



Historic Preservation Commission

Virtual Meeting
April 28, 2021 3:00 PM
Meeting Minutes

APRIL 28, 2021 HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

A Pre-Meeting was held virtually at 2:30 PM. Items on the Agenda were presented by staff as time permitted. The Board asked questions. No testimony was received and no votes were taken.

Members Present: Virginia Mobley, Chair
Chelsea Jackson-Greene, Vice-Chair
Kendra Clark
Rebecca Fenwick
Darren Bagley-Heath
T. Jerry Lominack
J. Haley Swindle
Dr. Robin Williams

Staff Present: Pamela Everett, Esq., Assistant Executive Director
Leah Michalak, Historic Preservation Director
Aislinn Droski, Assistant Planner
Olivia Arfuso, Assistant Planner
Sally Helms, Administrative Assistant
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

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

Ms. Mobley called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. She outlined the role of the Historic Preservation Commission and explained that staff will present each application with a recommendation; and then the petitioner will present his/her comments. The public will make comments. The petitioner will be given the opportunity to respond to the public comments. Then the HPC will make its decision.

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

VICTORIAN DISTRICT

[2. Petition of Justin Jones | 21-001242-COA | 121 West Waldburg Street | Porch Reconstruction](#)

[📎 Victorian Staff Recommendation - 21-001242-COA - 121 W Waldburg St.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[📎 Staff Research.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the reconstruction of the front porch for the property located at 121 West Waldburg Street with the following condition because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that all porch elements that require replacement or repair are done so in-kind, using wood.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kendra Clark

Second: Darren Bagley-Heath

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[3. Petition of Waters Building and Design | 21-001962-COA | 214 West Bolton Street | Rear Porch Removal and New Porch Construction](#)

[📎 Victorian Staff Recommendation - 21-001962 - 214 W Bolton.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[📎 Staff Research.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the removal of an existing rear, three-story deck, and replacement with a three-story rear porch addition for the property located at 214 West Bolton Street with the following conditions because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that the height of the railing on the stairs and porch do not exceed 36 inches.
2. Ensure the roof has a metal drip edge covering all edges and a maximum seam height of one (1) inch.
3. Ensure that the roof is pitched between 2:12 and 6:12 and that the eaves extend a minimum of 12 inches beyond the supporting wall.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kendra Clark

Second: Darren Bagley-Heath

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye

Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

CUYLER-BROWNVILLE DISTRICT

[4. Petition of Blondia Powers | 21-001460-COA | 2418 Hopkins Street | Porch Reconstruction](#)

- [Staff Recommendation 21-001460-COA.pdf](#)
- [Petitioner Research - Historic Photographs.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the petition for a roof replacement and porch reconstruction at 2418 Hopkins Street with the following conditions to be provided to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the drawings to include the porch roof pitch.
2. Revise the drawings to have columns matching the historic square tapered columns.
3. Ensure the column capital extends outward of the porch architrave, the balusters are placed between upper and lower rails, the distances between balusters does not exceed four (4) inches on center, and that the height of the railing does not exceed 36 inches.
4. Provide all porch materials.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kendra Clark

Second: Darren Bagley-Heath

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[5. Petition of Historic Savannah Foundation | 21-001973-COA | 607 West 39th Street | Rehabilitation/Alterations](#)

- [Cuyler-Brownville Staff Recommendation - 21-001973 - 607 W 39th St.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- [Staff Research - Sanborn Map and Photos.pdf](#)

[COA for Demolition of Rear Porch - 20-004300-COA.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the rehabilitation and reconstruction of a rear addition at 607 West 39th Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that the new rear door in the historic structure is painted.
2. Ensure that the lattice boards are at least one-half inch thick and recessed a minimum of three inches behind the front edge of the brick piers.
3. Ensure that the spacing of the balusters on the new stairs leading out from the porch do not exceed four inches on center.
4. Ensure that the HVAC unit and refuse storage area is screened from the public right-of-way.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kendra Clark

Second: Darren Bagley-Heath

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

STREETCAR DISTRICT

[6. Petition of Rayfield Reeves | 21-001195-COA | 507 East 36th Street | New Construction: Small, Parts I and II \(Continued from Previous Meeting\)](#)

- [Streetcar Staff Recommendation 21-001195-COA.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet - Application, Checklist, Special Exception Request.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet - March 24th Meeting.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet - Updated Drawings.pdf](#)
- [Board Decision - November 2020 Meeting 20-005231-COA.pdf](#)
- [Board Decision - March 24th Meeting 21-001195-COA.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the petition for New Construction, Small: Parts I and II for a two-story single-family, detached residence on the vacant parcel at 507 East 36th Street with the following conditions because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. If the proposed windows are simulated divided lights, ensure that the muntin is 7/8 inches or less, that the muntin profile simulates traditional putty glazing, that the lower sash rail is wider than the meeting / top rails, and that there is a spacer bar in between double panes of glass.
2. Ensure that all framing members are covered with appropriate trim (as shown in the window trim detail provided to Staff) and that all window glass is transparent with no dark tints or reflective affects.
3. Ensure that the distances between balusters does not exceed four (4) inches on center.
4. Ensure that the HVAC units and refuse are screened from any public right-of-way; submit the screening design. Plants / living matter cannot be used as screening.
5. If fences are to be installed, ensure that the appropriate checklist and all required supplemental information is submitted to Staff prior to installation.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kendra Clark

Second: Darren Bagley-Heath

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[7. Petition of Rayfield Reeves | 21-001196-COA | 509 East 36th Street | New Construction: Small, Parts I and II \(Continued from Previous Meeting\)](#)

- 🔗 [Streetcar Staff Recommendation 21-001196-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Application, Checklist, Special Exception Request.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - March 24th Meeting.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Updated Drawings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Board Decision - November 2020 Meeting 20-005231-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Board Decision - March 24th Meeting 21-001196-COA.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the petition for New Construction, Small: Parts I and II for a two-story single-family, detached residence on the vacant parcel at 509 East 36th Street with the following conditions because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. If the proposed windows are simulated divided lights, ensure that the muntin is 7/8 inches or less, that the muntin profile simulates traditional putty glazing, that the lower sash rail is wider than the meeting / top

- rails, and that there is a spacer bar in between double panes of glass.
2. Ensure that all framing members are covered with appropriate trim (as shown in the window trim detail provided to Staff) and that all window glass is transparent with no dark tints or reflective affects.
 3. Ensure that the distances between balusters does not exceed four (4) inches on center.
 4. Ensure that the HVAC units and refuse are screened from any public right-of-way; submit the screening design. Plants / living matter cannot be used as screening.
 5. If fences are to be installed, ensure that the appropriate checklist and all required supplemental information is submitted to Staff prior to installation.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kendra Clark

Second: Darren Bagley-Heath

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[8. Petition of Jennifer Kingsby | 21-001911-COA | 110 Brady Street | Rear Porch Addition](#)

[☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation - 21-001911-COA - 110 Brady St.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the rear porch addition to the property located at 110 Brady Street with the following condition because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Provide staff with the material specification for the screened porch door.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kendra Clark

Second: Darren Bagley-Heath

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye

J. Haley Swindle - Aye

[9. Petition of Coastal Development Partners, LLC | 21-001948-COA | 202 West 42nd Street | Special Exception Request \(From Previous Meeting\)](#)

- [☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation 21-001948-COA.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- [☞ HPC Board Streetcar Decision 21-000044-COA.pdf](#)

Motion

The Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the Special Exception for the property located at 202 West 42nd Street to allow for a 22-wide driveway as requested because the proposal meets the Special Exception criteria.

Vote Results (Approved)

- Motion: Kendra Clark
Second: Darren Bagley-Heath
- | | |
|------------------------|-------|
| Rebecca Fenwick | - Aye |
| Jerry Lominack | - Aye |
| Kendra Clark | - Aye |
| Virginia Mobley | - Aye |
| Chelsea Jackson-Greene | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |
| Darren Bagley-Heath | - Aye |
| J. Haley Swindle | - Aye |

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

[10. Adopt the April 28, 2021 Agenda](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby adopt the April 28, 2021 Agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

- Motion: Jerry Lominack
Second: Rebecca Fenwick
- | | |
|------------------------|-------|
| Rebecca Fenwick | - Aye |
| Jerry Lominack | - Aye |
| Kendra Clark | - Aye |
| Virginia Mobley | - Aye |
| Chelsea Jackson-Greene | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |
| Darren Bagley-Heath | - Aye |
| J. Haley Swindle | - Aye |

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

[11. Approval of the March 24, 2021 Meeting Minutes](#)

[📎 03-24-2021 Minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

The Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the March 24, 2021 Meeting Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Second: J. Haley Swindle

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

IX. REGULAR AGENDA

VICTORIAN DISTRICT

[12. Petition of GM Shay Architects | 21-001270-COA | 212 East Park Avenue | Rehabilitation, Alterations, Addition, and Construction of Accessory Structure](#)

[📎 Victorian Staff Recommendation 21-001270-COA.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)

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

[📎 Submittal Packet - Material Specifications.pdf](#)

[📎 Staff Research.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Olivia Arfuso gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for the rehabilitation and alterations of **212 East Park Avenue** with a rear addition. The applicant is also proposing the construction of a rear Carriage House. Two, non-historic rear additions are proposed to be altered. The first addition will be “refurbished,” while the second rear addition is to be demolished and newly constructed. The principal, historic building is proposed to be preserved. The deteriorated two-story front porch will be reconstructed, and a new rear deck will extend from the principal structure. The uncovered rear deck will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

Ms. Arfuso explained that the proposed Carriage House will be located along the lane and will be 18-foot-wide, 20-foot deep and (at its tallest point) 25'-1" in height. It will consist of a garage and a second-floor studio apartment.

Ms. Arfuso reported that staff recommends to approve the petition for the rehabilitation, alterations, rear addition, and construction of a Carriage House at 212 East Park Avenue 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. With regard to the front façade and porches of the historic main building:
 - Revise the front porches to match the old in design, texture, materials, and other visual qualities by using physical, pictorial, and contextual evidence.
 - Revise the front façade door design / configuration to be historically appropriate for this contributing resource and compatible with the neighboring historic buildings.
 - Revise the design of the windows on the front façade to have lite patterns that are historically appropriate for this contributing resource and are compatible with the neighboring historic buildings.
2. Revise the "fixed" windows on the rear facade to match the double-hung windows proposed on the Carriage House.
3. Ensure that the shutters are sized to fit the window opening, operable, and that the placement of the horizontal rail(s) correspond to the locations of the meeting rail(s) of the window.
4. Ensure that the eaves extend no less than 12-inches beyond the supporting walls, and that the roofs have a metal drip edge covering all edges and a maximum seam height of one (1) inch.
5. Submit information regarding the location of the electrical meter(s), mechanical equipment, and refuse storage to Staff for review, and ensure that they are all appropriately screened from any public-right-of-way.
6. Ensure that lighting specifications are submitted to Staff for review prior to installation, and that the appropriate fence checklist/information is submitted to Staff for review.

Ms. Arfuso entertained questions from the Commission

Mr. Lominack commented that he believes the handrail on the second level is too high. He believes that instead of the comment to reconstruct the porch to match what was there before that this be one exception that the Commission does not want the handrail that high.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay came forward and introduced the staff person accompanying him at today's meeting. He explained that the image shown on the screen shows that the second floor porch roof was clearly added and bears some of the trim for the window. None of the columns actually align. As Mr. Lominack pointed out, the railings are 42 inches high. The balusters are not historic. He asked is the staff recommending that they go back and create a two-story porch with a roof like what is shown in the photograph?

Ms. Michalak explained, in an answer to Mr. Shay's question, that historically when this was a single family home, which is what they are trying to go back to with a single door, there was only a one story porch. Therefore, staff is saying that a one story porch is appropriate, but the petitioner is trying to do a porch and one-half and change all the fenestration on the facade to different windows; different railings, etc. This takes away from the little characteristics that are left. If the petitioner wants to go back to single family, it needs to go back to just a one-story porch. Otherwise, a false sense of

historical development would be created.

Mr. Shay stated that this is what they thought, too, when he heard the staff's report. He explained that basically what they have is a house that was a very small single family home when it was built approximately in 1860. Afterwards, a series of additions and haphazard renovations were done over the years. Therefore, this makes it hard to determine what the original historic fabric actually was when it comes down to such things as window lite patterns, etc. Mr. Shay said the only photo they are aware of that shows any evidence of what was there historically was the poor photograph that showed how the house was altered when the second story porch was enclosed or partially enclosed. He said they welcome the Commission's discussion on whether it is better for them to make a guess of what the historic fabric was and try to recreate something. However, this would run the danger of creating a false sense of history or whether it is better to make it more obvious what they think is the remaining bits of the historic; or something that is clearly contemporary. He asked the Commission for their discussion on this aspect.

Mr. Shay said it is hard to make a discernment on the windows from the photograph that shows the existing six-over-six windows on the upper floor and the one-over-one windows on the bottom floor. But, they can work on this at staff level and try to make a determination on the light pattern compatibility. The windows that are on this building appear to be very old. However, he could not say that they are original. He explained that they have no problems with staff recommendation regarding making the windows double hung. They have no problems with staff's recommendation numbers 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Mr. Shay said they need assistance from the Commission regarding them trying to go back and make the front of the building look like what it might have been years ago if this is what they want them to do.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay stated that the Historic Savannah Foundation and its Architectural Review Committee fully support the staff's recommendations as they pertain to the front facade. They sympathize with Mr. Shay's dilemma as sometimes it can be very difficult to read historic buildings, especially one that has changed over time. Certainly, some of those alterations gain their own significance over time. Therefore, it can be a difficult path to tread. However, the proposed design as presented to the Commission, they feel is wholly inappropriate for a historic contributing building. They do not support any of the changes that are being proposed.

Mr. Arvay said the property definitely deserves some further study and it is the HSF's encouragement that the Commission continues this petition to allow further study. He explained that the staff's recommendations are so extensive that it would be better and responsible to continue this petition and have the petitioner come back with drawings that reflect more of the historic nature of the property. The HSF has an easement on the property next door and as he was flipping through some pictures with hope that this would shed some light on the subject, but he saw nothing that would be much benefit. The HSF has no objections to turning the structure back to a single family use. They have done this on many of their revolving fund properties. But, how to treat the historic double porch is a question. However, they believe at the very least that the porch should be retained as it currently is, although they like Mr. Lominack's question that the upper baluster be reduced to no more than 36 inches. All the other material should be retained if they are going to keep it as a two-story porch.

Dr. Williams, for clarity, asked staff if they were saying that since the home is being returned as a single family residence, that the second story porch which was associated with it being a duplex, should not be retained or it could be retained?

Ms. Michalak explained that basically staff is saying that when it was a single family home, the porch did not exist. However, if the second floor porch will remain, not the four foot tall railing, but the columns, roof, etc. should remain as they have been here a long time. Technically, though, when it was a single family, there was one-story porch. .

Dr. Williams said the building has gone through changes and the petitioner is proposing to take it back to a single family home which eliminates historic characteristics being a duplex which it has been for quite a

while, but just because it goes back to a single family residence it does not mean that they have to remove the second story porch.

Ms. Michalak said if they are going to keep a second story porch [this is what they are doing] but they are ripping off the whole thing to keep a different second story porch.

Dr. Williams asked that if the roof is deteriorated to such a point that it needs to be replaced, it could be replaced in-kind, but not change to the degree that is shown in the petitioner's proposal.

Ms. Michalak answered "yes." They can see that the columns and roof structure are here.

Dr. Williams asked what is the date of the photo.

Ms. Michalak said it is from the 1970s survey.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The Commission discussed the balcony on the second floor and the windows. The piers on the second floor are taller than the piers on the first floor and have a more visual weight which looks awkward sitting above the thin historic columns on the first floor. They suggested that a much lighter railing on the second floor with no piers would be more appropriate.

The Commission concurred that due to the extensive conditions regarding the front façade of the principal building that the petition should be continued. The architect would then have a chance to address the concerns of the current submission and the Commission would be given an opportunity to see the revised drawings and comment accordingly at the **May 26th** HPC Meeting.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the petition for the rehabilitation, alterations, rear addition, and construction of a Carriage House at 212 East Park Avenue to the May 26, 2021 Historic Preservation Commission regular meeting, in order for the applicant to address the following:

1. With regard to the front façade and porches of the historic main building:
 - Revise the front porches to match the old in design, texture, materials, and other visual qualities by using physical, pictorial, and contextual evidence.
 - Revise the front façade door design/configuration to be historically appropriate for this contributing resource and compatible with the neighboring historic buildings.
 - Revise the design of the windows on the front façade to have lite patterns that are historically appropriate for this contributing resource and are compatible with the neighboring historic buildings.
2. Revise the "fixed" windows on the rear facade to match the double-hung windows proposed on the Carriage House.
3. Ensure that the shutters are sized to fit the window opening, operable, and that the placement of the horizontal rail(s) correspond to the locations of the meeting rail(s) of the window.
4. Ensure that the eaves extend no less than 12-inches beyond the supporting walls, and that the roofs have a metal drip edge covering all edges and a maximum seam height of one (1) inch.
5. Submit information regarding the location of the electrical meter(s), mechanical equipment, and refuse storage to Staff for review, and ensure that they are all appropriately screened from any public-right-of-way.
6. Ensure that lighting specifications are submitted to Staff for review prior to installation, and that the appropriate fence checklist/information is

submitted to staff for review.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: Robin Williams

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

CUYLER-BROWNVILLE DISTRICT

[13. Petition of Sasha Reyes | 21-001803-COA | 922 West 42nd Street | Alterations and Addition](#)

[Cuyler-Brownville Staff Recommendation 21-001803-COA.pdf](#)

[Before and After Photos.pdf](#)

[Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

The petitioner was not present at the meeting.

Ms. Michalak gave the staff report. This petition is requesting approval for after-the-fact alterations and an addition for the property located at 922 West 42nd Street.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends to continue the request for after-the-fact alterations and additions for the property located at 922 West 42nd Street to the May 26, 2021 HPC Meeting in order to provide and redesign the following because the proposal is incomplete, is not visually compatible, and does not meet the standards:

1. Redesign the addition to:
 - Have a 20-foot rear yard setback
 - Reinstate the historic location of the rear wall of the main building
 - Be differentiated yet compatible with the historic building.
 - Be reversible.
 - Be subordinate in height from the historic main building (and distinguish the historic exterior walls from the new exterior walls with an addition offset).
2. Provide the existing and proposed lot coverage (after redesigning the addition).
3. Remove the vinyl windows from the historic building and reinstall the previous wood, double-hung, single-paned windows with a 6-over-6 true divided lite pattern.
4. Provide a specification for the addition windows; ensure that they are a material and operable type permitted by the ordinance.
5. Provide a design for the new rear door on the addition.
6. Retain and repair the historic metal standing seam roof.
7. Provide the locations for:
 - Electrical meter.
 - Refuse storage.
 - Mechanical equipment.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

No one was present on behalf of this petition.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] reported that they support the staff recommendations. The HSF is concerned with the growing number of the "after-the-fact" applications. They see applications such as this almost weekly at HDBR. They suspect they will see more at the HPC level. The HSF is hopeful that the Commission will deal with these issues swiftly. Certainly, on a case-by-case basis, they know that there are different circumstances behind some of these petitions, but overall, they are hopeful that both HDBR and HPC will continue to strictly enforce the staff recommendations.

Mr. Arvay said this petition before the Commission today is strictly a loss of historic character on a historic home. Although, staff is recommending that it be returned to such, he worries about the execution and is hopeful that the petitioner ultimately will be able to return the structure to what it was.

Mr. Lominack commented that he believes that sometimes there is tendency to get too prescriptive in the solution that an applicant should come back to the Commission with. He is concerned that the petitioner could come back with what the Commission has said, but still not have a good project. It is certainly possible to comply with the letter of the ordinance, but still do a bad job. The more prescriptive the instructions are given to solve the problem, if those things are done it sort of back the Commission in a corner where they have met the conditions that were set, but still they do not have a good project.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the request for after-the-fact alterations and additions for the property located at 922 West 42nd Street to the May 26, 2021 HPC Meeting in order to provide and redesign the following because the proposal is incomplete, is not visually compatible, and does not meet the standards:

1.Redesign the addition to:

- Have a 20-foot rear yard setback
- Reinstate the historic location of the rear wall of the main building
- Be differentiated yet compatible with the historic building.
- Be reversible.
- Be subordinate in height from the historic main building (and distinguish the historic exterior walls from the new exterior walls with an addition offset).

2.Provide the existing and proposed lot coverage (after redesigning the addition).

3.Remove the vinyl windows from the historic building and reinstall the previous wood, double-hung, single-paned windows with a 6-over-6 true divided lite pattern.

4.Provide a specification for the addition windows; ensure that they are a material and operable type permitted by the ordinance.

5.Provide a design for the new rear door on the addition.

6.Retain and repair the historic metal standing seam roof.

7.Provide the locations for:

- Electrical meter.
- Refuse storage.
- Mechanical equipment.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Darren Bagley-Heath

Second: Robin Williams

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

STREETCAR DISTRICT

[14. Petition of GM Shay Architects | 21-001940-COA | 1700 Drayton Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass with Special Exception Request](#)

- ☞ [Streetcar Staff Recommendation 21-001940-COA.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Submittal Packet - Narrative and Special Exception Request.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Submittal Packet - Photos, Drawings, and Renderings.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Staff Research.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Petition Response to Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Public Comment.pdf](#)

Ms. Virginia Mobley recused herself from participating in this petition based on a prior conversation.

Ms. Jackson-Greene chaired this hearing.

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for three new buildings to be located at 1700 Drayton Street, 104 East 34th Street, and 1705 Abercorn Street. The applicant is also requesting a Special Exception from the standard that states that *building footprints in the TC-1 zoning district are permitted to be a maximum of 5,500sf* in order to allow the footprint of the building at 1700 Drayton Street to be 12,300sf.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for three new buildings to be located at 1700 Drayton Street, 104 East 34th Street, and 1705 Abercorn Street with the following conditions to be submitted to the Commission for review with Part II: Design Details (within 90 days of this decision) because otherwise the project is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1700 Drayton Street

1. Increase the rear yard setback (along the lane) to 10 feet.
2. Provide electric meter(s) location.
3. Reduce the height of the fence along 33rd street in the front yard to a maximum of 3 feet or pull it back to not extend forward of the front façade of the building.
4. Reduce all fences (except the front yard fence described above) to a maximum of 8 feet high.

104 East 34th Street

1. Provide electric meter(s) location.
2. Provide the required shrubs with the parking lot screening/fence.
3. Wrap all structured parking along 34th Street with residential or nonresidential uses.
4. Reduce all fences to a maximum of 8 feet high.

1705 Abercorn Street

1. Reduce the building coverage to a maximum of 60%.
2. Redesign the square windows above the storefront on the east, north, and portion of the south facades to be transoms as designed on the remainder of the south façade.
3. Provide electric meter(s), HVAC and mechanical equipment, and refuse storage locations.
4. Reduce all fences to a maximum of 8 feet high.

Ms. Michalak reported additionally that staff recommends approval for a Special Exception from the standard that states that *building footprints in the TC-1 zoning district are permitted to be a maximum of 5,500sf* in order to allow the footprint of the building at 1700 Drayton Street to be 12,300sf because the Special Exception criteria are met.

Ms. Michalak entertained questions from the Commission.

Dr. Williams stated that he had a question regarding parking. He said this may or may not be within the Commission's purview, but is there a requirement for apartments to have a parking spot? Forty-two units and 42 parking spots are being proposed. Is this mandated per code or is it the desire of the applicant to have a parking spot per unit?

Ms. Michalak answered that one parking space is required per unit, but not under the HPC Governed Ordinance. This goes under a different ordinance.

Dr. Williams asked a follow-up question. Is there a precedent in this district or the ones under the purview of this Historic Preservation Commission for the maximum footprint a special exception.

Ms. Michalak explained that this is a brand new standard and special exceptions are new under NewZO. Therefore, this is the first time that this Commission has seen this; however, it has been done as a variance before NewZO was adopted.

Dr. Williams clarified he was speaking about parking spots.

Ms. Michalak clarified and explained that there is no exception to the parking spots. She thought Dr. Williams was talking about the footprint.

Dr. Williams explained that he was wondering if there is some latitude on the number of parking spots that would impact height and mass.

Ms. Michalak informed Dr. Williams that she believes it would be good to ask the petitioner that question. The petitioner has a grant from the Department of Community Affairs [DCA] for workforce housing and a lot of requirements are associated with this grant.

Mr. Bagley-Heath asked what comprises workforce housing. Is it not low income housing? What is the criteria with regards to earnings?

Ms. Michalak answered that this, too, is a question for the petitioner. Her understanding of DCA is 30% of the income. She understands that DCA has a lot of requirements.

Mr. Bagley-Heath said most of the structures that were shown were not visually compatible. The apartments appeared to be more detailed than some of the other buildings that were residential. It looks very institutional.

Ms. Jackson-Greene explained that today's presentation covers only height and mass. The next

petition will cover design details and materials.

Dr. Williams asked if the 1700 Drayton Street building facing 33rd Street, is the courtyard recessed on the front required for the square footage coverage issue or is it a decision based on the part of the petitioner to have the courtyard in the middle on the front?

Ms. Michalak explained that a couple of things went into this decision. The first time that the petitioner met with staff, they had the building flipped and the courtyard was on the lane. It was actually the staff's suggestion to flip it so that the front would be more compatible with the courtyard configuration of the adjacent Court Apartments.

Dr. Williams said he liked it, but believes it was a missed opportunity that when you enter the courtyard, you would expect that the door would be on axis to be straight ahead. This would be the tradition of a courtyard apartment or to have a door on either side on axis or across axis. This is why he was wondering about the parking and whether there is some latitude as the screens straight ahead are ventilation screens for a parking garage. He has concerns about how the courtyard is configured. It is being constrained by the parking plan?

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay came forward and introduced the designer of this project. He thanked Ms. Michalak and staff for working closely and intensively with them over the past six weeks to make this submission possible and to ensure that it is meeting the standards to the extent possible. Mr. Shay explained that the project is something that the City of Savannah brought forward to the community with a requirement that the proposed developer's would have essentially rent control apartments and that a certain percentage of the apartments would be set aside for the below market rents. This is what drives the workforce housing. They are trying to make apartments that are more affordable than the market housing that are being built two blocks away and in other sections of the city.

Mr. Shay explained that for them to achieve their goal, it is necessary for the developer to seek participation from the Georgia Department of DCA. They have a deadline of May 2021 to make the submission and cross the hurdle to make the deadline to qualify for this. The threshold issue for them today is the special exception. He explained that without the special exception they will not be able to qualify for the DCA funding. But, it is not an issue with regards to the COA. He just wanted to point this out. He said they chose the Mid-Century modern inspired massing and height because they wanted to make something that was clearly their own and would be complementary to the surrounding buildings. Mr. Shay explained that "complementary" does not mean that they need to match the surrounding buildings. He stated that historic buildings look better being historic and the contemporary buildings look better being contemporary. There is a larger footprint of buildings in this immediate vicinity in the boundary that Ms. Michalak outlined, including a number of them which are contributing. He said that Ms. Michalak counseled them that the institutional buildings did not count as much as the apartment buildings.

Mr. Shay explained that regarding Dr. Williams's question, the idea of a courtyard was something that they embraced from the start as a way to breakdown the massing so that from the street it would not look like a big slab building. It would look more articulated and more in scale. He believed that the renderings that they have included show that it does not read as one big slab, but reads as several small buildings. Mr. Shay stated that regarding the staff's comments that are in the conditions for the approval, they agree with all of them. They have actually revised the drawings and the renderings that show how they will approach this. Mr. Shay stated that they are going to push the building five feet away further from the lane and up to the property line on East 33rd Street. This is actually consistent with the other buildings in this blockface. This took care of the fence issue as it will remain in the same place; the building actually sort of caught up with it so that the fence surrounding the courtyard on the front will be in line with the building mass. Therefore, it could be higher than three feet. One of the attempts is to try to create apartments that are attractive to families; especially young families. Therefore, they want the courtyard to be a safe place for children. There are a lot of requirements for qualifying for the DCA grant assistance. This has to with the courtyard overhang and the amount of open space that DCA requires. They have worked very hard to meet both the historic standards from the Streetcar Neighborhood and the DCA standards.

Mr. Shay explained that the electric meters in all cases will be located along 33rd Lane as this is where the main powerlines are located. This is shown in the drawings. He pointed out that the massing on the southern building along 34th Street has been changed so that they have created a building mass to screen the parking on this side. They have already dropped this in to be able to present it today. The community garden is slightly reconfigured and they have a better looking garden fence surrounding this side. Some of the fences were 8'-6" but they have changed them to 8' around the other enclosed parking area. Not only do they agree with all of the recommendations in the staff report, but they have actually submitted documentation as to how they intend to comply with them.

Mr. Shay said he wanted to address the question about detailing. They look forward with the approval that hopefully the Commission will give them today for just the height and mass that they will be able to come back with a lot more information about how they will use the details to further breakdown the scale of the building. The materiality aspect will come back with Part 2. He said the size of footprint of the Abercorn building is small, but if it becomes more intense, they will propose that it be fenced. He explained that they got rid of the square windows and married them together so that they will be more like a transom.

Mr. Shay stated that they met with all the surrounding neighborhoods to ensure that they all knew what was going on. He entertained questions from the Commission.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Shay if he is required to provide a parking space for every unit.

Mr. Shay answered that the short answer is "yes."

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Shay if he considered balconies as components that would be included as it might impact height and mass.

Mr. Shay said other than on Abercorn Street, they chose to stay away from balconies. They are expensive to build and they do not add much value from their standpoint. But, because they add a lot of cost and they are under pressure to deliver an affordable construction cost, they decided not to add balconies.

Ms. Fenwick said the window sections that are a part of the design has brackets underneath. She was wondering if this was rendered in the design stage or whether it was to accommodate an element of the ordinance.

Mr. Shay answered that it is the latter. He welcomes someone saying that they don't have to have them, but they did not want to use this moment to acquire a special exception for them. They did not want to present something to the Commission today that had a long list of failures to meet the ordinance.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff received several supports for the project from the public.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Buckingham, a resident in this area, stated that the design is to build 42 residences with 42 parking spaces. The problem he sees with this is as follows: there will only be one car per apartment. Therefore, the design assumes that no visitors will require parking. It further assumes that the residents will only have one car. Furthermore, Drayton Street is not available for on-street parking. Only East 33rd and 34th Streets are options; however, these two streets are already heavily used for parking and as such, would not support the overflow. It is typical that in an industrial design that a buffer be included which is sometimes referred to as a safety factor into a design. He requested that such a buffer be discussed in this design such that there is enough room for overflow parking to be built into the design of the structure/lot. Mr. Buckingham said his next comment concerns visual compatibility design. It should be discussed that the Mid-Century design is not compatible with the houses across the street, the 100 and 200 blocks of 34th Street or on the adjoining block on 33rd Street towards Abercorn Street.

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said their Architectural Review Committee acknowledges the height of the project; the scale of the project is sensitive to the

surrounding area in terms of the footprint and the number of the stories and height of the project. He said their acceptance and approval of the project ends here. He did not want to make too much commentary on architectural decisions, but he believes it is hard sometimes to separate the two and associate the two. They are opposed to the current style of the architecture. Mr. Arvay said as visually incompatible, they believe a rich plethora historical styles surrounding the property that could be referenced, they are not looking for an outright copy of historic buildings. They want to make it clear that they are not looking for a carbon copy of the apartments, but they believe the architectural should be referenced more.

Mr. Arvay said they could not agree more with Mr. Bagley-Heath that the design is incompatible. He brings this up because in Part 2 as they pursue some remedies and solutions to this, at what point does this begin to affect height and mass; it may not do so at all. But, he thought it was worth putting on the record that they have grave reservations about rendering approval for this project based on what they have seen. However, he wanted to reiterate that they feel the height and mass is probably based on the example shown [strictly based upon] could be deemed appropriate, but the HSF feels that this project needs much more study and redesign. Therefore, the HSF does not submit approval for this today.

Mr. Shay, in response to public comments, said he lives in this neighborhood too. He believes that 42 spaces for 42 apartments are too many, not too few. But it is a requirement for the minimum parking spaces and they want to meet the requirement. Mr. Shay explained that in their course of their discussion with the City of Savannah's Engineering Department through the developmental process, the Traffic Engineering Department that there is so little else going on on East 33rd Street that they might want to try to qualify for some dedicated parking. He said, however, they decided not to pursue this for the reasons that Mr. Buckingham said in that the parking on 33rd Street is fair game for everybody. Mr. Shay said they are meeting the ordinance and this is not a requirement for visual compatibility.

Mr. Shay said regarding the Mid-Century compatible or noncompatible issue, they did not stray from the ordinance. The ordinance recommends that they do complementary contemporary architecture. They recognize that they have a lot more work to do with design detail and they are ready to do so. They look forward to healthy discussions about how to achieve those goals. They are not persuaded at this point that going back and trying to make this look more like a building from a different era is the appropriate approach. Mr. Shay explained that the function, itself, is to create apartments that are made for workforce is a very contemporary idea and function. You will not be able to go back in history and find this because it was actually taken up by rooming houses which are different.

Mr. Shay said they agree with the HSF that the height and scale are correct. To some extent, they agree with those who say that a lot more attention needs to be given to the detail; and they look forward to doing this at the appropriate stage which is Part 2. The main thing is that whatever the Commission decides today and it is so fundamental. However, they need the special exception of the footprint on the northern site.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission discussed the height and mass of this project at great length. The height and mass was approved as amended and presented by the petitioner at this meeting [April 28, 2021] with an amendment that the petitioner study the solid to void fenestration on the 33rd Street elevation. The Commission also approved the Special Exception as the Special Exception criteria were met.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for three new buildings to be located at 1700 Drayton Street, 104 East 34th Street, and 1705 Abercorn Street as amended and presented by the petitioner at the April 28, 2021 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting. The petitioner's presentation and amendments addressed all of staff's recommended conditions.

AND

Approval for a Special Exception from the standard that states that building footprints in the TC-1 zoning district are permitted to be a maximum of 5,500sf in order to allow the footprint of the building at 1700 Drayton Street to be 12,300sf because the Special Exception criteria are met.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jerry Lominack

Second: Robin Williams

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Abstain
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[15. Petition of LS3P Associates | 21-001950-COA | 315 West 38th Street | Rehabilitation and Alterations](#)

[☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation 21-001950-COA.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet - Narrative and Specifications.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet - Photos, Research, and Drawings.pdf](#)

Ms. Chelsea Jackson-Greene recused herself from participating in this petition.

Mr. Michael Garcia was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval to rehabilitate the historic school building into apartments for the property located at 315 West 38th Street as follows:

- Re-install stucco where missing from the previous removal of additions. The stucco on the main body of the building is in good condition and does not need repair.
- Remove non-historic fire escapes and associated non-historic door and window openings and repair (in-kind) the exterior walls to match existing banding configurations that were altered.
- Reinstall historically accurate wood windows in all located (except the historic curved windows at the front entrance which still exist and will be repaired in-kind).
- Repair front door and two rear doors in-kind.
- Non-historic wood awnings over the rear doors will be removed and replaced with metal canopies.
- All mechanical HVAC units are proposed to be installed on the center portion of the roof with screening.
- New electrical equipment on the rear.
- Refuse storage along the lane in a screened dumpster.
- Parking along the lane; gravel with a concrete pad at the ADA parking spot.
- Concrete sidewalks throughout the property to accommodate ADA.
- Historic fence posts, base wall, and wrought iron fencing will be repaired in-kind.

- New extruded aluminum fence along the lane.
- New ADA lift, stair, and door opening along the rear façade.

Ms. Michalak stated that historic preservation tax incentives are being sought for this project.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends to approve to rehabilitate the historic school building into apartments for the property located at 315 West 38th Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

Ms. Michalak entertained questions from the Commission.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Michalak if SCAD was involved in any way with this building.

Ms. Michalak answered "no." SCAD sold this building.

Ms. Mobley said that when SCAD had this property, a zoning text amendment was made to this property about parking in the rear of the building.

Ms. Michalak said she spoke with Mr. Marcus Lotson regarding this. Mr. Lotson informed her that this zoning amendment was never passed. This is why the present zoning is TN-2. If it had passed, it would be zoned TC-1. The parking issue concerned the vacant lots across the street.

Ms. Mobley stated that Traffic Engineering determined that access to the parking in the rear of the building was not doable.

Ms. Michalak said that Traffic Engineering attended the SPR meeting, but this issue did not come up at the SPR meeting. She said, however, this is a question that the petitioner will be able to address.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Garcia thanked the Commission and staff for reviewing their project. They are eager to get this project going; it will be a great revitalization for the community and the neighboring area along the Montgomery Street Corridor. He said regarding the parking, their Civil Engineer went to a Site Planning Review meeting with the City of Savannah last week. There were no issues in terms of providing parking at the rear. The only thing that was discussed was that angular parking vehicles are preferred as it is easier to mitigate entering in and out of the lane. He said for the property, itself, if they go to 90 degree parking, they asked that they further push it back into the site another seven feet. But at this time they are keeping it as angular vehicle parking. Mr. Garcia explained that Ms. Michalak summarized the text amendment correctly. Previously, SCAD owned this property, but the text amendment concerned the parking across the street. The amendment never passed. Therefore, it expired once NewZO was adopted. He entertained questions from the Commission.

Ms. Mobley stated that the property borders on Montgomery and Barnard Streets. What happened to Jefferson Street as it is between these two streets?

Mr. Garcia apologized and said that is a typographical error. He explained that what is labeled as Barnard Street is actually Montgomery Street and what is labeled as Montgomery Street is actually Jefferson Street.

Ms. Mobley asked if the access is from Jefferson Street.

Mr. Garcia answered that at the time they submitted the application to the HPC staff, the access was going to be off Jefferson Street. Based on the SPR comments, they will have to revise this amendment at a later date. He said as they go through some other site approvals, they are asking that they provide access off of Montgomery Street to remove cars exiting from Montgomery Street.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] stated that they endorse the approval of this project. They believe the project is well thought-out and executed properly.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission was in agreement with the staff recommendation.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve to rehabilitate the historic school building into apartments for the property located at 315 West 38th Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: Jerry Lominack

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

16. Petition of Ethos Preservation | 21-002016-COA | 2305 Price Street | Rehabilitation, Alterations, and Roof Addition

- 🔗 [Streetcar Staff Recommendation 21-002016-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - 3D Renderings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Memo Regarding Graffiti Removal Work to Date.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Narrative, Photos, and Drawings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Staff Research.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Preservation Brief 14_ New Exterior Add...pdf](#)
- 🔗 [SOIS Illustrated - Brick Painting Standards pg.80.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Preservation Brief 1_ Assessing Cleanin...pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Preservation Brief 6_ Dangers of Abrasive Cleaning to Historic Buildings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Preservation Brief 38_ Removing Graffiti from Historic Masonry.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Rebecca Fenwick recused herself from participating in this petition. She is a Principal of Ethos Preservation.

Ms. Ellen Harris was present on behalf of this petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for alterations and a rooftop addition for the property located at 2305 Price Street. The scope of work includes:

- The brick is proposed to be painted.

- Metal awnings removed.
- One of the entrance signs will be removed.
- All broken tile will be replaced in-kind.
- Broken brick will be replaced in-kind and repointed in repair areas with Type N mortar.
- Mirrored storefront glass will be replaced with clear glass in existing wood frames.
- All historic materials (including trim, storefront, tile, siding will be retained and preserved.
- Rooftop addition on the southwest corner of the building.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for the following work for the property located at 2305 Price Street because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Metal awnings removed.
2. One of the entrance signs removed.
3. All broken tile replaced in-kind.
4. Broken brick replaced in-kind and repointed in repair areas with Type N mortar.
5. Mirrored storefront glass replaced with clear glass in existing wood frames.
6. All historic materials (including trim, storefront, tile, siding retained and preserved.

Ms. Michalak additionally reported that staff recommends denial for the following work for the property located at 2305 Price Street because the proposed work does not meet the preservation standards:

1. Painting the historic brick.
2. Rooftop addition.
3. Cleaning the brick (until an appropriate treatment plan can be identified and approved by the HPC).

Ms. Michalak entertained questions from the Commission.

Dr. Williams said that on Price Street elevation there are two large brick repairs that are unfortunately a different color than the red bricks on the original structure.

Ms. Michalak stated the bricks were painted.

Ms. Mobley said that graffiti was put on the bricks. The paint was the method used to coverup the graffiti.

Dr. Williams asked that as a solution, the petitioner is requesting to paint the entire wall, but the staff is saying that the bricks not be cleaned until a better solution is obtained. Is it possible that those two big patches could eventually be removed?

Ms. Michalak answered yes. She explained that many solutions have been tried that are not supported by the Preservation Brief. Therefore, staff is afraid that they will keep trying to do something; but staff prefers that they stop trying things and wait until the Commission provides better guidance.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Harris thanked the Commission for hearing their petition and thanked Ms. Michalak for her thorough review. She explained that joining her on the virtual call was Mr. Nathan Snyder and Ms. Chelsea Phillips the new owners. Ms. Harris explained that there are two areas that staff is expressing concern about. The first concern is the painting of the brick and staff's second concern is the rooftop of the building. Ms. Harris explained that before they proceed with this petition, she wanted to withdraw one item. The owners will not paint the building and, therefore, withdraw this request.

Ms. Harris briefly spoke briefly about the building. This building is on a busy street and on a prominent corner. The building is in a residential neighborhood and was designed to fill the local needs of the nearby residents. The building has been underutilized for many years. It was recently

purchased by new owners who plan to rehabilitate the building and turn it into real estate offices and possibly a coffee shop in the future. The building on the interior is wide open and essentially there are no interior partitions. Ms. Harris explained that while there are storefronts on the north and northeast elevations, there are very few windows on the remainder of the building. Therefore, the inside is quite dark as not much natural light can get in the building. She said the rooftop addition serves quite a few different purposes. It allows for an interior mezzanine to be constructed to provide additional office space for the real estate office she mentioned earlier. It also allows for rooftop access for maintenance and repairs as well as potential for a coffee shop to have access to the roof. Ms. Harris said finally it could serve as a clerestory to allow additional light within the area.

Ms. Harris explained that the design of the addition is intended to be simple and contemporary. It is minimally visible from the public right-of-way and will not compete with the design of the historic building nor will it negatively impact historic materials or the integrity of the building. She said that the addition is contained within the historic parapet walls and the only material impacted will be the unoriginal roof structure. It is entirely reversible without damaging historic materials. Ms. Harris noted that as Ms. Michalak reported in the staff's report, the Secretary's of Interior Standards and Preservation Briefs do provide specific standards on additions including rooftop additions. She said that Standard 9 requires that additions do not destroy historic materials and that the new work be differentiated from the old. Standard 10 addresses "reversibility." Ms. Harris said they feel these standards are met. Ms. Harris explained that Preservation Brief 14 specifically addresses rooftop additions. It does not forbid rooftop additions, but rather states that constructing a floor on top of one, two or three story buildings, which would be somewhat in all of the Thomas Square district, is seldom appropriate for buildings of this size as it would measurably alter the building's portion and profile and negatively impact the character. However, the Brief goes on to state the circumstances and conditions that the rooftop might be appropriate; noting that a rooftop addition in a densely built urban area is more likely to be compatible on buildings that are adjacent to similarly sized or taller buildings. Ms. Harris explained that this building is adjacent to two-story buildings. The Brief also notes that the addition should be set back from the front and minimally visible, which this design accomplishes. The addition is set back almost 18 feet from 39th Street and almost 17 feet from Price Street.

Ms. Harris said that staff noted a few standards that may not be met. But, she does not believe that any of the issues brought up would be visible such as the roof deck or the shape of the windows, but they are happy to work with staff to revise any elements that they feel might be visible. She said they feel this is a great project and will not impact the historic character of the building. They believe it will enhance the streetscape and the neighborhood by bringing this building back to life and serve the community as it was originally intended to do.

Ms. Harris stated that Mr. Snyder and Ms. Phillips, the new owners, wanted to make some additional comments. The Thomas Square Neighborhood supports this project and a resident's letter of support was forward to Ms. Michalak this morning. Ms. Harris entertained questions from the Commission.

Dr. Williams said Ms. Harris mentioned that the rooftop addition is 18 feet from 39th Street and 17 feet from Price Street. Even, though, it is setback further from 39th Street, given that a longer view coming down Price Street, He asked Ms. Harris if they considered moving the building a little further to the south so it would be less prominent from the view the Commission just saw?

Ms. Harris answered that she believes this is possible; but it does impact the interior layout. However, if this is something that the Commission wishes to see, it could be something that may be they can accommodate.

Ms. Mobley commented that she would like for it to be noted that while the Board of Thomas Square has written a letter of support for this project, there was no public meeting or discussion held for the members concerning this matter.

Mr. Lominack asked what materials will be used for this addition.

Ms. Harris answered that it will be a smooth-face hardie siding. The windows are casement which has been approved by the Commission previously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said that their **Architectural Review Committee [ARC]** is glad to see something going in this corner store. This is certainly prominent property that has been vacant for a long time. The HSF is grateful to hear that the applicant has decided not to paint the building. Mr. Arvay said the HSF would be happy to share the information with the applicant that they have learned through trial and error when dealing with paint removal from masonry. They have several recommendations for treatments that they will be happy to share. However, he was aware that the owners' consultant was very familiar with this.

Mr. Arvay said concerning the rooftop addition, they strongly agree with staff that the addition is incompatible. As provided by the applicant, it is clearly visible from multiple right-of-ways. He said they believe the ordinance is clear about this and the charge is clear. It is not in the best practices and Standards for rehabilitation to have a visible addition on such a diminutive shoebox size building. They are hopeful that the Commission will uphold this Standard and not rationalize it. However, they feel, though, that if the applicant was agreeable to try and redesign it both by pushing it back further as Dr. Williams suggested and/or reducing the height [it seems that there is a floor-to-ceiling height in the height of the addition itself] that could be decreased. Mr. Arvay said a continuance could be granted if the applicant was agreeable with trying to go back and restudy this. However, as it is presented today, it does not meet the Design Standards.

Mr. Snyder said they will look at redesigning some of the aspects, but they want to make a nice physical space on the inside. He said they did push it back on 39th Street and Price Street. He thanked the Commission for hearing their application.

Ms. Phillips thanked the Commission for hearing their application. She said she has loved this building forever and always wanted it to be restored. Ms. Phillips informed the Commission that Mr. Snyder and she were not the ones who tried to eradicate the graffiti. There is a new rooftop addition in the Victorian District and she feels it makes such a great space. She loves the Thomas Square District and wants to ensure that their place will add to it. The neighborhood is very vibrant.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission discussed the rooftop addition and its design. They concurred that the petition be continued for a maximum of 90 days to allow the applicant to restudy the rooftop addition.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the petition for alterations and a rooftop addition for the property located at 2305 Price Street (for a maximum of 90 days) to allow the applicant to restudy the rooftop addition.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Jerry Lominack

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------|
| Rebecca Fenwick | - Abstain |
| Jerry Lominack | - Aye |
| Kendra Clark | - Aye |
| Virginia Mobley | - Aye |
| Chelsea Jackson-Greene | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |
| Darren Bagley-Heath | - Not Present |
| J. Haley Swindle | - Aye |

[17. Petition of Ward Architecture and Preservation | 21-001959-COA | 1812 Habersham Street | New Construction, Small, Parts I and II](#)

[☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation - 21-001959-COA - 1812 Habersham St.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet - Narrative and Drawings.pdf](#)

[☞ Staff Research.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Mobley left the meeting at 6:00 P.M.

Ms. Jackson-Greene chaired the meeting.

Mr. Josh Ward was present on behalf of the meeting.

Ms. Aislinn Droski gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Small, Parts I and II, for the construction of a two-story single-family dwelling at the vacant property located at 1812 Habersham Street.

Ms. Droski reported that staff recommends approval of the New Construction, Small, Parts I and II, for the property located at 1812 Habersham Street with the following conditions because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Install a private sidewalk connecting the stairs leading out from the main entrance to the public sidewalk.
2. Submit a COA application to staff which includes the ribbon strip driveway.

Ms. Droski entertained questions from the Commission.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Ward thanked staff for their presentation and comments. They will provide the necessary information to staff as recommended.

Mr. Ward entertained questions from the Commission.

Dr. Williams questioned the design solution on one section of the property.

Mr. Ward explained that they have the design solution on the east facade too. This is just a contemporary way to connect the two windows. Sometimes they have a larger window that was infilled with two smaller windows and a different material might span the openings. This is just to accentuate the two windows that are aligned up there and provide some different shadowing relief along the facade.

Dr. Williams asked if this corresponds to a staircase?

Mr. Ward explained that there is a staircase and a powder room below the staircase with a smaller window.

Dr. Williams said it might be more appropriate to make it seem more intentional as opposed to reading more like something being repaired. He was wondering if someone might come by and question that a patch is on the side of the house. He said maybe if those two windows projected slightly like an oriel window, maybe six inches. Something is needed to help provide some relief to the blank facade and justify a different material treatment. Is altering the windows a possibility in terms of maybe articulating them with a different material between?

Mr. Ward said this is something they can study. They are happy to take a look at this.

Ms. Fenwick believed they were looking at the relief recess in that the top drawing at the bottom left. She asked Mr. Ward to explain this.

Mr. Ward explained that this is a design element he used around the perimeter of the building. The green house next door on 35th Street side gable adds a similar feature to it. He said to him, it is a very contemporary way to accentuate the side gable. He used this element on the backside and also on the front. The side is covered up with the porches, but you can see it more pronounced on the east facade.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said it is clear that the architect is taking a clear, classic form and added some contemporary language to the traditional form. Some of them have already been pointed out. He said that their Architectural Review Committee [ARC] did not take so much exception with any of them, except for the small group of louvers around the front porch. This seems as a kind of incongruent feature. He assumed these were added in an attempt to update the forms slightly and express something contemporary. The ARC felt they were slightly incompatible.

Mr. Arvay suggested that instead of a smooth stucco finish for the foundation, that an actual brick foundation be considered to give the building a little more warmth.

Mr. Ward, in response to public comment, said regarding the louvers on the front porch, obviously they provide some shade to the element. They are trying also to tie them in with the side porch. He said they are trying to create some visual connection between the two. This is not an element that they must have, but believed that this a nice gesture to create the two porches in similar form. He said if the Commission feels strongly about them changing the base materials, they are happy to study it, but they prefer to use the stucco.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams discussed that it would be great if the petitioner restudied the form and materiality of the pair of windows on the north elevation. Otherwise, the Commission was in agreement with the staff recommendation.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the New Construction, Small, Parts I and II, for the property located at 1812 Habersham Street with the following conditions because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Install a private sidewalk connecting the stairs leading out from the main entrance to the public sidewalk.
2. Submit a COA application to staff which includes the ribbon strip driveway.
3. Restudy the form and materiality of the pair of windows on the north elevation and submit to staff for final review and approval.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Kendra Clark

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Not Present

Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Not Present
J. Haley Swindle	- Not Present

[18. Petition of James Reardon | 21-002028-COA | 525 East 39th Street | New Construction, Small \(Parts I and II\)](#)

[☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation 21-002028-COA.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet - Narrative and Drawings.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet - Material Specifications.pdf](#)

[☞ Staff Research - 1973 Sanborn Map](#)

Mr. James Reardon was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Olivia Arfuso gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction Small Parts I & II at **525 East 39th Street**; a two-story Carriage House is proposed to be constructed in the rear of the property. She said the proposed function aligns more with an accessory dwelling unit because it does not contain parking. The Carriage House will be 24-feet wide, 16-feet deep and 22'-10 3/8" in height (to the roof ridge) and is proposed to have a 5-foot rear yard setback. The exterior walls will be finished in white hardcoat masonry stucco, the roof will have asphalt shingles, the windows will be clad wood and the doors will be wood. Since there is no lane access, and buildings are constructed on all adjacent properties, the Carriage House will only be minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

Ms. Arfuso reported that staff recommends to approve the petition for New Construction Small Parts I & II at 525 East 39th Street with the following conditions to be submitted to Staff, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the west side yard setback to a minimum of 3 feet to meet the standard or apply for a Special Exception, to be heard at a future HPC meeting, to align with the historic building (which is a setback of less than 3 feet).
2. Revise the roof shape to be hip, and ensure that the pitch is reduced to be 4:12 or 6:12.

Ms. Arfuso entertained questions from the Commission.

Dr. Williams said on the submittal, there seems to be some confusion with the labeled photos. Two different buildings are labeled 525 East 39th Street on page 3 of the document. He asked which of the two is the house in question.

Ms. Jackson-Greene pointed out the correct house.

Dr. Williams asked what kind of roof is on the house.

Ms. Arfuso said it has a parapet roof.

Dr. Williams said he was curious why staff would recommend a hip roof, if the house has a parapet roof.

Ms. Arfuso explained that staff determined from the drawings that it was either a hip or a gable like shape. Staff determined that a hip roof was more appropriate given the other contributing buildings on the block.

Dr. Williams said the bottom photo shows a side gable roof. It seems as if there are many types of

roofs in this area. Maybe this could be a point of discussion for the Commission.

Mr. Lominack said the building will likely not be seen. If it was something that would be seen in relation to the main building issue, it would be different. But, this really does not need to come before the Commission. He said no one will probably know it has been built. He does not think it matters in this case.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Reardon thanked the staff and Commission for hearing their petition. He said as far as the roof forms, they originally started out with a gable roof, but in meetings with the staff, they thought the hip roof was better. He started changing drawings and hit a deadline.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] stated that he believes that Mr. Lominack and Dr. Williams made some good points. He stated that regarding Mr. Lominack's point, it is minimally visible, but at the same time their Architectural Review Committee [ARC] feels that the design is important, even if it is only minimally visible. To this end, the HSF recommends that the applicant consider matching the stucco finish to tie-in more with the historic building which appears to a kind of textured stucco rather than smooth. Mr. Arvay said he was unsure whether the plans say what type of finish. Therefore, they strongly encourage the property owner to use the same treatment as the historic home. He said likewise, they would get rid of the visible control joints which does not appear to add anything to the building. They feel that the large "shop-like" windows should be more referential to the main building and be at least one-over-one. Mr. Arvay said he understood why staff did not include this in their recommendation, but he as a member of the public is making this recommendation that these changes be made.

Mr. Arvay said he believes that the comment from Dr. Williams about possibly a parapet roof for this structure has merit. But, he will allow the Commission to work this out.

Mr. Reardon, in an answer to public comments, explained that during the meeting with staff, he was told to go ahead and submit the drawings; let the Commission see them and come back to staff. He said this is why there are two different roof shapes on the A-200 sheet. He has no problems with the staff's comments regarding moving it so he will have three feet nor does he have a problem with the roof form. He also, he does not have a problem with the stucco joints being executed differently.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams thanked Mr. Lominack for making the point that there is no lane here. In principle, they want, however, the roofs to speak to the relationship of the building. If there are ways for this to be controlled such as with the control joints such as was suggested should be okay. Whichever roof the Commission or staff feels is the best solution is okay. Consequently, he withdrew his concern that it has to be the same as the main building.

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 & II at 525 East 39th Street with the following conditions to be submitted to Staff, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the west side yard setback to a minimum of 3 feet to meet the standard or apply for a Special Exception, to be heard at a future HPC meeting, to align with the historic building (which is a setback of less than 3 feet).
2. Revise the roof shape to be hip, and ensure that the pitch is reduced to be 4:12 or :12.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kendra Clark

Second: Robin Williams

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Not Present
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Not Present
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

[19. Acknowledge Approved Staff Reviews](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby acknowledge Approved Staff Reviews.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Kendra Clark

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Not Present
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Not Present
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[20. Petition of Javier Medina | 21-001488-COA | 1502 Price Street | Staff Approved - Roof Replacement](#)

[📎 Streetcar SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-001488-COA.pdf](#)

[21. Petition of Henry Benton | 21-001664-COA | 13 East 39th Street | Staff Approved - Replace Windows and in-kind siding replacement with conditions](#)

[📎 21-001664-COA SIGNED Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[22. Petition of Michael Woodard | 21-001802-COA | 2507 Florance Street | Staff Approved - Repair/Replace Siding and Roof with condition.](#)

[📎 21-001802-COA SIGNED Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[23. Petition of Jeffrey Downey | 21-001751-COA | 119 East 37th Street | Staff Approved - Signs with conditions](#)

[21-001751-COA SIGNED Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[24. Petition of Betty Mitchell | 21-001900-COA | 526 East 35th Street | Staff Approved - Roof Replacement](#)

[Streetcar Staff SIGNED Decision - 21-001900-COA.pdf](#)

[25. Petition of Justin Wells | 21-001857-COA | 520 Seiler Avenue | Staff Approved -In-Kind siding replacement with conditions](#)

[21-001857-COA SIGNED Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[26. Petition of Javier Medina | 21-001487-COA | 1815 Barnard Street | Staff Approved - Roof Replacement](#)

[21-001487-COA SIGNED Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[27. Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 21-002048-COA | 1400,14018,1410 MLK Jr. Blvd | Staff Approved - Amendments to previously approved COAs.](#)

[Victorian Staff SIGNED Decision 21-002048-COA.pdf](#)

[28. Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 21-001938-COA | 1400 Bull Street | Staff Approved -Sign](#)

[Staff SIGNED Decision - 21-001938 - 1400 Bull St.pdf](#)

[29. Petition of Klaus Roofing Systems of Georgia, LLC | 21-001939-COA | 536 East 40th Street | Staff Approved - Roof](#)

[Staff SIGNED Decision - 21-001939-COA.pdf](#)

[30. Petition of Klaus Roofing Systems of Georgia | 21-001917-COA | 507 West 39th Street | Staff Approved - Roof](#)

[Staff SIGNED Decision - 21-001917 - 507 West 39th St.pdf](#)

[31. Petition of James Mikell | 21-000805-COA | 508 West 32nd Street | Staff Approved -Roof replace, Doors, Fascia replacement with conditions](#)

[21-000805-COA SIGNED Decision Packet.pdf](#)

XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

XV. ADJOURNMENT

[32. Next HPC Pre-Meeting: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 at 2:30pm](#)

[33. Next HPC Regular Meeting: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 at 3:00pm](#)

Dr. Williams stated it might be good that as staff plans their next retreat to include the consideration of some kind of policy that might lead to an ordinance that extends preservation protection from buildings to landscaping. He said that Forsyth Park has a study being sponsored by the Trustees Garden Club and public comments are available now. He explained that Forsyth Park is not being treated with the same level of preservation care or by the same standards that a building would be if it was in the Historic District as landscape features are not a part of the ordinance. Dr. Williams asked if it is staff's place to institute a policy for preservation protection to landscape features. Could staff incorporate this into a workshop?

Ms. Michalak explained that Ms. Ellie Isaacs, a member of the Historic District Board of Review brought up this same issue. Ms. Michalak said at that time, she recalls the Executive Team, Ms. Wilson and Ms. Everett, said they would need to be directed by the City to create such an ordinance. Therefore, it was suggested that Ms. Isaacs created an ordinance of her own and with other interested parties such as Dr. Williams, make some sort of proposal from the community.

Ms. Everett stated that she remembered them saying this. Ms. Everett said a recommendation would need to come from the community. This is not something that the staff could do on its own.

Dr. Williams said this answers his question. Members of the public, however they form a proposal gets sent to City Council. Then City Council upon voting on the proposal, empowers the MPC to implement it. Is this correct?

Ms. Michalak answered "yes." She informed Dr. Williams that first this needs to be discussed with the Alderman whose district would be affected. Ms. Michalak informed Dr. Williams that it may be a good idea for him to get with Ms. Isaacs and discuss this.

34. Adjourn

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Ms. Jackson-Green adjourned the meeting at 6:30 p. m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Leah G. 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.