Engle in terms of mass, he, too, did not see how the Review Board could vote favorably for this today.

Mr. McCoy said the front entrance as shown will be the front entrance to the building. They did discuss the possibility of doing sidelights to differentiate and make it clear to the public that when they approach the building that it is the primary entrance. He believed that sidelights could accomplish this. As far as the HVAC, his understanding in discussing this with Mr. McCorkle and others involved in the project, is that the HVAC unit will be in the pass-through area. He believes that the Board of Review is suggesting that there is not enough ventilation here to allow for the units. However, they were discussing smaller units and he does not know what the requirements are. Mr. McCoy understood that the Review Board concerns are: 1) air conditioning units; 2) differentiating the front door; and 3) the cornices. He asked about the issue with the back entrance.

Ms. Ramsay explained that Mr. Carey stated that with the diagonal recess, it looks like the two stories are unsupported at the corner.

Mr. Engle suggested that the petitioner get with the staff and Mr. Carey and talk about the issues.

Mr. McCoy said that Mr. McCorkle has worked closely with the staff and talked about this matter with them. Mr. McCorkle is very concerned about doing this appropriately. He was sure that Mr. McCorkle would want to talk with the staff about setting the east and west elevations further back. There are some things that Mr. McCorkle would not want to concede because he is trying to expand their building to be consistent with their growth. The lost square footage is critical. However, they will take a look at the issues of the doors, the detailed cornices and rear entrance. There are a lot of entrances that have a second and third floor cantilevered. It is not unusual to see porches supported by columns.

Mr. Randolph Scott said with regard to the air conditioning unit, they will enforce the noise ordinance. He was not talking about whether there is enough ventilation, but was strictly talking about the sound. If complaints come forth, the petitioner will have to address the noise if it is above the level or remove the air conditining unit.

Chairman Watkins told Mr. McCoy that a request for a continuance would need to come from him.

Mr. McCoy stated that he wished Mr. McCorkle was present so he could provide the answers. However, based on the questions that have been raised, a continuance makes sense. They would rather come back with something that could be approved. As he has stated Mr. McCorkle is trying to come up with something that works for him, while also works for the Review Board.

Board Action:

Continue to the meeting of December 9, 2009 per petitioner. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Joe Steffen

Second: W James Overton

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Joe Steffen	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Abstain

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

7. Petition of Patrick Phelps -H-08-4013-2 - PIN 2-0003 -08-001 - 412 Williamson Street - One Year Extension of Approval for Demolition of Existing Building and Part I Height and Mass for New Construction

Attachment: One Year extension November 12, 2009 1.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Pkg.pdf

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Phelps, Architect, for Hansen Architects, P.C.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

Mr. Engle asked that if this extension was not granted and the applicant brought it back under the new ordinance, what would change?

Ms. Ward answered that this is in the Factors Walk character area; therefore, there are different rules that already apply to this area as opposed to the rest of the Historic District. Also, this area is not subject to the new large scale development standards that are in the revised ordinance. Factors Walk is different and they don't want a lot of recesses, step-down and set-backs. They actually want the buildings to be built to the lot line and height. She explained that the applicant is requesting to go two stories above the height map and our proposed ordinance has a provision to go only one-story above the height

map. Therefore, they will need to do the process that they are doing today and seek a variance from ZBA for that standard. They would still need to make a finding fact that those two stories would be visual compatible.

Mr. Engle wanted to know what is on the site now.

Ms. Ward stated that it is a one-story extension of the Promenade. It is a hotel that faces Bay Street.

Mr. Engle asked if it would be to the City's benefit from a historical perspective for the building to be removed.

Ms. Ward stated that staff does not have any objections to the building being demolished. It is not historic.

Mr. Engle wanted to know what would be in this building's place during the one year extension of the application.

Ms. Ward believed that this is a question for the applicant. She surmised, however, that the applicant would keep the existing building in place until they seek a permit to construct the new building on site.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Ward if the applicant was amiable to all the suggestions she enumerated.

Ms. Ward said they could ask the applicant, but these were the conditions that the Review Board put on the original approval that was granted in 2008. The applicant is definitely aware of these conditions and has been for more than a year.

Mr. Engle wanted to know what is the benefit to the City to allow the time extension to occur.

Ms. Ward explained that the Historic District ordinance has a provision that we are allowed to grant a 12 month extension of a project as long as they get it in before the original approval expires which is today and as long as there are no changes to the conditions on the site and no changes to the ordinance have gone into effect.

Mr. Engle wanted to know what would be the repercussion if the Review Board voted not to extent the application.

Ms. Ward stated that a reason for the denial would need to be stated and then the applicant would need to reapply and submit a new application.

Mr. Steffen stated that Ms. Ward was right. If they are going to deny an extension there needs to be some reason; something has fundamentally changed either in the area or in the project to make it no longer historically compatible. Therefore, as long as a petitioner is willing to abide by the same standards that they were before, he believed that it is certainly in the best interest to the community that the Review Board continue these requests. Frankly, if anybody gets something built as things are now, they have access to banks that

he has not heard of. Presently, money is not being loaned for these projects.

Mr. Engle said that he agreed with Mr. Steffen, but his concern is about the two additional stories and that and the new ordinance would not allow it. He wanted to know if the mass and height that have been approved allow two-stories additionally.

Ms. Ward explained that the previous approval recommended approval of the two additional stories and the Board made a finding of fact that it was visually compatible provided that they worked with the City on the Montgomery ramping project and that they provide retail and multi-ground floor uses along the street fronting facade. Neither ordinance allows the two additional stories; the applicant would have to seek a variance under either ordinance.

Mr. Engle said there are a lot of comments that have been addressed by returning back to the staff. Will the applicant do all the things that the staff has requested?

Ms. Ward stated that applicant is going to do all these things in Part II. They have not come back for Part II and she did not know if this was due to the economy. However, this could be a question for the applicant.

Mr. Engle asked if the applicant could come back and request an extension for another year.

Ms. Ward said this would be the final extension on Part I. They are only allowed a one-time extension.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS

Mr. Phelps stated that the project is being continued on economic hardship. There are still efforts by the owner to develop the project fully. The hotel that is presently on the site will remain in operation and intact until the project is ready to go. Some of the comments made by the staff came out prior to their meeting. He believed that they addressed some of the comments such as with the architectural, the relocation of some of the retail, reconfiguring the lobby, bringing it to the corner of MLK and Williamson and also the partitions. Regarding the condition of working with the City on the MLK improvements and the extension of Williamson Street, they are continuing to talk with the City as far as implementing these activities when the project is ready for start-up. Originally, the MLK improvement area stopped at Williamson Street, but they have agreed to and will pick up the improvements down to River Street on the cost to the developer as well as the improvements to Montgomery Street. He stated that there is a loose agreement that the design will be provided by the developer and that the City will implement the changes as they improve this corridor.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the developer is amiable to the additional height on the River Street elevation.

Mr. Phelps said they could continue to work with staff to see how this could be configured. Currently, as the rooms are laid out, they are in the core that is closer to Williamson Street. Also, there is the open patio with retail that faces River Street.

Therefore, they could possibly put up a taller screen wall that encloses the open patio area. However, he believed that they want to be kind of sensitive with this. Mr. Phelps said as River Street turns, the perception of buildings, although they follow the street, they do follow the plain of the facade that steps back. But, they can continue to work with staff on this.

Ms. Reiter clarified that if this extension of Part I is granted and the applicant comes back and gets approval of Part II, then after that approval year ends, they could get an additional extension on the final Part II.

Mr. Thomson said he felt uncomfortable with what he heard about not extending the approval on the hope that the new ordinance would apply and change the approval. He cannot technically and correctly tell the Review Board what is the correct answer, but he could sense a lawsuit looming or they would be required to apply the same current ordinance anyway because the application was submitted prior to the adoption of the new ordinance.

Board Action:

Approval of one-year extension of approval to demolish and new construction with conditions as previously approved - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Joe Steffen

Second: Gene Hutchinson

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Joe Steffen - Aye

Malik Watkins - Abstain

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

8. Petition of Stella S. Moore - H-09-4177(S)-2 - 310 East Jones Street - Hardie Plank Siding on Addition.

Attachment: Submittal Package.pdf

9. Petition of Carrie McGranahan - H-09-4178(S)-2 - 504 East St. Julian Street - Color Change

Attachment: Submittal Package.pdf

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

10. Worked performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness

XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

New Business

11. Historic District Ordinance Revisions Update - Sarah Ward

Attachment: Mayor and Aldermen Report 102009.pdf

Ms. Ward gave an updated report. The Historic Ordinance Ordinance Revisions were approved by the Metropolitan Planning Commission on October 20, 2009. Staff made a presentation on the ordinance at the City Council workshop last week. The ordinance information is running on Channel 8, the Government Channel. This item will be on Council's November 19, 2009 meeting agenda for a public hearing and the 1st reading. If everything goes well, the second reading will be on December 3, 2009.

Ms. Ward stated that once the ordinance is adopted, staff will provide the Historic District Board of Review with an indepth workshop.

Dr. Henry commended staff for their work on the ordinance. **Dr. Watkins** concurred and stated that the staff has done a phenomenal job. **Dr. Henry** made a motion that some kind of commendation be given to the staff for their fine of writing, processing and managing the work of this ordinance. The motion was seconded by **Mr. Steffen** and carried unanimously.

Mr. Thomson stated that it would be important if several or all of the Board members could be present at City Council meeting on November 19, 2009.

12. Information item: Forsyth Park Cafe Sign

Attachment: Forsyth Cafe Sign.pdf

The sign was presented to Board for information purposes only.

13. Nominating Committee

Ms. Reiter stated that the Review Board needed to form a nominating committee for the officers of chairman and vice-chairman. A report needs to be given to the staff so it could be included in the December meeting packets. The voting for these officers will be held in December. The officers serve two years and then come off for one year. The following members volunteered to serve on the nominating committee: **Mr. Engle, Dr. Henry and Ms. Ramsay.**

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

14. Adjournment

There being no further bussiness to come before the Historic District Board of Review,
Dr. Watkins adjourned the November 12, 2009 meeting at approximately 3:46 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Reiter
Preservation Officer

BR:mem

NOTE: Minutes not official until signed.