



## Historic Preservation Commission

---

Virtual Meeting  
June 30, 2020 10:00 A.M.  
Meeting Minutes

### JUNE 30, 2020 HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Members Present: Karen Jarrett, Interim Chair  
Travis Coles  
Dwayne Stephens

Staff Present: Melanie Wilson, MPC Executive Director  
Leah G. Michalak, Director of Historic Preservation  
Ryan Jarles, Cultural Resources Planner  
Alyson Smith, Historic Preservation Planner  
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant  
Sally Helm, Administrative Assistant  
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst

#### I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

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

**Ms. Jarrett** called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. She outlined the role of the Historic Preservation Commission 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, 10 minutes, to comment. The petitioner will be given the opportunity to respond to the public comments.

#### II. SIGN POSTING

#### III. CONSENT AGENDA

#### IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

##### [2. Approve the June 30, 2020 Agenda](#)

###### **Motion**

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve June 30, 2020 Agenda.

###### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Travis Coles

- Aye

Karen Jarrett	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye

## V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

### 3. Approve June 9, 2020 Meeting Minutes

[📎 06-09-2020 Minutes.pdf](#)

#### **Motion**

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve June 9, 2020 Meeting Minutes.

#### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Travis Coles

Travis Coles - Aye

Karen Jarrett - Abstain

Dwayne Stephens - Aye

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

## VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

## VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

## IX. REGULAR AGENDA

### **VICTORIAN DISTRICT**

#### 4. Petition of Greenline Architecture | 20-002261-COA | 906 Drayton Street | Alterations and Additions (with Variance Recommendation and Special Exception Request)

[📎 Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[📎 Previous Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[📎 Staff Images.pdf](#)

[📎 Victorian Staff Recommendation 20-002261-COA.pdf](#)

**Mr. Keith Howington of Greenline Architecture** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Michalak** gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for rehabilitation, alterations, and additions for the property located at 906 Drayton Street. The scope of work consists of the following:

- Covered drop-off entrance canopy addition;
- Elevator addition;
- Two stair tower additions;
- Rooftop terrace addition;
- Modifications to existing openings;
- Replace all windows and doors;
- New awnings;
- New paint and finishes.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that the applicant is also requesting a variance from the Base Zoning District standard

that states: Nonresidential building footprint (max sq. ft.): 2,500 To allow additions to the existing nonresidential building for a total footprint of 7,408 square feet. The existing building footprint exceeds the standard at 5,850 square feet. The petitioner is also requesting that a Special Exception be granted from the Design Standard that states:

*There shall be a primary entrance along the primary street at intervals no greater than 60 feet.*  
To allow one primary entrance along Drayton Street which is 71 feet wide.

**Ms. Michalak** said this project was first heard by the HPC at the June 9, 2020 Meeting. The Commission voted to continue the project in order for the petitioner to address missing information, visual compatibility, and design standards as follows:

1. Provide the building coverage percentage;
2. Building footprint exceeds maximum permitted in the district (request a variance);
3. Provide setbacks for the additions;
4. Provide the height of the existing building and the height of the contributing building to the south on the same block face;
5. Remove the covered drop-off canopy addition;
6. Reduce the height of the trellis and set it back further from the street facing facades;
7. Revise/redesign the trellis translucent panels and the wire mesh railings;
8. Provide specifications for the new/replacement doors;
9. Include a second primary entrance on the front façade to meet the standard;
10. Provide details for the parking lot fence;
11. Provide lighting specifications.

The building was constructed in 1959 for the Independent Life Insurance Company and is not a contributing resource within the National Register Victorian Historic District or the local Victorian Historic District.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for rehabilitation, alterations, and additions for the property located at 906 Drayton Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Either remove the covered drop-off canopy addition in its entirety or reduce it (in size/footprint) to the minimum size necessary and screen it with an 8 foot wall along Drayton and a portion of the lane as to be minimally visible from the Drayton Street.
2. Ensure that the required shrubs are planted between the parking lot fence and sidewalk.

**Ms. Michalak** reported also that staff recommends approval of the Special Exception from the standard that states: *"There shall be a primary entrance along the primary street at intervals no greater than 60 feet."* To allow one primary entrance along Drayton Street which is 71 feet wide because the Special Exception criteria are met; and staff additionally recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals from the Base Zoning District standard that states: *"Nonresidential building footprint (max sq. ft.): 2,500"* To allow additions to the existing nonresidential building for a total footprint of 7,408 square feet (the existing building footprint exceeds the standard at 5,850 square feet) because the variance criteria are met.

**Ms. Michalak** entertained questions from the Commission.

**Ms. Jarrett** knew that access is in the front of the building, but she wanted to know if there is adequate access through the other portions of the building for people to get out of the building in case of an emergency.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that the petitioner would be able to better address Ms. Jarrett's question, but some of the additions here are required for egress from the building. She pointed to an area and explained that the petitioner has added an area here which is along Drayton Street.

## **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Howington** thanked the Commission for hearing their petition today and he thanked the Commission for hearing the petition last month. The Commission's comments were very helpful in getting them to where they are now. Mr. Howington thanked the staff for a thorough review.

**Mr. Howington** stated that as they can see, they had approximately 18 conditions from last month's petition. Today, the conditions have been reduced significantly to basically two conditions. He explained that upon looking at the ordinance, they actually increased the front of the building. They were at less than

the 77 required amount for the coverage that the ordinance requests. Therefore, they increased the lot coverage by adding the sidewalk on the Drayton Street side and the signage was a part of that coverage for drop-off. Mr. Howington said they did this for two reasons, which was to increase the footage on Drayton Street to help fill in the gap between the two buildings which is the intent of the ordinance; and also to increase the pedestrian activity along Drayton Street. He explained that there is not just one entrance, but the sidewalk is here that goes back to the secondary entrance on the south side. Consequently, they believe they met the intent of the ordinance by doing this.

**Mr. Howington** said upon looking at the patterns along Forsyth Park [he included these examples in his comment page], this is not uncommon around Forsyth Park -- random patterns with drop-offs. For example, the Mansion Hotel on the northeast corner of Forsyth Park, the next building on western side of Forsyth Park, and actually there is a porte cochere on the side of the building. As he has said, this is not an uncommon pattern around Forsyth Park.

**Mr. Howington** said he wanted to remind everyone that what is currently here is a parking lot that can accommodate ten to twelve cars. But, what they have done is eliminated the parking spaces and have proposed a thin minimum canopy for service drop-off. Therefore, very seldom would you see cars in the lane. Now, the cars will only be seen as they drop-off packages and/or guests to the building. Their client has many out of town guests and they want to provide a covered drop-off area for the guests. Mr. Howington stated that the staff has recommended an eight foot wall to help screen this, but they have some serious concerns about the eight foot wall, not only visibility, but they feel that they have met the intent of the ordinance by increasing the footage along Drayton Street. He explained also that an eight foot fence along the sidewalk is a security issue for people coming in, going out, and walking down the sidewalk. Someone could hid behind the wall and attack someone.

**Mr. Howington** said he wanted everyone to keep in mind that this is a non-contributing building. The Victorian Map was updated two years ago, this building was more than 50 years old at that time. Therefore, it was not classified contributing when it could have been. Other developers have wanted to demolish this building; they wanted maximize lot coverage and height, but this present owner does not want to do this. This building makes a great example of the International Style, mid-century building. A building that is listed as non-contributing should be able to evolve and have new life. They have maintained this Drayton Street facade as a pure concept of what was here originally. Therefore, he believes what they are asking for meets the intent of the ordinance and the patterns around Forsyth Park. Mr. Howington entertained questions from the Commission.

**Mr. Coles** said in accordance with the pictures that the petitioner provided, would it be possible to have a part wall with an iron fence with some type of shrubbery above.

**Mr. Howington** explained that they will do landscape here. But their client has concerns with the wall. However, he will talk with the client about this matter. They looked at putting a wall here, but in his opinion, the wall did not look good here. Their intent is to make this a covered entrance as minimal as it possibly can be. As they can see, it is very thin, small and curves all the way back to the middle of the drop-off on the Drayton Street side. They do not have much room from the lane. But, nevertheless, they will definitely landscape this.

**Ms. Jarrett** was curious about why the entrance could not be a little narrower. She asked if the wall could be moved back and minimize the overhang.

**Mr. Howington** answered that according to Traffic Engineering, they must have at least 20 feet for two-way traffic.

**Ms. Jarrett** explained that she was talking about pushing the roof back towards the car.

**Mr. Howington** explained that this was purposely done to increase the lot footage along Drayton Street. They purposefully put a structure and mass along the south side of Drayton Street to increase the massing to meet the minimum of the ordinance.

**Ms. Jarrett** said if she understood correctly staff wants the overhang to be minimized this with the canopy.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes staff wants them to pull off the lane, either remove it or pull it back.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that this building is not required to meet the standard that Mr. Howington is referring to as this is a pre-existing non-conforming frontage. The staff was suggesting that it

should be removed in its entirety or if it was minimized as much as possible, it would certainly put something here where you could have a covered entry and people would stay dry.

**Ms. Jarrett** said she was also wondering based on Mr. Coles' comments about the wall and landscape, what about an open wall of some sort that people could not hide behind and would give a buffer.

**Mr. Howington** explained Mr. Coles to say a low wall with a fence on top of it so that it would be visible. He said they looked at this to match a fence on the north side of the property. But, this cluttered it up and did not give them a clean aesthetic look.

**Ms. Jarrett** asked Mr. Howington if he was unwilling to work with staff on trying to get everyone the same page or does he need to go back and talk with his client to see what else he could do to come to some compromise with staff?

**Mr. Howington** answered that he has talked with his client and the porte cochere is some that he actually needs. They have clients coming in from all over the world. However, he will take this back to his client and discuss parts of the wall along Drayton Street, which they feel is not the solution, but they will consider this.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF]**, thanked Mr. Howington and his client for meeting with HSF staff and some members of the Architecture Review Committee this week. Mr. Arvay realized that they did not have to meet with them, but they appreciate them doing so, so they could discuss their concerns with them. At the end of the meeting they agreed to disagree with several of things as they are not required to address some of the things with this project.

**Mr. Arvay** said they agree with staff about the porte cochere. The functionality is essential to a building and they believe the architect and the client have tried their best to reuse the building and they are grateful. He was hopeful that there is some way that they can minimize the porte cochere so that they will have a back covered area to pull under. They are also hopeful that the petitioner will still agree to some of the vertical features on the front of the building that were not recommended by staff. But in an attempt to keep the front facade as pure as possible and return it to its original design, they are hopeful that the petitioner will consider this.

**Mr. Arvay** said he wanted to go on record thanking the petitioner for maintaining as much of the building as they can because as Mr. Howington pointed out, this building is eligible to be a contributing structure, but was not deemed so two years ago.

**Mr. Howington**, in response to public comments, thanked Mr. Arvay for his comments. As Mr. Arvay stated, they met with the HSF and Architecture Review Committee who requested a few things that the staff did not comment on. He said the porte cochere was one area. They also talked about them removing the awning and steel columns along the front of Drayton Street. Mr. Howington said he would consider this and would do if the Commission would approve their porte cochere as is. He would be happy to take these away and keep the features on this building more pure along Drayton Street if the HPC would deem this favorable. He said they also met with the Victorian Neighborhood and are waiting on a letter from them as they are in favor of the project. Mr. Howington concluded that if the Commission would approve of them getting the porte cochere based on the random pattern of similar patterns around Forsyth Park, his client would be happy to remove the added fenestration.

**Mr. Arvay** said the HSF would be happy with this.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Stephens** stated that he appreciates the petitioner's willingness to work with some of the concerns. He thanked the petitioner for addressing all of the concerns from their previous petition submission. He is on the fence about the porte cochere. He does disagree that there are quite a few examples in this area; however, he does not believe that this area needs to be riddled with this type of function. Mr. Stephens believes that a landscaping option could be a good option in the event the landscaping is maintained and offers some level of transparency so that there will not be an issue of safety concerns. As they all know, some bushes and hedges become overgrown and persons can easily hide behind them and create an unsafe condition as the petitioner presented. Mr. Stephens believes that if the petitioner is willing to address some of the concerns and do what they have basically submitted as an alternative, this could be a

compromise with may be using the landscaping as a buffer.

**Mr. Coles** was in agreement with Mr. Stephens. He also believes that taking the HSF recommendations would be a good compromise keeping the facade on the Drayton Street side true to its original design.

**Ms. Jarrett** said it appears that the porte cochere could be modified so that only one car could fit underneath. Presently, it looks like there are two car width here. The landscaping is one of the things that would be good, but they do not know what the landscaping would look like. Therefore, she has a level of uncomfortableness. There needs to be something there that could be maintained by this company. However, she believes this company could do so.

The Commission discussed screening the drop-off canopy area. The consensus of the Commission was for the petitioner to provide staff with renderings of their proposed screening of the pass-through from Drayton Street for staff's approval.

#### **Motion**

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the petition for rehabilitation, alterations, and additions for the property located at 906 Drayton Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Screen the covered drop-off canopy addition from view of Drayton Street.
2. Ensure that the required shrubs are planted between the parking lot fence and sidewalk.

Approval of the Special Exception from the standard that states: "There shall be a primary entrance along the primary street at intervals no greater than 60 feet." To allow one primary entrance along Drayton Street which is 71 feet wide because the Special Exception criteria are met.

Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals from the Base Zoning District standard that states: "Nonresidential building footprint (max sq. ft.): 2,500" To allow additions to the existing nonresidential building for a total footprint of 7,408 square feet (the existing building footprint exceeds the standard at 5,850 square feet) because the variance criteria are met.

#### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Travis Coles

Travis Coles - Aye

Karen Jarrett - Abstain

Dwayne Stephens - Aye

#### [5. Petition of Sawyer Design | 20-002613-COA | 530 East Park Avenue | New Construction \(Small\), Parts I and II \(with Special Exception Request\)](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation 20-002613-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Narrative, Photos, and Specs.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

**Mr. Jon Leonard of Sawyer Design** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that the applicant is requesting approval for New Construction: Parts I and II for a three-story

triplex to be located on the vacant parcel at 530 East Park Avenue. A two-story carriage house, with two off-street parking spaces and a dwelling unit, is proposed at the rear of the property along East Park Lane. The applicant has also requested a Special Exception from the following Design Standard: *Gable and hip roof shall be symmetrically pitched between 4:12 and 10:12* to allow for the pitch of the main front-facing gable to have a 12:12 pitch.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Parts I and II for a three-story triplex to be located on the vacant parcel at 530 East Park Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review approval because the proposed project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Reduce the ceiling height of the 2nd and 3rd floors to reduce the overall height of the building to meet the maximum height standard and to be visually compatible.
2. Provide light fixture specifications.
3. Secure a remote parking agreement for the required parking.

**Ms. Michalak** reported also that staff recommends that a Special Exception be granted from the following Design Standard that states: *Gable and hip roof shall be symmetrically pitched between 4:12 and 10:12* to allow for the pitch of the main front-facing gable to have a 12:12 pitch.

**Ms. Michalak** entertained questions from the Commission.

### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Leonard** stated that they agree with staff recommendations. They do not have any issues with the modification of the floor height as they believe that they can make the house fit in with the 11 foot floor and with the ceiling reduction on the remaining two floors. They will provide the light fixture. He said regarding the light fixture, the owner is working on getting the agreement together. Mr. Leonard entertained questions from the Commission.

**Ms. Jarrett** asked if the parking agreement would be an easement or when the property is sold, would this issue be resolved.

**Mr. Leonard** did not have an answer to Ms. Jarrett's. However, he knew that the City requires that the parking agreement takes place for approval which is the legal document that will be put in place, He needs to look at the City's paperwork.

**Ms. Michalak** said she believes the parking permit has to be renewed once a year.

**Ms. Jarrett** said, therefore, it is a possibility that after one year, the off-street parking may disappear.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that she does not know that part of the ordinance pertaining to parking.

**Ms. Wilson** said if three parking spaces are needed, the petitioner would have to take care of this with the City. If the parking spaces need to be included as a part of the recommendation, then this needs to be made a part of the recommendation for the project. However, one year does not address the issue of not having appropriate parking. This needs to be a longer term. She said the City will require that it be a longer term.

**Mr. Leonard** asked who does he get the parking information from. Is it Marcus Lotson?

**Ms. Wilson** explained that the petitioner may speak with the Parking Services Director, Shawn Brandon at the City of Savannah.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF]** said they concur with the staff recommendations. They are pleased to hear that the petitioner's architect is willing to work with staff on the height of the building as the building is dramatically too tall for this neighborhood. Mr. Arvay said they are hopeful that the reduction of the floor height on the 2nd and 3rd floors will adequately address this. The HSF's Architecture Review Committee was a little skeptical if this would truly address this issue. He believes that the roof pitch may be a concern as well.

**Mr. Leonard**, in response to the public comments, said they already have a section that was previously done that almost takes two feet out of the front elevation. They are willing to make it a 10:12 pitch versus a 12:12. Mr. Sumner explained that they will be able to reduce this to be compatible with the neighborhood.

### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

The Commission discussed the height of the building. Ms. Jarrett said it appeared that Mr. Leonard was talking about adjusting the ceiling height. She stated that instead of reducing the ceiling height of the 2nd and 3rd floors, the recommendation could be to "reduce the overall height of the building to meet the maximum height standard and to be visually compatible." They agreed with staff's recommendation #2 and #3. The Commission also was in agreement that the Special Exception be approved.

### **Motion**

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the petition for New Construction: Parts I and II for a three-story triplex to be located on the vacant parcel at 530 East Park Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review approval because the proposed project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Reduce the overall height of the building to meet the maximum height standard and to be visually compatible.
2. Provide light fixture specifications.
3. Secure a remote parking agreement for the required parking.

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission is also recommending that a Special Exception be granted from the following Design Standard that states:

Gable and hip roof shall be symmetrically pitched between 4:12 and 10:12.  
to allow for the pitch of the main front-facing gable to have a 12:12 pitch.

### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Travis Coles	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye

## **CUYLER-BROWNVILLE DISTRICT**

### [6. Petition of City of Savannah Code Compliance | 20-002642-COA | 726 West Victory Drive | Contributing Building Demolition](#)

- 📎 [Application, 726 W. Victory Dr., 20-002642-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Photos and notes from previous file, 20-002642-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [726 W Victory Drive Court Order.pdf](#)
- 📎 [726 W. Victory Dr. Building Observation Stamped and Signed.pdf](#)
- 📎 [COA 19-002821 726 W Victory Dr.pdf](#)
- 📎 [HSF Letter.pdf](#)
- 📎 [HSF Email.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Email correspondence with City of Savannah.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Cuyler-Brownville Staff Recommendation 20-002642-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [HSF - 726 W. Victory Dr., - Tax Commissioner Letter.pdf](#)
- 📎 [HSF - 726 W. Victory - MPC letter.pdf](#)

**Mr. Joshua Downs, Code Compliance Officer for the City of Savannah** was present on behalf of the petitioner.

**Mr. Ryan Jarles** gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for the demolition of a contributing building in the Cuyler-Brownsville Historic District located at 726 West Victory Drive. The City's Inspection Worksheet states that there is wall rot as well as front roof rot and collapse. The Inspector states that he recommends demolition. The building's demolition was ordered in Recorder's Court on June 2, 2014.

**Mr. Jarles** explained that the historic building was constructed in 1925 and is a contributing structure within the Cuyler-Brownsville Historic District. It is a representative example of the bungalow-form house built in the southern portion of this district and it still possesses high historic integrity even though it has experienced deferred maintenance and neglect. There has been a significant amount of demolition in this district over the recent years and very few intact examples like this building remain.

**Mr. Jarles** stated that on June 25, 2019, the MPC made the decision to continue the petition for demolition of a contributing building in the Cuyler-Brownsville Historic District located at 726 West Victory Drive [File No. 19-002821-COA]. The order for demolition made by the Recorder's Court of Chatham County was ordered in the name of the defendant and property owner Jesus Castillo (Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Savannah v. Jesus Castillo). It appeared the City of Savannah had no legal standing to apply for the demolition based on this court order because the defendant named on the legal document is the property owner Jesus Castillo who at the time was found to be deceased.

**Mr. Jarles** said that the court ordered demolition did not vest ownership of the property to the City of Savannah. The applicant (The City of Savannah) was told to go to the Recorder's Court of Chatham County to retain a new order either vesting ownership of the property to the City of Savannah or go through the process of having the property deemed as a blighted property and the authority be given to the City for its demolition. On May 14, 2020 staff was provided a document via Lester B. Johnson, III, Assistant City Attorney explaining the legal standing of the City of Savannah allowing for heirs of a deceased property owner to act as personal representatives (executors) of a property in cases of demolition.

**Mr. Jarles** stated that prior to the documentation received from Assistant City Attorney Johnson, they were answering the demolition criteria based on the fact that the property had received the court order stating that the demolition would be required to alleviate an immediate threat to public health and safety. They have received information from the Historic Savannah Foundation regarding their beginning a judiciary inquiry process with the Chatham County Tax Assessor on June 20, 2019. They received authorization on February 11, 2020 for the sale of this property which was setup for the April 12, 2020 tax sale. But due to the Covid 19, the sale was rescheduled and will be held on July 7, 2020.

**Mr. Jarles** said staff's original recommendation was for approval of the demolition due to the court order being provided. However, as stated at the bottom of the staff's recommendation, notification is shown that at the meeting, staff's recommendation could change. Mr. Jarles stated, therefore, staff is changing its recommendation, which is to continue the petition to allow for the completion of the judicial process that the Historic Savannah Foundation has begun. to the Preservation Commission Regular Meeting to allow for the building to be included in the tax sale.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Downs** commented that as Mr. Jarles reported, they came to MPC a year ago and the petition was continued for six months. The City of Savannah has been maintaining the exterior of this property for quite some time. They have filed a lien on this property for \$2,995.00. They have had to clean the property twice. This property is presently unsecured. They have had to constantly work on this property. There has been all kind of issues. A contractor was hired who had to remove human waste. Mr. Downs said he understood the desire to save this property, but he believes it is more important to remove the condition that allows someone to squat the property. The neighborhood needs to be made safer.

**Mr. Stephens** asked Mr. Downs if he said that the City has been attempting to maintain/secure this property.

**Mr. Downs** answered that the City has been maintaining the property, cutting the grass, removing trash, and debris. He explained that during his last inspection he found that the front door was kicked in and people were squatting there. He has an open case now to secure this property which will adds a bigger bill for this property. The City has been maintaining the exterior grounds and doing what they are allowed to do within the ordinance.

**Mr. Stephens** stated that he asked the question because he was aware that in this community has not

previously had this type of protection. He also hates to create a haven for the things that have been pulling this community down. Mr. Stephens thanked Mr. Downs for sharing what the City has done for this property thus far.

**Ms. Jarrett** asked Mr. Downs why the contractor has not done any work to secure the building.

**Mr. Downs** answered that the building was previously secured. However, it was recently reopened. He said all the windows and the rear doors are secured, but the front door has been kicked in since May, 2020. Squatting has always been at this property. The foundation walls have been opened and people are going in the building. They have contacted the Savannah Police Department about this.

**Ms. Jarrett** asked Mr. Downs how comfortable he is with continuing this petition for 30 days.

**Mr. Downs** stated that he read in the letter from HSF that the July 7, 2020 sale has been postpone to September. Also, it is based on if the HSF wins the bid on tax sale. He said he understands HSF's desire to acquire the property, but he sees that this is being pushed off further.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF]** thanked Officer Downs for being present. He has worked with him on other projects. The HSF shares the concerns as Mr. Downs and the City. Mr. Arvay explained that the July 7, 2020 tax sale has been rescheduled to September 8, 2020. It is still HSF's intent to purchase the property at their earliest convenience. He wanted to point out that had it not been for Covid-19, they would be addressing the housing code violations. The circumstances now are out of the HSF's control. In the meantime, they are happy to work with the City to try to implement some measures. He does not believe that it is an either or proposition. As Ryan Jarles pointed out in the beginning and as Mr. Stephens alluded to, this neighborhood has suffered a lot of loss in the last 20 years of contributing structures. The HSF does not want to see another structure demolished. They believe that with some half measures, this can be implemented. The HSF wants to help in assisting this property; but frankly it is not their property yet and, therefore, does not have this right. Mr. Arvay said that HSF's attorney spoke with Attorney Lester Johnson this morning who did express to their attorney about securing the property and may be address the issue of securing the porch. They believe that there are ways to secure this property to get them to the September date. If they win the bid, this property will become another unit of affordable housing. This what is needed in this neighborhood. He entertained questions.

**Mr. Downs**, in response to public comments, stated that every time they have to do something to this property, they have to go through the full process. He said looking at his case for securing the property is this week. The City's contractor will be assigned to secure it by the end of next week. He understands that Covid-19 pushed things off. He was okay with continuing the petition.

### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

The Commission discussed that they are not in favor of the demolition. This community is one that definitely needs attention and care. Mr. Stephens was elated to hear that HSF is trying to work with the City to own this property. He was in agreement to give this property a little more time for possible restoration. Mr. Coles, too, was in agreement of possibly saving this property. Ms. Jarrett was also in agreement to save this structure.

#### **Motion**

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the petition to demolish the building located at 726 West Victory Drive to the September 22, 2020 Historic Preservation Commission Regular Meeting to allow for the building to be included at the September 8, 2020 Tax Sale.

#### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Travis Coles

- Aye

Karen Jarrett

- Abstain

Dwayne Stephens

- Aye

## STREETCAR DISTRICT

### [7. Petition of Ethos Preservation | 20-002611-COA | 514 East 34th Street | New Construction \(Small\) Parts I and II \(with Variance Recommendation\)](#)

- ☞ [Map 514 East 34th Street.pdf](#)
- ☞ [COA Application 514 East 34th Complete Package.pdf](#)
- ☞ [20064 08 - Split - Lots 123 & 132, Barry Ward, Savannah.pdf](#)
- ☞ [20-002611-COA HPC Rec.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Exhibit 3 Historic context.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Revised drawings per staff comments.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Public Comment\\_Grieve Letter.pdf](#)

**Ms. Ellen Harris of Ethos Preservation** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Mr. Ryan Jarles** gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction Small (parts I and II) and a fence located at 514 East 34th Street. The New Construction building is to be 30'-4" in height, 19'-0" in width, 68'-0" in depth, and located on a lot that is 27'-0" in width and 100'-0" in depth. To allow for a lot area of 2,700 square feet and a lot width of 27'-0".

**Mr. Jarles** explained that the following materials are proposed for the New Construction:

1. Foundation; Cranberry Flash DTP456 Acme Brick with Savannah Ivory Mortar (porch), and Sand Finish Stucco in 9239 Cappuccino.
  2. Walls: Smooth Face Hardie Board Siding with 6" exposure.
  3. Trim: Smooth Face Hardie Board.
  4. Porch Shutters: Atlantic Shutters – Louvered Design.
  5. Columns: Painted 8" wooden square columns with cap and base (to be custom made).
  6. Porch Railings: Painted, pressure treated wood railings and balusters (to be custom made).
  7. Windows: Sierra Pacific Premium Double-hung 2/2.
  8. Doors: (front) Rogue Valley #4612 Fir Craftsman Door, (back) Rogue Valley #144 Fir.
  9. Roof: Owens Corning 30-year Estate Grey Shingles
  10. Gable Vents: 24" wooden louvers.
  11. HVAC/Trash Screening (Fence): Pressure treated painted wood (to be custom made).
- These materials are visually compatible.

**Mr. Jarles** reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction Small (parts I and II) and a fence located at 514 East 34th Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. If lighting is to be proposed revise the drawings to include said lighting and provide staff with material specifications prior to providing staff with drawings to be stamped for permitting.
2. Lower the foundation height to be compatible with the average of the adjacent contributing buildings.
3. Revise the stucco inset to be a minimum of three inches.
4. Incorporate more windows along the ground floor façade of the east and west elevations to ensure that the 30% standard is met.
5. Redesign the shutters so that the porch railing is still incorporated in order to be visually compatible

**Mr. Jarles** also reported that staff also recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals from the

Article 5 - Base Zoning Districts standards “TN-2. Lot Dimensions (min). Single-family Detached. Lot area (sq. ft.): 3,000 and Lot width (ft.): 30” to allow for a lot area of 2,700 square feet and a lot width of 27'-0” because the variance criteria are met.

**Mr. Jarles** entertained questions from the Commission.

**Ms. Jarrett** was concerned as to how the railings would be installed. Will the railings be outside of the shutters?

**Mr. Jarles** answered that it is common that when people are screening their porches with these shutters that they include the continuance of the rail throughout as if the porch was still there.

### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Harris** thanked the Commission and staff for their review of Ethos' petition. They had a number of meetings and phone calls with the staff to get their drawings finalized. She appreciates all the help that has been given to her throughout this process. They are absolutely in agreement with all of the staff's recommendations. However, she wanted to share her screen with the Commission to show them how they intend to meet all of the comments.

**Ms. Harris** said the first recommendation references lighting. They did not show lighting on the exterior, but they do intend to have some sort of light fixture. They will provide the information to staff. Staff's second comment was to lower the foundation height to be compatible with the average of the adjacent contributing buildings. She said the original proposed height was to be 3' - 2". They are proposing to lower this to three feet. She believes the comments came from the context elevation which actually showed the elevation heights of the adjacent buildings to be lower than this. Ms. Harris said this was incorrect. The foundation at 512 is three feet and the foundation at 516 is also three feet at the highest point. There is a slope in the road where it goes down. Therefore, 516 looks to be a little lower. They are proposing to match this at three feet. This context elevation is more accurate. She apologized for any confusion related to this. They will also field measure as the foundations are being laid to ensure that the height is visually compatible.

**Ms. Harris** stated that staff also recommended that the stucco inset be a minimum of three inches. This is no problem. Staff requested that more windows along the ground floor façade of the east and west elevations to ensure that the 30% standard is met. They fully intend to do this and will submit this to staff for review and approval to ensure that this standard is complied with. She pointed out also that staff recommends that the shutters be redesigned so that the porch railing is still incorporated in order to be visually compatible. Ms. Harris said that when they did research on what other historic porches have done when incorporating railings, they saw that the shutters often go down to the porch floor. She showed the Commission an image that shows how the railing is reading through in a much pronounced format. They shared with staff and staff felt that this would be an acceptable solution to show a pronounced horizontal railing showing through. This is how they propose to address this particular standard. If the Commission feels that the ballaster should show through, they can also incorporate this on the inside of the shutters. Ms. Harris explained that the reason the shutters are here is because the wall is required to be fireproof. Therefore, this is a fireproof measure that they feel is visually compatible and is a creative solution to show that they are meeting all the fireproof standards.

**Ms. Harris** explained that as, Mr. Jarles reported, they are requesting approval to for two variances related to the lot width which is also determining the lot size. All parcels outlined in yellow meet the 27 feet wide and 2700 lot size. Therefore, they feel that this is more consistent with the development pattern than it would be if they met the 30 foot standard requirement. Ms. Harris entertained questions from the Commission.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Greive** stated that their concern with the project is safety. They are aware that the 27 foot frontage is standard. But, over the last three years they have had three fires. One of which would have been avoided if it was not for that proximity. 504 caught fire and in the process caught 502 on fire because they were so close together. In terms of space, it is invasive, but they might be more tolerant of this because if it was not occurring in the midst of a global emergency. They have looked next door for the last several months and did not see one worker wearing a mask. The owners showed up also not wearing a mask. With this being so close in proximity to their property, they would be in defiance to the guidelines. If fire safety is not an appropriate issue, they feel that at least they can ask for postponement of this project just because of the

proximity to their property and the neighboring property at 512.

**Ms. Sanoren** states that she lives in the corner property across the street at 519 East 34th Street. She wanted to voice her concern for similar concerns as her neighbors. They have had three fires in less than three months. She has had ongoing issues with the construction noises as she works from home. Her neighbors also have voiced concern about the construction noise.

**Ms. Harris**, in response to the public comments, said she appreciated the neighbors' comments. She is sympathetic to their concerns. They will certainly comply with any COVID-19 regulations and be as sympathetic as possible and limit the construction as much as possible to limit the impact on their neighbors. They are meeting all fire codes and are doing everything possible to minimize the potential impact.

### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Stephens** said that guidelines are in place that has to be adhered to. There also are things that would otherwise be allowed for properties. They don't want to infringe upon the rights of other property owners, especially when something is consistent with the development patterns that they review. However, he is sympathetic to the positions and concerns as they are issues that needs to be considered, but they need to be realistic with themselves that when they find properties in certain places they may subject themselves to some things that may be a little less than desirable.

**Mr. Coles** agreed with Mr. Stephens. He, too, is sympathetic towards the concerns. But, he does not believe the HPC has the purview to force wearing masks. Today, the Mayor said the mask issue will be taken up with City Council.

**Ms. Jarrett**, too, sympathizes with the circumstances in the Historic District. The lot sizes are what they are. One of the pluses of new construction is that firewalls are required. What is being put here will be more fire resistance than what existed before. She agrees with Mr. Stephens and Mr. Coles. This is what is required in this area.

### **Motion**

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the petition for New Construction Small (parts I and II) and a fence located at 514 East 34th Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. If lighting is to be proposed revise the drawings to include said lighting and provide staff with material specifications prior to providing staff with drawings to be stamped for permitting.
2. Lower the foundation height to be compatible with the average of the adjacent contributing buildings.
3. Revise the stucco inset to be a minimum of three inches.
4. Incorporate more windows along the ground floor facade of the east and west elevations to ensure that the 30% standard is met.
5. Redesign the shutters so that the porch railing is still incorporated in order to be visually compatible.

AND

Recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals from the Article 5 - Base Zoning Districts standards ";TN-2. Lot Dimensions (min). Single-family Detached. Lot area (sq. ft.): 3,000 and Lot width (ft.): 30"; to allow for a lot area of 2,700 square feet and a lot width of 27'- 0" because the variance criteria are met.

### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Dwayne Stephens	
Second: Travis Coles	
Travis Coles	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye

[8. Petition of Coastal Partners | 20-002609-COA | 550 East 32nd Street | New Construction \(Small\) Parts I and II](#)

[☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation 20-002609-COA.pdf](#)

[☞ Application, checklist,pictures, description, 550 East 32nd St, 20-002609-COA.pdf](#)

**Mr. John Sumner of Coastal Partners** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Mr. Ryan Jarles** gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Small (parts I and II) and a fence on the lot located at 550 East 32nd Street. The building is proposed to be (2) stories, 29'-2" in height, 22'-0" in width, and is to be 40'-0" in depth. The building is proposed to be on a lot that is 22'-0" wide at the street and is 4,432 square feet.

**Mr. Jarles** explained that the following materials are proposed for the New Construction:

1. Front Porch Foundation: horizontal hog penning to be painted.
2. Rear Porch: wood, to be painted.
3. Columns: wood, to be painted.
4. Porch Railings: Painted wood railings and balusters
5. Window trim and frame: wood, to be painted.
6. Roof: architectural shingles.

These materials are visually compatible with the visually related contributing buildings.

**Mr. Jarles** further explained that the following materials require additional information:

1. Foundation: proposed to be stucco, however, no stucco specification was provided within the submittal; provide staff with stucco material specification for review and approval prior to submitting drawings for permitting.
2. Exterior Walls: Hardie Board; ensure the Hardie Board has a smooth finish.
3. Trim: Hardie Board; ensure the Hardie Board has a smooth finish.
4. Windows: labelled within the drawings as being "Windsor" brand windows, however, the specification to which series was not provided; provide staff with the window specification for review and approval prior to submitting drawings to be stamped for permitting.
5. Doors: door specifications were not provided within the submittal; provide staff with material specifications for the doors prior to submitting drawings to be stamped for permitting.
6. Fence: 6'-0" in height wood fence; ensure the fence is to be painted or stained.

**Mr. Jarles** reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction, Small (parts I and II) and a fence on the lot located at 550 East 32nd Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Incorporate a visual support, such as columns or brackets, on the rear porch.
2. Recess the hog penning a minimum of three inches.
3. Ensure the Hardie Board has a smooth finish.
4. Ensure the fence is painted or stained.
5. Include a private sidewalk connecting the main entrance of the building to the public sidewalk constructed of brick, concrete, stone.

6. Provide the following specifications:

- Stucco
- Windows
- Doors
- Lighting Fixtures

Mr. Jarles entertained questions from the Commission.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

Mr. Sumner apologized for the missing items. He will give all the needed information to the staff. As far as the lighting fixtures, they own the houses on 32nd Street. They have done gas lanterns and will do this on the front at the side of the door. They will give staff the window specifications, the door, etc. Mr. Sumner said he understood that putting a column of bracket on the rear porch makes sense. He will take care of this.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

The Commission was in agreement with the staff recommendations.

#### **Motion**

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the petition for New Construction, Small (parts I and II) and a fence on the lot located at 550 East 32nd Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Incorporate a visual support, such as columns or brackets, on the rear porch.
2. Recess the hog penning a minimum of three inches.
3. Ensure the Hardie Board has a smooth finish.
4. Ensure the fence is painted or stained.
5. Include a private sidewalk connecting the main entrance of the building to the public sidewalk constructed of brick, concrete, stone.
6. Provide the following specifications:
  - Stucco
  - Windows
  - Doors
  - Lighting Fixtures

#### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Travis Coles	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye

#### **X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS**

[9. Petition of Shauna Kucera | 20-002290-COA | 1312 Abercorn St | Staff Approved - after - the- fact design change to window grouping](#)

[Signed coa Decision 20-002290-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[10. Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 20-002616-COA | 216 W. 42nd St | Staff Approved - Principal use Wall Sign](#)

[Signed Decision 20-002616-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[11. Petition of Rebecca Lynch | 20-002615-COA | 200 East 31st Street | Staff Approved - replace storefronts with condition](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[12. Petition of Christopher Hines | 20-002657-COA | 1109-1111 Abercorn Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair-Replace](#)

[SignedStaff Decision 20-002657-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[13. Petition of Marcia Jones | 20-002251-COA | 1516 Montgomery Street | Staff Approved - principal wall sign with condition](#)

[Signed COA DECISION 20-002251-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[14. Petition of Sandra Pemberton | 20-002841-COA | 310 West 34th Street | Staff Approved - in-kind wood replacement for second floor porch](#)

[Signed Staff Decision 20-002841-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

## XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

## XII. OTHER BUSINESS

## XV. ADJOURNMENT

[15. Last Meeting - Thank you for your service!](#)

**Ms. Jarrett** said today is the last day that they will work as the Interim Historic Preservation Board. They extended "Good Luck" to the incoming Historic Preservation Commission.

**Ms. Michalak** thanked the Interim Board for helping to get this Commission off the ground and serving as interim members.

[16. Adjourn](#)

There being no further business to come before the Interim Historic Preservation Commission, Ms. Jarrett adjourned the meeting at 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Leah Michalak  
Historic Preservation Director

LGM:mem

***The Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission provides meeting minutes which are adopted by the respective Board. Verbatim transcripts of minutes are the responsibility of the interested party.***