



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
December 12, 2012 2:00 p.m.  
Meeting Minutes

**DECEMBER 12, 2012 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING**

**HDRB Members Present:** Linda Ramsay, Chair  
Ned Gay, Vice Chair  
Reed Engle  
Dr. Nicholas Henry  
Keith Howington  
Sidney J. Johnson  
Brian Judson  
Stephen Merriman, Jr.  
Ebony Simpson  
Robin Williams, Ph.D

**HDRB Member Not Present:** Zena McClain, Esq.

**MPC Staff Present:** Tom Thomson, Executive Director  
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Director  
Leah G. Michalak, Historic Preservation Planner  
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

**City of Savannah Staff Present:** William Shearouse, Assistant City Attorney  
Tiras Petrea, Zoning Inspector  
Lorie Odom, Zoning Inspector

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

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

**Ms. Ramsay** called the meeting to order at 2:05 and welcomed everyone in attendance.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2. [Approve Minutes of November 14, 2012](#)

Attachment: [11-14-2012 Minutes.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve November 14, 2012 Meeting Minutes - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Sidney J. Johnson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

**III. SIGN POSTING**

**IV. CONTINUED AGENDA**

3. [Petition of Paul and Leslie Belliveau | 12-001033-COA | 548 E. Jones St. | New Construction, Shed](#)

**Board Action:**

Continue this item at the petitioner's request, no date certain. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

## V. CONSENT AGENDA

### 4. [Petition of Lou Thomann | 12-001410-COA | 120 East Jones Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Paint Colors.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs and Specifications.pdf](#)

#### **Board Action:**

Approval for the after-the-fact addition as requested because it is compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

### 5. [Petition of James Johnson for Marchese Construction | 12-001589-COA | 234 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Existing Photographs.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

#### **Board Action:**

Approval of the fascia and projecting signs as requested because they meet the standards and are compatible. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

6. [Petition of Andrew Wilford | 12-001733-COA | 535 East Congress Street | Demolition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Application and Photographs.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval for demolition of the non-historic building, including all fencing and paving, at 535 East Congress Street because the structure possesses no known historical or architectural significance, is less than 50 years of age, and is not eligible for historic designation. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

7. [Petition of James Newkirk for Up Front Signs & Graphics | 12-001790-COA | 31 West Congress Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Application and Drawings.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Existing Photograph.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval of the principal use sign as requested because it meets the standards and is compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

8. [Petition of Marshall Urstadt | 12-001814-COA | 513 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings and Renderings.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval of the principal use projecting sign as requested because it meets the standards and is compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

9. [Petition of Richard Mopper | 12-001786-COA | 31 West Congress Street | Exterior Alterations to Entrance](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approval of the new mahogany entrance to 31 West Congress Street because it is visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards provided that the wood frame around the transom align with the wood filler door surround below. The glass panel within the transom should not extend beyond the door frame. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

10. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc. for Screamin Mimis | 12-001811-COA | 10 Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approval of the principal use projecting sign because it is compatible and meets the preservation - PASS and sign standards in the ordinance.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye

Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

11. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 12-001815-COA | 102 Fahm Street  
| Rehabilitation/Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval for exterior alterations, additions, and fencing on the property at 102 Fahm Street because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the design standards, with the condition that the storefront be recessed a minimum of four inches from the face of the building or match the existing recess for existing windows and doors within the facility. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

**VII. REGULAR AGENDA**

**Agenda A (Items 11-15 will be heard at 2:00pm)**

12. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | H-12-4702-2 | 201](#)

West Bay Street | Addition

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Mr. Patrick Shay** along with **Mr. Saad Al Jassar** and **Ms. Maggie Ward** were present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior courtyard improvements to the southeast corner of the property at 201 West Bay Street along West Bay Lane and a portion along Barnard Street. The request includes demolition of the non-historic appurtenances on the south side of the hotel and replacement with brick planters, hedge row and light fixtures. A freestanding trellis is proposed within a hardscaped courtyard. Entrance and freestanding vehicular canopies are proposed. As the Board may recall they saw a similar proposal for this project several months ago. However, the design concept has changed significantly. Therefore, basically, this is a new revision to the plan.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval for exterior courtyard improvements to the southeast corner of the property at 201 West Bay Street along West Bay Lane, including demolition of the non-historic appurtenances on the south side of the hotel and replacement with a brick planter, hedge row and light fixtures, freestanding trellis, entrance and freestanding vehicular canopies with the following conditions:

1. Reduce the size of the decorative steel plates for the entrance canopy to be as minimally intrusive as possible and provide details of the design and dimension to staff for final approval.
2. Redesign the entrance canopy to have a flat roof with projecting lip on the fascia to be compatible with the size, scale, proportion, and massing of appurtenances on historic structures in the district.
3. Submit light fixture types that are consistent with the City specifications for light fixtures with the public spaces to staff for final review and approval.
4. Introduce a color (not white) for the awning attached to the secondary entrance on the south facade to be compatible with the building to which it is attached.

**Mr. Howington** questioned the supplementary colors.

**Ms. Ward** answered that the supplementary colors will be used to paint the steel members before the trellis and the vehicular canopies.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Shay** stated that they have considered the staff's report. The one issue that they would like to discuss with the Board is whether or not the rigid awning at the entrance can be curved rather than flat as has been recommended by the staff. They have three reasons for wanting the awning at the entrance to be curved: 1. They want to make sure that it was clearly differentiated from the



existing historic building; 2. They chose also to make something that is clearly contemporary for the smaller awning at the customer drop-off point. As someone arrives to the hotel, they will be able to park their car, get out and check-in the hotel. A valet will probably park the car. 3. They believe that the curve helps to differentiate between clearly contemporary elements and the existing historic fabric; and that the two relate nicely with each other.

**Mr. Shay** said there is also a functional reason the curved awning is being requested. He explained [pointing to an area] that as the awnings that are rigid metal as proposed comes over and down, there is actually a hotel room that is right there. When they looked at trying to figure out how high to make the top of the edge of the awning if they carried it across straight. it would actually be in the middle of the hotel room and it also gets to a height across the front where they are not convinced on a rainy day with a little wind such as today, that the person would actually be out of the weather when they are at the front door. Therefore, they wanted to bend that down. The hotel room would have somewhat a more pleasant view of the standing seam metal roof. If someone was standing in this area, they would be covered better. Mr. Shay said [pointing to an area] that the awnings have to be taller in this area because it is the drive area to accommodate a UPS truck. One awning actually goes a little underneath the other awning so that the canvas awning protrudes and slightly goes underneath the rigid metal awning above.

**Mr. Shay** stated that as far as the awning being a different color, they would be happy to submit to staff the idea of probably a dark green as this is the current color with the identity of the existing property. With regards to the light poles, they are happy to review whatever are the City's standards for the area. They will take a hard look at them and if they look like something that is compatible, they will be happy to come back to staff and propose them. He said, however, he is a little ambivalent about this, too. It is on private property and they want to differentiate it; although they are next to the public right-of-way, the area on the inside is going to be at times limited to the use of hotel guests. Mr. Shay said he does not want to create confusion in that someone will be walking around Ellis Square with one signature lighting standard and walking down Barnard Street and think that it is apart of the City of Savannah's park as well. Nevertheless, he can work with this and probably choose a different finish or something that is different enough, but looks like a part of the family. He said the rack reduction in the size of decorative steel plates, he agrees with this. The size structurally could be smaller and still do its job.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Shay if the smaller awning could be a little higher. Upon looking at the elevation, it appears that the consistent datum header running across the building should line up with the floor height. It appears that it is a little lower. He does not know why it is eight (8) feet, but could it be nine (9) feet?

**Mr. Shay** explained that the beam line actually runs [pointing to an area] all the way there as a row of columns are consistently spaced ten (10) feet a part. Therefore, it actually unifies the trellis awning with the passenger drop-off

awnings. The beam is continuous. He believes they set it to be about eight (8) feet. They need the beam for structure reasons, but they also like it for visual reasons such as when you approach the space from Barnard Street, you enter in the corner and as you make the turn you are actually getting a really strong force perspective that leads you to understand that this is the front entrance to the hotel. Right now, it is a bit difficult to actually read where the front door entrance to the hotel is as it is setback a couple hundred feet in the lane.

**Mr. Howington** said he did not know whether the top of the beam represented the top of floor line. But, just bring it up a little.

**Mr. Shay** said okay.

**Mr. Howington** said the other consideration would be the light poles. It seems as if the light poles could be spaced a little more evenly. He said he does not know if this was done on purpose, but there are three, then two, and two are on Barnard Street and none are even. Therefore, when he looks down the lane, he sees this. May be they could be slid over a little so that the western pole could line up with the column of the trellis area.

**Mr. Shay** said it would be nice if it had a regular rhythm. They will take a look at this as well. This is a good idea.

**Mr. Engle** stated that to clarify, Mr. Shay is willing to substitute a dark green for the white on the fabric. He does not have a problem with the modern canopy shape, but he has a problem with the white color. An example is the cover at the amphitheater in Forsyth Park and see what white stretched fabric looks like after two years.

**Mr. Shay** answered he will use the dark green. For clarification, they will be proposing that just the awning [he believes this is what the staff recommended] over the exit would be the green color. He said they would like to keep the lighter for these because they would like to up light them at night. They have chosen a fabric that is really expensive; therefore, it should not mildew. He said he did not know what the fabric is on the amphitheater in Forsyth Park. He was not sure the entire Board members saw their sample fabric, but it is not like a canvas such as a sail on an old sailing ship. It is a very high performance material.

**Mr. Merriman** said it will probably be more maintained than Forsyth Park.

**Mr. Engle** said he believed there is a regulation on lighting of awnings.

**Dr. Williams** said he wanted to follow up on Mr. Howington's point about raising the beam. He said one consequent depending on how high as presently the base of the beam aligns with the top ground floor windows at the piers. He assumes that the second floor also has hotel rooms that will be partially obscured by the white canopy.

**Mr. Shay** explained that the it aligns exactly with the structural floors on the

inside.

**Dr. Williams** said if the entire structure was raised, it would further obscure the view from the five windows where there is the white canvas. Therefore, what you gain on one end, you will lose on another. Presently, it appears that it is very carefully calibrated at the base of the beam just slightly above the top of the windows. He trusts that rooms are here where the five windows are located.

**Mr. Shay** confirmed that rooms are where the five windows are located.

**Dr. Williams** said raising the beam for the whole series of trellises will presumably consequently raise the white canvases and would further obscure the view.

**Mr. Howington** said the white canvases are in the front and there is a large space behind. He said his thought is that between the back of the canvas a large planting area is here. Therefore, you will get a lot of sunlight.

**Dr. Williams** said he was not worried about blocking, but he was thinking of views. He said he realizes that the higher the canvases are, the less that anyone in those rooms will be able to see.

**Mr. Engle** said this is really not a concern for this Board. They are talking about exteriors, not what is viewed from the inside. This is not a purview of this Board.

**Dr. Williams** stated that it is an exterior element that has an impact on the experience of the building. He knows that they do not need to talk about the interior, but it is an exterior element. For example, if it was twice as big and had a consequence of twice as many windows, if it gets taller it will have an impact.

**Mr. Howington** said structurally it feels more correct to him for it to line out with the structure of the building.

**Dr. Williams** said the only thing he sees on the building are the segmental arches. It appears that the fixed metal ones have a more gentle curb while the canvases have a steeper curve.

**Mr. Shay** said they are drawn to be the same curvature. But, he could not promise that mathematically upon the metal and canvas being built that they would be perfectly the same curvature.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Shay if there is a rationale for the particular angle they have.

**Mr. Shay** answered just high enough so that the UPS driver will not knock it down when they drive here. A standard car is only so tall, but their experiences

tell them that they need to be about 13' - 9" in order to guarantee that nobody hits it. It seems very high to provide shelter, therefore, they chose a shape that allows people to stand underneath with more shelter and out of the rain. However, they chose the area behind here to be landscaped so the water that comes off the canvas will fall in the landscaped area.

**Mr. Howington** said the view of the window is looking out of a parking garage. Unless, you look at the angle, you look at Barnard Street.

**Mr. Shay** said this is the true. You will not be looking at Ellis Square.

**Mr. Howington** said correct; you will not be looking at Ellis Square, but looking at a parking garage. It is not a nice view.

**Mr. Shay** said he believes that it is certain that Ellis Square will always be there, but he can assure that it is not certain that the parking deck will always be there.

**Ms. Ward** said that in reference to Mr. Engle's question about lighted awnings, the awning section of the Historic District ordinance states that back lit or internally lit awnings are prohibited. When they reviewed the proposal, although they are using awning fabric, she did not consider the vehicle canopy to be an awning.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they agree with the comments that staff has made in their report and recommendation. Particularly, with the recommendation to redesign the entrance canopy to have a flat roof as opposed to the curvilinear shape. Additionally, they feel that the vehicle canopy is not visually compatible with the structure of the historic building or the modern addition. HSF feels that it references the mid-century modern period and design. While it might be suitable at a mid-century bus depot for example, they do not think that there is context for this odd shape as well as the construction of the vehicular canopy.

**Ms. Meunier** said the HSF suggests that instead continuing the pattern of the wood trellis in this location with awnings to provide shelter, they feel that the odd shape while it is very differentiated from new additions [they should be differentiated], should be compatible. They do not need to be as differentiated as this case.

**Ms. Meunier** said another point the HSF wants to make is in terms of the lighting requirement. They suggest that the petitioner speak with Bridget Lidy and Mike Weiner at the City of Savannah regarding the lighting requirements as they are working on a lighting plan for the Historic District.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Henry** said he agrees with the staff's recommendation regarding the

foundation concerning the shape of the awnings.

**Ms. Simpson** said, she, too, agrees with the staff's recommendation regarding the awnings.

**Dr. Williams** asked if they would be opposed to just changing the fixed canopy and not the ones with the white canvas or all of the them. He believes that the staff recommended just changing the fixed canopies.

**Mr. Engle** asked the staff to show on the elevation exactly what is being recommended as he was somewhat unclear.

**Ms. Ward** explained that the staff's recommendation is that the canopy attached to the historic building, have a more traditional shape and form. Staff believes that a flat roof will be more compatible with the historic element. She said pointing to an area on the elevation that this feature is entirely free standing set apart from the historic building. Therefore, staff did not have any comments to the design of this.

**Mr. Judson** asked Ms. Ward, continuing with Mr. Engle's question, to point out on the elevation where the canopy will be located.

**Ms. Ward** pointed out that the curve canopy will be attached to the building. It is 30 feet long and projects 14 feet from the face of the building. As Dr. Henry has alluded, staff's concern is the shape because it is so large. She said if it was smaller, it might be more successful in blending in with the historic building. However, it stands out. She pointed to the vehicular canopy that will be curved. She pointed out the wooden trellis that will have a flat slightly pitched roof.

**Mr. Engle** said, he, too, is in agreement with the staff's recommendation. He is actually surprised that staff did not say that this is not consistent with the Secretary's standards, at least the portion that deals with awnings.

**Mr. Gay** said the staff's report did state that it was not consistent.

**Mr. Engle** said the awning that is attached to the historic building is not consistent with the Secretary's standards.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the redesign of the canopy would go back to staff.

**Ms. Ramsay** answered yes.

**Board Action:**

Approval for exterior courtyard improvements to the southeast corner of the property at 201 West

Bay Street along West Bay Lane, including demolition of the non-historic appurtenances on the south side of the hotel and replacement with a brick planter, hedge row and light fixtures, freestanding trellis, entrance and freestanding vehicular canopies with the following conditions:

1. Reduce the size of the decorative steel plates for the entrance canopy to be as minimally intrusive as possible and provide details of the design and dimension to staff for final approval.
2. Redesign the entrance canopy to have a flat roof with a projecting lip on the fascia to be compatible with the size, scale, proportion, and massing of appurtenances on historic structures in the district. - PASS
3. Submit light fixture types that are consistent with the city specifications for light fixtures within the public spaces to staff for final review and approval.
4. Introduce a color (not white) for the awning attached to the secondary entrance on the south façade to be compatible with the building to which it is attached.
5. Modify location of light fixtures to have a regular spacing along Bay Lane.
6. Raise the roof beam of the freestanding structures to align with the brick band course on the south elevation of the hotel structure.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

[13. Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | H-12-4727-2 | 600 East Bay Street | New Construction, Part I, Height and Mass, Phase A](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Aerial Views.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Public Comments Received.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Cover Letter, Narrative Description of Heights and Additional Stories.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photos, Drawings of Adjacent Buildings, Historic Context, and Materiality.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Master Site Plan and Building Key.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Hotel One.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Parking Garage.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Hotel Two.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Retail Buildings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Riverfront Elevation and 3D Images.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Letter from the Chamber of Commerce 121012.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Letter of support for Northpoint Hospitality Group 120712.pdf](#)

**NOTE:** **Ms. Ramsay** gave the ground rules for the hearing for this petition. When there is a large number of potential speakers or where there is a likelihood of protected discussion, the Chair shall set a time limit on the debate. Both sides of the issue shall be afforded not less than five (5) minutes for a presentation nor more than thirty (30) minutes. The maximum time afforded shall be a function of the number of persons desiring to speak and the complexity of the issue.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked the audience to raise their hands if they wanted to speak on this petition. She said the maximum allowable public time for both sides (for or against) will be thirty (30) minutes. The persons speaking for or against will have to determine who will take up the time. Each side will be given 30 minutes. Mr. Howington will be the timekeeper.

**Ms. Ramsay** read the following statement: "The Savannah Historic Board of Review participated in the public process regarding the proposed amendments to the Historic District ordinance. The amendments changed the Historic District Height Map for the property at 600 East Bay Street. The Mayor and Aldermen have taken action on the matter. We, the members of the Historic District Board of Review, are appointed to review projects with the ordinance. We accept the changes that were made to the ordinance and are charged to review projects and consider compliance with the ordinance. We have no personal or financial interest, no bias, and are prepared to review this item under the new ordinance."

**Ms. Ramsay** said if there is anyone on the Board who does not agree with this statement, they should recuse themselves.

**Mr. Howington** asked for clarification on the thirty (30) minutes hearing process. He asked if the thirty minutes were for the total hearing.

**Ms. Ramsay** answered that each side will be given thirty (30) minutes.

**Mr. Howington** clarified that each person speaking would not be given thirty (30) minutes.

**Mr. Ramsay** said no. The total time for each side to make their comments is thirty (30) minutes.

**Dr. Williams** said for the sake of perhaps anticipating public comment, the ordinance has been modified and, therefore, it is not the purview of this Board nor an open question of whether or not this height change should be or not allowed.

**Ms. Ramsay** explained that it has to be visually compatible.

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

**Attorney William Shearouse, Assistant City Attorney** was present to give guidance to the Board.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Part I Phase A, of seven buildings on the property at 600 East Bay Street. Ms. Ward said this is the largest project by far that has come through since she has worked here. Due to the size and significance of this project, the Part I, Height and Mass review will be considered in two phases. The Part I, Phase A which the Board will consider today include the height, proportion of structure's front facade, rhythm of structures on the street (setbacks and any parking standards that affect setbacks), massing including recesses and scale. Phase B, which will be considered at another meeting, includes the proportion of openings, rhythm of solids to voids, entrances and balcony/porch rhythm, any parking standards that may affect these openings or entrances, walls of continuity, and roof shape. Directional character is considered by both the building form and openings, and applies to both Part I reviews.

**Mr. Engle** asked Ms. Ward to clarify how the Board deals with rhythm of a structure when they don't deal with openings in a structure.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the building footprint shape is within today's scope.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes. With regards to Mr. Engle's question, Ms. Ward explained that the rhythm of the structure on the street, the standard reads "the relationship of a structure to the open space between it and an adjacent structures shall be visually compatible with the open space between it and the contributing structure." Therefore, the Board will be looking at the placement and the open space created between structures, not the openings within the building.

**Ms. Ward** explained that in order for everyone to be on the same page, there is one existing building on the parcel which is the former headquarters for the Georgia Power. She said that the model has been extremely helpful in staff's review of this project. She encouraged the Board to look at the model as they



talk about project. She may be referencing it from time-to-time. The project is broken up into seven (7) buildings. This will result in an eight (8) story structure with an overall height of 87 feet above mean sea level.

**Mr. Engle** said for clarification that the Board is dealing with mass today, but the additional story they are not suppose to deal with it when they consider mass because it will not be approved until Part 2.

**Ms. Ward** stated that if the Board is comfortable approving it at that height, it would have to be a "conditional approval" contingent upon those materials being submitted when the Board looks at the materials. They are linked in our ordinance, but the Part I review does not consider materials.

**Mr. Engle** said, however, mass approval today is not necessarily giving approval for the additional story.

**Ms. Ward** explained that if the petitioner does not meet the material standard, they do not get the additional story. This makes it a conditional approval. If they do not meet the condition, then it is not approved.

**Dr. Williams** asked staff if the Board has within its power to deny the extra story even if it conforms.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes. She will explain the standards later; but presently, she is giving the Board an overview of what the petitioner is proposing. However, the petitioner is eligible for an additional story because they are large scale development. But, this does not mean that the petitioner is entitled to it.

**Mr. Merriman** said "eligible" means the project has to meet the criteria.

**Ms. Ward** said yes. The criteria has to be met and it also has to be visually compatible. Therefore, this Board has to make a determination whether it is compatible.

**Mr. Merriman** asked that even if the criteria is met, it may not be visually compatible.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes.

**Ms. Ward** stated that staff was notified by a member of the public [she believes it would be best dealt with in the site plan review process] regarding the proximity of the parking garage to the property line. There may be some code issues here because of the fire rating on the property line. She explained that this would be something that the petitioner would need to work with Building Department on as the Historic Review Board does not have any required setback here. Therefore, it is not a standard of the this Board.

**Mr. Judson** said he was reading the historic map. They know that the Marriott is not within the Historic District. He asked other than this, does the border of

the historic district line up with edge of this property.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes.

**Mr. Howington** said he is excited about this project because of the opportunity to create a nice sense of space; however, he does not understand how it qualifies as a large scale development, but it is exempted from standards; yet underneath the standards since it is a large project, it is so big in complexity, he wanted to make sure the Board is following the ordinance. He asked if the additional story is granted underneath the standards, if it is exempted from the standards, how can it also qualify for an additional story which is underneath the standards. For example, since Factors Walk is exempt from those standards, he wanted this to be qualified for the records.

**Ms. Ward** said since this is an important element, she wanted to try to answer Mr. Howington's question. Ms. Ward explained that the ordinance gives the boundaries of the Factors Walk area which this project is within. Ms. Ward said on page 39 to page 40, [number 5 and 6] the ordinance states that "new construction on the south side of River Street shall not exceed the height map. However, a building or buildings that meet the definition for large scale development are eligible for a maximum of one additional story above the height map providing that one more of the following criteria in Section N[16]e 2-2 are met. She said also under #6 it says that "new construction on Factors Walk is exempt from commercial and large scale development standards."

**Mr. Howington** said that he understands this, but he did not understand the "e" part which allows the Board to grant the additional story and he likes it because it is great to provide commercial on the ground floor and/or materials to gain another story which is a great trade off. But, he does not understand how they can adhere to the standards if they are exempt from them, but they are also allowed to provide another story if it falls under the same standards. May be this is a question for the attorney.

**Ms. Ward** said a representative is present at the meeting today from the City Attorney's office to answer questions. However, she will try to explain it again. She explained that this allows an additional story above the height map provided that one of the criteria is met in Section 2. An additional standard in this section says that the construction is exempt from the large scale development standards.

**Ms. Ward** clarified that normally within the Historic District, we have a map that says you can build this many stories. But, this is one location in the Factors Walk area where it is actually measured in feet. Therefore, it is a little different than what is done within the Oglethorpe plan of the district or even in the west boundary area. The forty-five (45) feet above Bay Street results in 87 feet above mean sea level. Under the height map, this is what the petitioner is permitted to build to.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends the following:

**HOTEL 1:**

Approval of Part I, Phase A, Height and Mass of Hotel 1 with the following conditions:

1. Provide a continuous wall plane on the western end of the River Street (north) facade.
2. Approval of the additional story provided that the material standard is met and the sustainable roof certified by the City Manager and submitted with the Part II Design Details application for the Certificate of Appropriateness.

**PARKING GARAGE:**

Continue Part I, Phase A, Height and Mass of the Parking Garage for consideration of the following items:

1. Ground floor height for the active ground floor uses be a minimum of 14 feet in height to be consistent with ground floor commercial building heights in the proposed development and in the historic district.
2. Reduce the height of the parapet at the eight foot-six inch portion of the top floor.
3. Reduce the height of the building at the southeast corner adjacent to General McIntosh Boulevard at the eastern property line. Eliminate the fire stair and five spaces within this segment to reduce the height at the corner, the overall height of the building, and the size of the additional story.

**HOTEL 2:**

Continue Part I, Phase A, Height and Mass of Hotel 2 for consideration of the following items:

1. Break up the massing of the two-story segment along the river front. Reconsider the vertical element at the far western end of the structure.
2. Increase the north setback of the western half of the hotel segment along the waterfront to be consistent with the line of continuity established by the proposed development along the waterfront.
3. The height should not exceed two-stories forward of the adjacent Marriott Hotel in order to be compatible with neighboring structures to which it is visually related and to continue the one- and two-story character of new development adjacent to the river walk.

**RETAIL BUILDINGS 1-4:**

Continue Part I, Phase A, Height and Mass of Retail Buildings 1-4 for consideration of the following items:

1. Extend the gable roof to the south end of the building to be more compatible with buildings in the historic district. The exterior of the building should echo the change in design provided in the broken roof shape which may help break up the massing of the structures.
2. Reduce the overall height of the structures. The second floor should not exceed the height of the first floor.
3. Eliminate the bridges between structures. If the bridges are determined to be appropriate, the roof should be eliminated to be compatible with bridges in the Factors Walk area and to reduce the physical and visual obstructions to the river view.
4. Reduce the height of the center elevator projection as much as possible; consider a flat roof.

**Mr. Engle** asked staff to show on the plan how much the staff is recommending be

reduced to the parking garage.

**Ms. Ward** explained that her concern is it is the lowest point of the site and is adjacent to open space. There is no building here; therefore, the height is just more apparent.

**Dr. Henry** asked would it be advantageous to widen the spaces some more between the four retail shops.

**Ms. Ward** said the spaces are twenty (20) feet wide. Staff is not recommending this, but it is at the discretion of this Board. Twenty (20) feet is significant in the historic district.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Ward if she said that Hotel 1 would use the existing office building as the one west of it.

**Ms. Ward** answered that she believes the heights are compatible. They may be not be exactly the same, but they are similar. She believes this is what compatibility is about.

**Mr. Engle** asked Ms. Ward to clarify how in the four retail buildings the staff determined by the mass the height of the stories on the interior.

**Ms. Ward** replied that staff did not determine the height on the interior.

**Mr. Engle** said Ms. Ward stated reduce the height on the second floor, but if all they are looking at is mass, how does she know where the height of the second floor is?

**Ms. Ward** answered that based on the drawings that the petitioner has submitted [the floor to floor height] the height of the second floor is both visually more apparent.

**Mr. Engle** said, however, they do not see this on the outside.

**Ms. Ward** answered that she believes they will see it on the outside because the petitioner is delineating the difference between the first and second floor through canopies and projections. Therefore, she believes it will be apparent.

**Mr. Engle** said he was not questioning this, but was just wondering how the Board is supposed to deal with this as a mass issue.

**Ms. Ward** said she believes that it will be apparent based on the model, the renderings and elevations that have been submitted that the ground floor height is significantly lower.

**Mr. Engle** asked staff if the Fire Department has commented on the ten story parking garage.

**Ms. Ward** answered that the Fire Department has not commented.

**Ms. Ward** stated that before the Board moves forward with this hearing, she wanted to bring to the Board's attention the public comments that have been submitted to staff. Two emails were received and were enclosed in the Board's packet. They were from Brian

Luckett and Kelly Luckett. They are both in opposition to the project. They have concerns about the impact of the development. Since the release of the packets, staff has received two letters in support of the project. They have been provided to the Board in their folders. One is in support of the project from William Hubbard of the Savannah Area Chamber of Commerce. The other letter is from Hugh Tollison of the Savannah Economic Development Authority.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Shay said** he was present on behalf of their client, Northpoint Hospitality. Accompanying him at today's meeting were: Saad Al Jassar and Maggie Ward. He believed that Northpoint was being represented by their area General manager, Whipp Tripplet. They are the purchasers for the development. The seller is Georgia Power and was being represented by Swann Seiler. Northpoint was also being represented by their attorney, Mr. Harold Yellin. He said that Attorney Yellin would make a brief introduction and then he would come back and explain the architectural portion of the project.

**Ms. Ramsay** explained that the petitioner makes his or her presentation. The petitioner is Mr. Shay and Mr. Yellin is the attorney. She asked Attorney Shearouse for a ruling on this.

**Attorney Shearouse** said the attorney would make his comments and then the petitioner makes his comments.

**Attorney Yellin** said his comments would be brief. What he was going to say may actually not be necessary because of the comments made by Ms. Ramsay before the hearing began which he appreciates the letter that was read into the record. However, he said as a matter of housekeeping, Mr. Shay of course address the architectural issues, but they felt from a point of perspective of complete disclosure, they wanted to let the Board know how they got to be here today. This is very important to them. Attorney Yellin said several months ago before they filed the first piece of paper they met with actually six (6) members of the MPC staff [not one staff member but six] as they recognized that this was a unique piece of property. The size of the property is unusual, four acres in downtown Savannah. It has enormous investment that is required for this project. They knew it was unique in every sense of the word. Therefore, they met with staff knowing full well that they had two options; either coming initially to the Historic Review Board which is what they would ordinarily do if this was a single building or go to City Council as they did do because there were multiple buildings on four acres. After consultation with staff they made the decision to go to City Council. He said this as it is important to them that there was no attempt to circumvent any process. It was determined collectively that this was the correct procedure and this is the one they followed. Therefore, they went to City Council for a determination of what their envelop would look like and he appreciates the comments made by Ms. Ramsay that this Board now recognize that this is the height map.

**Attorney Yellin** said they consider this to be a very important property right which they have now acquired. It was considered by City Council and was approved by City Council. He guessed where they end up having a little bit of discussion is on one hand they believe it is an important property right and as Ms. Ward has said [it appears in her staff report] on one page it may say that the number of stories on the height map "shall be permitted subject to certain exceptions or counting of stories" and in other sections of the

report it will say, "new construction shall be permitted to the number of stories as shown by the height map, but height of buildings and height of individual components shall be visually compatible to contributing structures to which it is visually related." He said, therefore, they have a little bit of friction and this is the part they have to get through and this is what they are prepared to get through. They are very much okay with the idea of discussing facade and rhythm of structures including setbacks and parking standards and the massing as noted in Ms. Ward's report. Where they have greater concern is when they start talking about moving floors and taking away square footage; taking away rooms.

**Attorney Yellin** said he brings this to the Board's attention as they know there will be some give and take; this is a part of the process. But, they do feel very strongly that there is a property right acquired. The most important thing that he can tell the Board is to please know that they are prepared to work with them and that the petition follow a course of action only after meeting with the MPC staff and that it was approved by City Council on June 28, 2012. They appreciate the Board's recognition of this fact.

**Mr. Shay** came forward and thanked Attorney Yellin for his comments. He wanted to begin his remarks and maybe asking for clarification. He questioned whether his remarks were limited to thirty (30) minutes. as the petitioner.

**Ms. Ramsay** answered no.

**Mr. Shay** said he did not intend to take thirty (30) minutes, but he just wanted to know. He said he wanted to begin by saying to them all that their teams' commitment is to create a place that is every much a part of Savannah as River Street and Rousakis Plaza which were created about forty (40) years ago. They are going to be talking about individual buildings, shapes of windows, and eventually about a lot of other things. But, they are deeply committed to the idea of creating another amazing place in Savannah along the Riverfront and they want to work with the Board to make sure that they get as good a place as they possibly can. They are committed to taking the time that it takes and taking the effort that it takes to make sure that they get it exactly right. This extends to his team and also to his engineers, landscape architects and everybody that is working on the project.

**Mr. Shay** explained that one of the things they struggled with early on in the design process was seeking as they ordinarily do in their works within the Historic District, for the appropriate context. What are they going to relate to? In the center core of the Historic District this is usually a lot easier in the sense that there is plenty to relate to. He wanted to point out to the Board that if they blindfolded somebody from anywhere in the world; especially the United States, and brought them to this place and took the blindfold off, and said, "where are you?" He doubts seriously that the individual would immediately say, "Oh, I am in Savannah, Georgia." Because, what they have in this place is a context that really looks an awful lot more like Atlanta. You can see in the photograph that it is a tall building [Atlanta does not have as good a river as we do], and a surface parking lot. He has been to Atlanta many times and probably the Board has, too. Atlanta is a city full of tall buildings surrounded by small oceans of asphalt parking lots. Another very prominent building that they see when visiting the site [although it is not in the Historic District] when looking across the river is another very large scale

building that looks more like Buckhead than it does Savannah, Georgia. Therefore, one of the things that they want the Board to understand is that they decided that they were going to cast the net a little bit wider in order to look for the appropriate context in some cases and in other cases they were going to ignore some of the adjacent buildings with the visually relationship to.

**Mr. Shay** said historically this area in about 1920 was very much industrial in character. They can even see up there across from their site that a massive structure was up there which was the Atlantic Gas Light. This entire area was an area of industry that was devoted to unloading ships full of coal, moving the coal up hill and converting it into natural gas up on the high bluff of Savannah. This still cast a shadow in a lot of ways over what this site is to this very day. As the designers, they decided to look a little wider for appropriate context. They looked at the skyline of Savannah and in this particular case, they can see from Hutchinson Island and what they saw was that in places it is a very active skyline. They looked at other successful examples of smaller scale elements of hotels and they were very much taken by the two level porch that they saw on the front of the Marshall House. They like the proportion of the Savannah Cotton Exchange for the smaller buildings; they looked historically at some of the other large-scale hotels that were in the downtown area fifty (50), sixty (60) or eighty (80) years ago and one of the things they saw were very strong cornices and in the case of the now gone John Wesley Hotel, a roof garden was up there that must have been for its view and this is now an office, but of course it was original the Manger Hotel. They saw some of the old industrial railroad buildings that still remain and they like the roof lines and some of the proportions that can be learned from this. They certainly like the materials. They like the awnings, but they like the awnings that staff seems to like in the Ellis Square as well; the Kress Building type awnings are straight metal awnings.

**Mr. Shay** said they have always loved the idea of creating loggias. There are not many remaining examples of them in Savannah. They actually came across the roof line and the colonnades from what was once our great train station, which has since been demolished. It looks to him for all the world like the train shed that was behind this building that was demolished so that we could make way for I-16 was probably a glazed train shed of somewhat of a grand train station that are prevalent in Paris that have been preserved. He said they also found that they like some of the temple forms that were found in the major buildings along the area. None of these are in the ward and none of these are necessarily directly visually related, but they felt that they were much more relevant than the Westin on Hutchinson Island or the big box Marriott that is immediately adjacent, either of which sort of knows that they are in Savannah to this date.

**Mr. Shay** said there are other elements that they are particularly taken by. He does not know if the Board wants to get into the meat and potatoes of talking about the height of the buildings, but in the area of Factors Walk they think there are elements that they want to try and use in order to create this next great place along Savannah's riverfront. He said he would let the Board enjoy the photograph without telling them what each and everyone of them are, but relatively steep and relatively narrow staircases are certainly part of what they think of when approaching the waterfront. This is also about openings and about the bridges that are along Factors Walk. This is one of the more unique places in Savannah; one of the main character defining elements of Savannah is that we have these wonderful open bridges and connectors between the buildings that are in these areas. They would like to use these as cues for their design as they go forward.

He knows that they will get in the nitty gritty of are the windows three (3) feet wide and five and one-half (5 1/2) feet high. But, he wanted to let the Board know that these things are the things that they think of as being in their designer tool box as they move forward.

**Mr. Shay** explained that when he says they want to make a place in Savannah that is as good as the place that Bob Joyner and Eric Meyerhoff created forty (40) odd years ago in Rousakis Plaza he wanted the Board to understand that what this is about is what he thinks of now as common ground. Mr. Shay said he was very struck by the fact that what they are talking about the places where people can congregate. These places are not all the same, but they are very different from the photograph that he showed the Board that looked like Houston, Texas or Atlanta, GA. He said what those involved are having different types of spaces so that we have the Riverwalk as an extension and have a large area that feels like a public park. Mr. Shay said so the Board can get an idea of the scale, [pointing to an area] that area right there is the same size as Franklin Square. It is not a huge park, but it is also not diminutive. They also think that this plaza that is up at the top in front of what he will refer to as the SEPCO building [he knows it is Georgia Power] and John McIntosh in the process of creating a nice plaza up here because this corner over here is the corner of the National Landmark Historic District and right now you would think you are falling off the edge of the planet when you get there because there is no place that you can go at this time. They would like to create a great place where the people can gather and congregate here and then a relatively narrow descending set of stairs so that if you are up on the high bluff in the National Landmark District, then you would finely be able to have a way to get down and connect through into the Riverfront.

**Mr. Shay** said in the private realm they have a great courtyard space [pointing to an area] that is going to be here and another will be here that relates to River Street and also open up to the public realm in a way that is very attractive. He said there is a challenge to doing this; creating common ground means that you are not going to use some of the territory that your client has paid or will pay so dearly for. You will sort of surrender that back into the public realm even if it is on private property, but invite people to walk on it, pass through it and permeate it. Mr. Shay said, therefore, leaving enough common ground means that you have to also concentrate the buildings. He said if you want to have great spaces in and around all of these buildings, then to some extent not over doing it, they need to be able to concentrate the buildings into relatively small footprints. The current map would allow this entire area to be covered up with a two-story building. However, he thinks this would be tragic and he obviously would not present this to the Board as an architect. Mr. Shay said [pointing to an area] the current map would allow this entire area to be as tall as now three stories or forty five (45) feet above Bay Street. He said what they have chosen to do is to take this and subtract from it in order to be able to create the kind of places that they think make this of Savannah.

Another important thing he wanted to tell the Board is that very early on they chose to relate to the SEPCO building. He remembers the first time he went



over here that it was not his favorite kind of architecture [he is more of a classical or neo-classical guy] but the more they got into this building and the more they measured it and the more they studied it and the more they looked at the drawings that were prepared by that engineering group and a local architect for the interiors, the more they fell in love with it. They decided that they wanted to recommend to their client that rather than do what might be the obvious thing which would probably be to demolish it and use the large foot print in this area, that they ought to reuse it. Give it another fifty (50) years of potential going into the future and then they ought to relate to that building as the only really immediately adjacent bit of historic context. They also chose very early on to turn their backs on the Marriott. This building was not originally designed for Savannah, it was designed for Louisville, Kentucky and just ended up here by a strange set of circumstances. It is not a building of Savannah and as it was pointed out by the staff, it is a building which was not subjected to the standards. Mr. Shay said they would like in their design to basically cover this up so that as you were walking down the River Street frontage or walking through the National Landmark Historic District that when you got to the point where you saw this vista you did not see that, but saw a beautiful building that was designed to the standards that they have painstakingly developed and that they want to bring before the Board to show that they meet for what historic compatibility is in this day and age in Savannah, GA.

**Mr. Shay** said, therefore, today what they are presenting to the Board is their strategy to meet these goals in terms of a mass, proportions, and setbacks. As staff has presented to the Board, they are very excited about the opportunity once they cross these thresholds to come back to the Board with the elements that the ordinance describes as the building blocks of compatibility. These have to do with solids and voids, the rhythms, and also the vocabulary that they are going to choose for the building, themselves. They look forward to coming back.

**Mr. Shay** said he would close his remarks by saying this is hard work and he knows it is hard work for the Historic Review Board. He knows also that it is not fun to come to meetings that are like this and have to make difficult decisions, but this could be a way for us to work together and actually have fun and enjoy ourselves in creating a really wonderful place. He told the Board that the presentation by their staff and he wanted to compliment Ms. Ward that he really enjoys working with her. He has had a lot of great meetings with her and Mr. Thomson presenting ideas and getting feedback. The level of the staff report that the Board just saw, he believes is excellent. He was not going to tell the Board that he was happy with every single thing that he read in it. There is something that they do need to discuss which is the notion of limiting how far the roof tower can project beyond one of the ugliest buildings in Savannah as if they have to relate to it, but do they actually have to showcase it. Mr. Shay if the Board looks at it, the side that they are covering up does not have windows in the hotel rooms. He said whoever design this building from Louisville, Kentucky knew that there would be a building right next to it in Savannah some day.

**Mr. Shay** said he understands what Ms. Ward wants and perhaps there could be

a logical line of buildings along the riverfront as a consequence and they will be able to see the Marriott beyond where the tower steps back. He said for them, it means that they would sacrifice from their program on the order of about twenty (20) hotel rooms and on top of this, they would be good hotel rooms. They would be rooms that were on the front where you would be able to look up and down the river in both directions. He promised the Board that they would put windows on the side that looks up the river, unlike the Marriott. Mr. Shay said, therefore, in order to give this up, they would need to find some way to meet their program and get something in return. Now, there is a potential solution and that is what they have presented did not ask for a one-story height bonus on this particular tower. When he came before the Metropolitan Planning Commission (MPC) with the petition to them as Attorney Yellin pointed out, the drive path that they were asked to go through one of the more prominent MPC Board members said, I think you are being too timid, I think you need to propose a much taller building. Frankly, he believes that sentiment might have carried the day, but that is not what they want to do. What they want to do is present a building that is tall enough so that it ends the vista along River Street and makes it of an architecture that is compatible, rather than an architecture that is incompatible so that the range is completed in a way that even from Hutchinson Island, you would be able to tell where Savannah's Historic District ended and where the modernest place began.

**Mr. Shay** said there is a potential solution here, but he needs to hear from the Board as to what their attitude is towards all the elements that is on this because at the end of the day, it is an ensemble; it is a bit of a zero sum game. If they want to subtract from some place, then he has to figure out in order to meet his client's goals and expectations and the seller's price point, he has figure out a way to recover and recoup something in return for that. Mr. Shay said he really believes that without dissecting the staff's report too closely he would like to keep the bridges between the little buildings. However, he wanted to digress here and tell the Board that the reason is it would have been much easier to present one building that did not have that space between them. Mr. Shay said believe him if the buildings were one building it would be much smaller than the footprint of the Crab Shack. However, they deliberately chose to make more openings in there so that the part of the walk along River Street would be much more permeable. But, they would like to have them connected at the second level through the little bridges so that people could walk in at the lower level directly off of River Street, but then the upper level might be a restaurant or another business function at the top that you would get to at least in part by going up the little stairs that would be here. Mr. Shay asked the Board to please carefully consider this because it would really break his heart to be back before the Board in another month presenting two buildings instead of four or maybe one building instead of four.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Shay how he felt about the staff's recommendation that the bridges be transparent such as the Factors Walk bridges uncovered, just metal, very transparent such as in the pictures.

**Mr. Shay** said he totally agrees.

**Dr. Williams** said Mr. Shay explained that there is a narrow walkway the SEPCO building and the new hotel number one (1). He said that Mr. Shay referred to it as a narrow walkway, but he did not notice this on the plans. How narrow is the walkway?

**Mr. Shay** answered that presently, it is about eight (8) feet.

**Mr. Engle** said as he understood the staff's recommendation in relationship to the Marriott, they were not talking about exposing the Marriott to view, but only talking about pulling the tower back so that it would be on line with the head of the Marriott. Therefore, it would not be exposing the Marriott for view, but just pulling back twenty (20) to thirty (30) feet of the river view that would be obstructed.

**Mr. Shay** stated that it would expose the Marriott to view, but it is not likely that you would see the entire view that he showed. You would not see 120 feet on the riverfront, but you would be able to see the Marriott. They would be pulling it back so that in perspective if this room tower was punched back, you would then be able to see the Marriott as you were walking up and down the riverfront.

**Mr. Engle** said he did not see how because the Marriott is set back from the riverwalk. It is about 50 feet to the south.

**Mr. Shay** said it would be a ten-story building with a two-story building in the foreground.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Ramsay** reminded the persons who would be making public comments that when they come to the microphone, please state their name. The remarks should be addressed to the Board and should be confined to the facts of the petition under the purview of the Review Board. This specifically does not include issues such as parking or financial impact over which the Review Board has no control. She explained that each side of the issue has thirty (30) minutes. Mr. Howington is the timekeeper. Ms. Ramsay reminded the persons to state whether they are for or against the petition.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the Board would hear first the public comments from persons who are for the petition.

**Ms. Swann Seiler** said she was representing the Georgia Power Company. She stated that Georgia Power and its predecessors have been a part of the Historic District for over 200 years. In fact, they chose to keep their corporate headquarters in the Historic District. They have confidence in this developer; they have a proven track record and they feel that their plans are consistent with the City's vision for the future. Therefore, they support this.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if anyone else was present to speak on behalf of the

petition.

**Ms. Ramsay** [as no one else came forward to speak for the petition] said that the Board would now hear from the public who were against the petition. She reminded them that they would have thirty (30) minutes.

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said that they do not necessarily oppose the petition, but they do have some comments to make.

**Ms. Meunier** commented Ms. Ward on the staff's report. She said it was very thorough and the HSF agrees with all of the points Ms. Ward is making. However, the HSF wanted to add to the second part of the staff's recommendation that HSF agrees for the continuance of Part I, Phase A, of the parking garage, hotel 2 and the retail buildings. They also would like to reinforce some of the points that Ms. Ward has made as well as add some points. She will make her points building by building.

**Ms. Meunier** said for the parking garage, the HSF strongly agree with staff that the height of the building should be reduced along General McIntosh which is the south facade. They feel that it should be dropped at least to the height of the belt course that is indicated in the renderings. When Ms. Ward was reviewing this she pointed the level out and the HSF feels that it should be reduced at least to that point if not lower so that it will not overwhelm the adjacent Trustees Garden and be more appropriate. This is the lowest point of the site.

**Mr. Engle** asked Ms. Meunier to pinpoint this on elevation so that the Board would be aware of the areas that she is talking about.

**Ms. Meunier** pointed out on the elevation that they feel it should be reduced at least to this point if not lower on this corner. She said [pointing to an area on the elevation] that the staff is recommending this, but not specific about how low it should be, but the HSF thinks it should be at least there. Additionally, she knows that some questions came up about the fire code and so forth in their review, but the HSF wanted to bring it to the Board's attention as well as to the petitioner's attention that the eastern facade of the parking garage is right on the property line. She believes this affects the openings that they can have on the property line for fire code and at the same time, there is also are certain requirements for parking garages that require certain openings for ventilation and safety. This is something that would need to be addressed.

**Ms. Meunier** for said for Hotel 2, they strongly agree with staff's recommendation that the height of hotel 2 should not exceed two stories forward of the Marriott Hotel along the north facade and the riverwalk. Based on their estimations from the area site plan, it is a variation of 20 to 40 feet forward of the Marriott and this is a very significant distance. The HSF also believes that both the eastern mechanical tower at the top of the building on the highest story as well the matching western element should be reconsidered,

particularly the roof shape.

**Dr. Henry** informed Ms. Meunier that it would be helpful to him if she would point out the areas she was talking about.

**Ms. Meunier** pointed out that she was talking about this area and the western matching element that is at the two-story level. They agree with staff that it is evident that the second story is higher than the height of the first story from the exterior. Therefore, the HSF agrees with the point that the second story should not be a larger floor-to-floor height. She said with regards to Hotel 1, HSF has the following concerns: it has been mentioned that the stairway that is proposed between the existing SEPCO building and the new hotel building will be eight (8) feet wide. They feel that it will create a "shoot effect" sort of like a wind tunnel and they think it is too narrow. There are some stairways that go down to River Street between buildings that are narrow. The ones they looked at in particular [she may not be referencing the ones that the petitioner is talking about], they measured ten and one-half (10 1/2) feet to fourteen (14) feet in width and these were between buildings that are two to three stories tall. In this case, they are looking at eight feet surrounded by buildings for the new hotel that will be between five (5) and eight (8) stories; this will be soaring upward and they believe this will be too narrow.

**Ms. Meunier** said another point is that the minimum ground floor height of fourteen (14) feet is typically recommended for commercial and active uses. Ms. Ward has pointed out that in this case it is Factors Walk character area and, therefore, the standards do not necessarily apply, but because it is being made as a recommendation for the parking garage, with Hotel 1 they are meeting that requirement on River Street at the ground floor. They are not looking at doors yet, but on the Bay Street facade, if there are going to be any entrances and the facade will be active, the HSF thinks there should be some incorporation of higher floor heights. It is currently nine (9) feet because it is the third floor in the overall hotel. But, this would also help to address the relation between the adjacent Georgia Power building. The existing Georgia Power building has very tall floor-to-floor heights.

**Ms. Meunier** said lastly staff made a point about the Hotel 1 and recommended a continuous plane along River Street. To address this point as well as a lot of the other points that both the HSF and staff have made, they think that there maybe a way to reconfigure the site plan. She understood that the petitioner has spent a lot of time looking at this and that many months have gone into this project, she was not trying to discount this at all, but they think that there may be away to restudy how this configuration happens with River Street and this building. To create a more rectilinear lot for Hotel 1 so that they do not have such an odd shape that would allow more regular building shape and footprint as well as more space to build rooms. Also, relocate some of the parking from the parking garage underneath Hotel 1, to be hidden by the bluff, so that you can potentially take some of those additional stories off of the top of the parking garage. She said that she would actually look to Mr. Stuebe who has a visual.

**Mr. Judson** said that Meunier mentioned that the Hotel 1 is under proposal today. The idea that the other portions of this are to be continued, he believes is just the staff's suggestion. He said, therefore, to clarify the entire project is proposed today with the recommendation that those components be continued.

**Mr. Merriman** said the petitioner would have to ask for the continuance.

**Mr. Judson** agreed with Mr. Merriman and said that he just wanted to be sure that they all were clear that at this point, the petitioner has not asked for a continuance and the Board is considering the entire proposal.

**Mr. Engle** said he wanted to get one more clarification from the staff before the next public comment. He asked if the trolley [streetcar] line is public right-of-way. This isn't a part of this property. Therefore, nothing can be done with the curb of the trolley line.

**Dr. Williams** said this is River Street.

**Ms. Ward** clarified that Mr. Engle was correct. Nothing could be done without some type of partnership to realign the street and pull up the tracks.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked the public to continue with their comments.

**Mr. Stuebe** came forward and stated that he was representing the Downtown Neighborhood Association (DNA) as well as the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF). He said they are concerned that the design of this project is being driven by the existing road pattern of the east end of River Street which is the curb line of the street and has the road track does in fact have the road rail tracks in it. Mr. Stuebe explained that he believes this came into being because of the railroad. They suggest that an approach be adopted that relates to the historic rectilinear road pattern that existed within the proposed project area and predominates as well in the Historic Landmark District of Savannah. He said [pointing to an area] that historically the road came through here and turned in a sharp angle to the right to come out to Bay Street and McIntosh Boulevard. As a result of using the historic street pattern much of the proposed site plan disproportion the amount of space to the interior circulation streets as shown in drawing S-2.

**Mr. Stuebe** [pointing to a section] said, therefore, they have this street here and another street here. Therefore, all the space in here is kind of devoted to circulation more than pedestrian use. He said that they suggest that the site plan be revised to rectilinear street grid and that the interior of the site be more fully built out with two multi-story buildings and, thereby, affording the ability to open the eastern end of River Street to the Savannah River. By taking this approach and straightening out the street, you would be able to build designs that are compatible with a flush interior within the Factors Walk character area of which this project is a part as per page seven (7) of the staff's report. The currently proposed structures within multi-facets and setbacks are not visually

compatible with the Factors Walk character area.

**Mr. Stuebe** said that the existing road or the trolley tracks could be rerouted through the proposed park or square as was done historically in downtown Savannah. He explained that what they are suggesting is [pointing to an area] that this area be a park and the tracks go through the track area. This will also open up this part of the site to the river because all of this is being blocked now with the two-story extension. By building a bigger bulk here you could then open up the site to the river and still have the same amount of square footage in the project. As Ms. Meunier said, they could also put some of the parking under the bluff in this area and reduce the size of the parking garage on this site.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Stuebe if he was saying that volume of the structures would remain the same.

**Mr. Stuebe** answered that this would have to be studied, but what he is doing is substituting space that is not built out and opening it up as a park or open area to the river. He said [pointing to a section] that this space here is not in accordance with the ordinance. The buildings are meant to be perpendicular to the river, not parallel as is. Mr. Stuebe said, therefore, this is not appropriate and has to be changed to be at least like these. It would be wonderful if they could be opened to the river because the entire project as you walk down River Street is very confining and you really lose the whole view of the river.

**Dr. Henry** said it was somewhat difficult for him to see Mr. Stuebe's steps. He asked Mr. Stuebe if he was retaining the pocket park in this idea.

**Mr. Stuebe** answered yes. He said [pointing to an area] that the pocket park would be right here.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Stuebe to put his sketch on a white background as he believed this would enable the Board to read it better.

**Mr. Stuebe** explained that the double crossings are the two-story buildings. The angle parts are the multi-story buildings. They can play with the height of the buildings and so forth in exchange for opening up the site to the river as this would really do and make it less confining.

**Mr. Merriman** said it is a whole new approach.

**Mr. Stuebe** said he believes that it is more consistent with the overall character of the Factors Walk area which the current project is not. If they look at the hotel on the model, it has no visual compatibility with Factors Walk.

**Mr. Daniel Carey** came forward as a downtown resident. He wanted to acknowledge something that Mr. Shay said in the beginning, it is difficult, it is a challenging site, and is a challenging project. Mr. Carey said clearly there has been a lot of effort put into this, which he respects and appreciates. He believes that they all are in this together. He thinks that the invitation to

collaboration is really our responsibility. When Mr. Shay opened with this, he was reminded of what City Council talked about when they considered amending the Height Map. Council gave a lot of considerations, may be not as many as he would like to design and may be more towards economic considerations. Mr. Carey said ultimately, Council concluded that they would allow the Height Map to be amended because they felt comfortable that this would all go back to the Historic District Board of Review and that we/you would make it right, which is a big charge. He said that the Board may or may not be comfortable with this charge of responsibility, but this is really what City Council said. Council said they could do this because it will all get fixed at HDBR.

**Mr. Carey** said they are talking about the cradle of Savannah and this is an immensely important site. Therefore, they must give it their best to come up with the best product here. He also wanted to comment on several things that Attorney Yellin said regarding property rights, which he certainly respects. But, his interpretation of what Attorney Yellin said was that there is this individual property right that needed to be respected as if it was sacrosanct, which he does not necessarily agree that it is and he does not know that it is all that individual. He believes the property right here is collective because this is a very public space. There is private property and there is public property and it is very much shared. Mr. Carey said he believes that what happens down there is going to be shared and is collective. So, therefore, those property rights are not so individually based as much as they are collectively based that we all have a right to this and the best space that we can. Therefore, those views that we are talking about preserving, whether it is somebody's perspective about the point of reference being the Marriott or the point of reference being Hotel 2 being sort of the end of something and that becoming the focal point. Mr. Carey said he guessed, in his opinion, the river is the focal point and this is really what they ought to be respecting. He hopes that when people walk along Factors Walk, the riverfront and so on that they really are appreciating the water and the human scale that you get when you are next to sea level. To change that would alter this so dramatically with tall buildings.

**Mr. Carey** said, therefore, he believes that what Mr. Stuebe has brought up back to the original charge, that this will take a lot of ideas and a lot of good people's input to bring this together, opens up certainly the possibility that there are many questions yet about this project as it is proposed. In his mind at least it isn't visually compatible right now as proposed. He certainly agrees with staff's recommendations that if they were to consider anything today it would be Hotel 1. Mr. Carey does not believe they are in any position yet; there are too many questions and too many options for the other buildings.

**Mr. Carey** stated that he appreciates the idea that a citizen or a DNA representative as put forth, but to him it just underscores the importance of getting this right by taking more time, which he was glad to hear Mr. Shay offer, and getting some real input and being as creative as they can be to take care of this great public space, the cradle of Savannah; this shared collective space that we all are going to live with for many, many years. He said he personally does



not believe that they have visual compatibility yet; he thinks there is more work to do and he certainly will lend whatever he can do towards achieving this.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Carey if he was suggesting that the Board consider Hotel 1.

**Mr. Carey** said if anything, he agrees with staff that Hotel 1 could be discussed at great length, but he does not believe that the others are right.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Howington [the assigned timekeeper] if the Board had more time for public comments.

**Mr. Howington** said they have a total of eighteen minutes used. Therefore, they have twelve more minutes.

**Ms. Ramsay** entertained more comments from the public.

**Mr. Terry Koller**, Director of Railroad Operations for the Georgia State Railroad Museum. He is an employee of the Coastal Heritage Society. He also manages the maintenance and repair of the River Street Streetcar. Mr. Koller said he just wanted to offer a word of caution on Mr. Steube's proposed plan. He believes that even though the City owns the railroad track right-of-way, but they are required to keep it open for future railroad freight use in case of an emergency or short term use by the Port. Therefore, they might want to be careful on how that alignment is changed if the plan was to go ahead. He appreciates the fact that it was accommodated in the idea through the park. The streetcar can accommodate tighter curbs and closely clearances, but the freight railroad can not. Therefore, they might want to check on what the requirements are for this.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if there were any more public comments. No one came forward. She then advised Mr. Shay that he had the right to respond to the public comments.

**Mr. Shay** said he was looking forward to the Board's discussion because this is really a crossroad moment to the project for him to make a recommendation to his client as to what they should or should not expect of the process going forward. He said, however, two things are worth addressing and he appreciates the fact that the non-architects in the group realize that they have studied this for a long, long time. This is what they do and he cannot describe the enormous responsibility and liability that are associated with being in this place at this time and this moment.

**Mr. Shay** said in regards to the fire code about the zero property line parking garage, the current building code requires that a parking garage that is on a zero property line would have a two-hour fire rating. He said that there are a number of different ways to meet that requirement. It could be a solid wall, but it could also be the right kind of glazing and it could also have an automatic fire sprinkler system. There are different ways to meet this. There also could be an accommodation from the adjacent property owner with some kind of easement

and agreement not to build a building right up to their property line. As for as the ventilation requirements; parking garages do not have to be ventilated with free air from the outside of a building, one needs to go only to the underground areas of Ellis Square to see that there are other strategies for ventilating parking garages if necessary.

**Mr. Shay** said with regards to Mr. Stuebe's master plan, frankly it is something that more than a year ago when he was first asked to look at doing the master plan that they studied in earnest. The curb of River Street as Mr. Koller presented to the Board is the City of Savannah's right-of-way, but the railroad, not the trolley, does have a property right [he is not a lawyer], akin to a right of passage to be able to access that track at some point in the future if they ever need it. This is something that is in the deed and in perpetuity. So, the existing rail line is not something that they, as a petitioner or even the City of Savannah, would be able to change themselves.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said he wanted to make a comment on what Mr. Carey said. He asked Ms. Ward to display on the screen the elevation from the river. He said the lack of compatibility is the four buildings. It looks like suburban housing. They have top, top and no river exposure once you are in there. His feelings are he would rather have two four-story buildings with 80 feet of river exposed than plunk, plunk, plunk. They have been boxed in by the Height Ordinance to the point that now they have no river views at all. If they can accommodate two of those retail buildings as another story on a hotel and open up that much of the river. The problem is it is only two stories tall, but so what as now they have no river view. As he has already said, he agrees that they should be pulling the eight story tower back 30 feet.

**Dr. Williams** said he wanted to understand what Mr. Engle was saying. For clarification, he asked Mr. Engle if he was saying that he would rather see those buildings taller, but fewer of them.

**Mr. Engle** answered that Mr. Shay made the statement that he would come back next month with one big building that took up the entire site, two-stories tall. Well, he would rather see two buildings connected with 60 feet of river open space between them than he would four plunk, plunk, plunk with 20 feet between them. If there is any landscaping, it would restrict the view more. You are going to possibly have a second floor connector walkway. There is no river exposure at all anymore and he would rather combine them into two longer buildings with four times more space between them that is dedicated to the public. This is, in a way, what Mr. Stuebe suggested before of having a park. Mr. Engle said pull these into two buildings and then you will have a park between them.

**Dr. Henry** questioned that, therefore, it would be two-six story buildings.

**Mr. Engle** answered no. Take one of those double buildings and put it

underneath the hotel and give the hotel the additional story and use it for retail. Then you would only have two of those here.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes one of the things to consider is that first of all these are captive two stories. He believes the site does not permit anything higher than two-stories. In fact, the staff has suggested that they be lowered in profile which he thinks is essential. He believes the site also has to be considered not only views for River Street, but views from Emmet Park. This is directly in front of the part of Emmet Park where the warehousing ends, you have a view looking down on the Waving Girl and this is probably the best view up the river from the east end of downtown. The lower these could be, are the better. Therefore, the suggestion of consolidating them, he cautions anything higher. In fact, he agrees with staff that they should be absolutely low as possible.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Engle if he was saying that the openings between these four pavilions are sufficient enough, but he would rather see consolidation. Keep the same square footage, but consolidate and open them up may be into two buildings and group the openings somehow. He said that Mr. Engle said there is no context, but if they look in one of the old photos, they can see historically like the two merchants sheds that were built may be five or six years ago that are a little to the west that are oriented with a front gabled roof as these are. Dr. Williams asked Mr. Shay if he was correct in saying that these are front gabled. These are in the spirit of the little pavilions that would be on the north side of River Street. So, they do have an historic precedent of two sheds in their shape and size. But, those sheds were not always like a series of standing soldiers.

**Dr. Williams** commented that if the Board looks at the aerial view [the 1920 view looking west], the nature of this area is if you look at River Street and how it serves an organic element following the contour of the river, he thinks this should be the datum that should be more than anything guiding their hands on this site, not taking a diagonal grid of downtown as was suggested in one of the public comments. Dr. Williams said he believes that River Street first and foremost is the context of this and Factors Walk. He said historically, as they can see in the view looking west, it is very organic and irregular. To him, those four buildings are too regimented and may be two buildings with a bit of a bend between them would pick up that curvature might actually be more in keeping with the spirit of the site and put some space between them. He said, however, he thinks that the geometry or lack of regular geometry and a little more organic could really be taken advantage of in the relationship of these buildings.

**Mr. Howington** said they have the ordinance standards that says buildings should be perpendicular to the street. If they have a longer building, historically the context pattern was to have the gable running east/west. Now, the ordinance states the opposite of that. Therefore, if they end up with a very long building, the correct thing to do would be to put the gable on the shorter end. Mr. Howington said he believes it is a good solution, but they have a conflict.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes they have the power to say that given the unique nature of this site, if they feel that two buildings with side gables running parallel to the river is the best solution right here.

**Mr. Engle** said why side gables; why not a flat roof?

**Dr. Williams** said historically, everything down there is gable; all the sheds.

**Mr. Engle** said everywhere they are flat roofs.

**Dr. Williams** said some are gable and some are flat.

**Mr. Engle** said they are dealing with compatibility of what exist today, not what existed 100 years ago. They are not restoring River Street.

**Dr. Williams** asked what is there to the west, north of River Street.

**Mr. Engle** answered a lot of warehouses, but flatter shed roofs.

**Dr. Williams** said and those two sheds that have gable roofs.

**Mr. Engle** said they do not have to pick the two as an example.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes the best solution for the waterfront is to enhance it and keep it public. Therefore, they are looking for more public space. He said one thing that this project does that he likes is it creates some connectivity to the river. He believes this is important and a bigger larger green space might enhance the public space and open those views.

**Mr. Howington** knows this has been worked on a long time, but to him the orientation of the mechanical tower at the end of River Street seems a little out of place. It looks to replicate a cupola which is in that historical photo. Not that they are repeating historical patterns of buildings, but the historical context of the pattern to him seems not to be the middle of River Street, but as River Street comes around and hits General McIntosh Boulevard, it talks about the end and the beginning and that cupola would be in a better place there because it is always on an axis at the end of the street to create beginning and end of River Street. As you enter River Street to him for the parking garage to turn its back on the Marriott, some of the parking could be linear to the Marriott and put more of a public front on General McIntosh with the cupola and entrance up there because this is such an important entrance. He said to have a parking garage here seems to take away from that importance. It is not about the visual form as much as it is about the physiological form. When you get to the end of that street, you have this big wall of building; stepping it down and creating a landmark tower and hide the parking along the dead zone of the Marriott seems more appropriate to him.

**Mr. Howington** said Hotel 1, has an odd angular shape that seems a little odd

and out of place in Savannah,. There may be a way to get more rooms back; creating a bump out that is more rectilinear instead of angular to follow the road. Therefore, they would be following more of the pattern of Savannah instead of a pattern of the road which is very unique here.

**Dr. Williams** said he wanted to make the comment that this is one of the sites that he thinks of with the organic flow of the warehouses. When you are on River Street, you have this continuous wall of five-story warehouses for most of the length of River Street and then here you get this carved out, oddly shaped courtyard facing the east end of River Street. He said he was not sure why the courtyard is there and what flexibility you have with it but to him this is one of the best opportunities on-site to conform; with something more angular. If this was a warehouse, what would it do on the site? It would have a big courtyard carved out in the middle of it and would basically be angled to conform presumably as a straight line or may be like some of the warehouses actually having an elbow in the middle of them and could be a bent building that would follow something closely to the geometry of the site. Maybe it would have a podium for a few stories and then step back to this tower. Dr. Williams said he has a real issue with the shape of Hotel 1 just in terms of its massing as well as the sawtooth facade of the parking garage, which has these random bump-outs and seven corners facing General McIntosh. It is not going to be a pleasant experience walking pass all those ninety (90) degree angles.

**Dr. Williams** said that he agrees with Mr. Howington. Mr. Shay showed pictures from all over downtown Savannah, but conspicuously absent were any of the warehouses that are immediately to the west of this site. To him the behavior of those warehouses should be the principle. The stairs and walls were shown, you showed the Custom House and the train station, but the historic warehouses that are just a few feet to the west of the site to him are the most important context. He said to behave as if you are continuing that series of buildings would be to him the most compatible issue. More important than height as they relate to the street. To him, the L-shape [he does not know how to describe the parking garage], jagged building is completely incompatible to this site as Mr. Shay feels that the Marriott is. Therefore, he believes that those two buildings for him are the ones that need the most consideration in terms of their massing.

**Mr. Engle** said the point that Ms. Meunier made about the eight (8) foot wide stairway. No one would want to walk down there with an 83 foot building.

**Dr. Williams** said he agrees.

**Mr. Judson** said he wanted to interject a couple of comments. Some of them are counterpoint to comments made by the petitioner and his attorney. He feels compelled to have them on record. Unfortunately, he will be addressing Attorney Yellin's points, but he is not here, but on the matter of property rights, they all are familiar with the process. They all know that the Height Map has been modified. As they saw historically with other height map issues within the district and as he reads in the wording of the Height Map, "they are not compelled to grant to that. The governing factor is still a visual

compatibility." Mr. Judson said from this, he will slide into a comment Mr. Shay made. As a businessman, he certainly understands a big part of Mr. Shay's formula which is the return of investment. He said to Mr. Shay that you have made the term that if we take away here, then we must put something else there. He said he certainly see how this is a part of Mr. Shay's balancing act and is certainly a part of Northpoint's consideration that it is certainly the return of investment factor on this site.

**Mr. Judson** said, however, for the record he just wanted to make sure that they as a Board did not accept that as a doctrine because this is not the case. What they need to end up with is a project that is visually compatible and as they are mandated as a Board, the economic considerations are not theirs; not that he is not sympathetic nor understands them.

**Dr. Henry** said that they all are in agreement and wants to retain as much of the view of the river that they possibly can. He said on this point regarding Hotel 2, the meeting rooms that are according to Mr. Stuebe's point, should be going the other way according to the ordinance. Is this correct?

**Ms. Ramsay** said she believes they all are considered one building. Generally, the ordinance states that they should have a north/side orientation.

**Dr. Henry** asked Attorney Shearouse if this should stand legally the way it is now.

**Attorney Shearouse** answered that a legal question was not being asked, but was asking a contractual question. It seems to him that the question is whether or not that building is north of River Street, east of River Street or northeast of River Street.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the Board gets to decide which direction it is going.

**Attorney Shearouse** answered that this is the Board's job.

**Mr. Engle** said he knows that this will sound horrid, but to his mind, the real issues are unlike staff's recommendation. He said that Hotel 1 and the four retail buildings; these five buildings to him are what is changing the whole character of River Street. He believes they must focus on those four retail buildings and on building Hotel 1. Staff is recommending approving an additional story for Hotel 1 for materials only. Mr. Engle said he is not satisfied with this. He thinks they should approve an additional story for Hotel 1 only if they take two of those retail buildings and shove them underneath Hotel 1 and get them off the river all together. Now, they would have the authority to grant an extra story for retail use if they put another story on there and make the first floor retail. There are options that they can open up the river and he does not think that they all have been explored.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she believes that the staff's recommendation was conditional approval of Hotel 1 and the continuation of the parking garage, Hotel 2 and the

four little buildings. She said as she understood Mr. Engle and perhaps Dr. Williams that they would also like to include Hotel 1 in a continuation.

**Mr. Merriman** asked what if they did this and they put those retail spaces underneath Hotel 1; eliminate two of them. What would keep those spaces open for the future?

**Mr. Engle** said if it is going to be a parking space, they would have to dedicate it and there would have to be some kind of agreement.

**Mr. Merriman** asked if there was a way for the Board to approve it with this being the condition. Do they have the power to say this is how it will be from time and forever?

**Ms. Ramsay** answered that they do not. As they all know this has happened in the past where retail space was on first floors of hotels. They can say that it is retail space and make it fourteen (14) feet high, but they cannot make them put retail in it.

**Mr. Merriman** said if they did that and left, it would come back to the Board.

**Mr. Gay** asked what is to maintain that open space forever. Ten years from now, they might build something there.

**Mr. Engle** said this is the most critical thing to him more than anything else. He is not talking about what was historically there because they know that things change every ten years for the last 300 years. But, they are talking about compatibility today and the compatibility today is when you walk down River Street, you have a big wall on your right [he is assuming you are walking east] and you have consistent views of the river on your left. This will take that away. Therefore, it is not compatible. He believes the Board needs to be pushing and working with the architect to see how they can get this back.

**Ms. Ramsay** pointed out that she and Dr. Henry were present at the MPC meeting that Mr. Shay referred to and one of the MPC members stated "why don't you put more stories on the hotel and get rid of those four little buildings on River Street?" She said this was a part of the member's statement. Ms. Ramsay said she believes the Board is now at the point where they can ask the petitioner if he wishes for this petition to be continued.

**Dr. Williams** said he was not sure if they adequately addressed staff recommendation of pulling back the multi-story north end of Hotel 2. He said he believes that Mr. Shay's perspective for persons walking on the northernmost walkway along the edge of the river that if you pull it back, you would probably see more of the Marriott, but to him more critical is the historical relationship of the upper part of the bluff where there is the ole harbor light which had a straight line of view down the river. Dr. Williams said he also thinks that the SEPCO building partially blocks this, but, nevertheless, this is one of the most glorious eastern views and it would be very interesting to see a site plan that was a little wider.

**Dr. Williams** pointed out that if they imagine drawing a line from the northern edge of the SEPCO through there this would be the view corridor from Emmett

Park over here. As it stands this would project and partially block what is historically one of the great views of the urban vista down the river and to him this would be the major reason for pulling this back in line with the Marriott would allow or at least imagine that.

**Dr. Williams** said if he understood it right, this is low and is two stories. These are all very low and from the upper bluff, they are not obscuring the view. Now, Mr. Engle's point of view is that from River Street, these openings are not wide enough to allow that sense of connection. Dr. Henry's view is that this being like an L is too closed in and further blocks it off.

**Dr. Henry** said if they lay in the north/side direction, they will have a better view of the river.

**Dr. Williams** said it is a rectangular, therefore, he does not know how they would configure it so that it would fit on the site. He said that one idea was proposed was to move some of the retail space under here, which he suggested may be a podium and maybe there is enough square footage in this area that they can accommodate some of the lost space if this was opened up. However, it seems like all components of this project warrant reconsideration and he does not believe that they should follow staff's recommendation and approve one piece. Dr. Williams said he believes there are enough questions relating to all these pieces.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the Board could agree on a certain few concepts.

**Dr. Williams** asked what the Board would be voting on.

**Mr. Judson** said it would be in the spirit of trying to give as much clarity as possible.

**Dr. Henry** said he believes that the overriding principle [if they want to call it that] is to preserve as much of the river view as humanly possible.

**Dr. Williams** said roll back the upper and at the lower level. He would say that another concept would be, from a massing point of view, to respect the nature of the warehousing and be less fragmented. He knows that fragmenting buildings is a popular thing to do in places such as Atlanta and other cities, but the warehouses historically are very long, rectangular, simply articulated buildings. He believes that this should be a guide, especially to the Parking Garage and Hotel 1. Hotel 2 seems to be relatively simple block. However, he tends to agree with Mr. Howington that skyline feature is somewhat a gateway quality. He knows this came up in the other hotel that Mr. Shay designed at the west end of River Street where they had the discussions about this is an entrance to River Street that it is a gateway. He said this is even more of a gateway. Buildings here are flanking River Street and it seems that there is not adequate recognition of what could be really a splendid sense of entry into this zone.

**Ms. Simpson** said she believes that there are some wonderful components and opportunities she is concerned that this could become Anywhere, USA. Savannah is very unique and they have a wonderful opportunity to continue that



connection between the pedestrians and the river. She believes that it is really important to keep this in the forefront and that they don't create such a confining space that they are changing what they see now that could potentially be there throughout their lifetime. What they will see is a building versus the view that they have now on the river.

**Mr. Engle** stated that as Dr. Williams said, if he is walking down River Street towards the river, you have the curb, but if that was a wall as the warehouses are, a solid wall along there.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Engle if he was speaking of Hotel 1.

**Mr. Engle** said yes, Hotel 1. Instead of this, he really did not know what the space would be used for. No one is really going to sit and sunbathe on this little thing. This could be used for building.

**Dr. Williams** said this is what he is saying, too.

**Mr. Engle** said having a whole wall of buildings along here which would echo the warehouses and take that gained space and get rid of it or add it for the retail buildings. It looks like two of those retail buildings could fit in that courtyard area on top of each other.

**Dr. Henry** said he would be willing to sacrifice the courtyard for the view.

**Mr. Engle** said open it up and have it as usable public space. He said Mr. Shay talked about the great space here, but the great space here is public right-of-way. In the first place, the only thing that is really begin given is the little triangle up there with the road through it.

**Dr. Williams** said that another area of opportunity is that little triangle there. He knows that Mr. Shay spoke about that being a public park or serving in the spirit of a public park. But, to him the island of green here and that little triangle there is another buildable place. Honestly, you could angle a part of this building and maybe take some of that and extend it into this area. Dr. Williams said, however, he is a little confused about what the City's property is and what the petitioner's property is on the site. Is it correct that River Street is City's property?

**Mr. Shay** answered correct.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the island is a part of the petitioner's property.

**Mr. Shay** answered that it is jointly owned by Georgia Power.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the property is potentially buildable.

**Mr. Shay** answered yes, it is potentially buildable.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the whole triangle here has the potential to accommodate a rerouting of that driveway, and reconfiguration of the building.

**Mr. Shay** answered yes.

**Dr. Henry** said he assumes that the only thing that they could not bother is the

tracks.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Shay if he wanted to ask for a continuance or wanted the Board to continue further discussion or whether he thinks that the Board has given him enough directions.

**Mr. Shay** stated that with the Board's indulgence on behalf of someone else, could they take a three minute break and let him come back and do that.

**Ms. Ramsay** called the meeting back to order after the short break.

**Mr. Shay** said at this precise moment he was not ready to ask for a continuance. He would like to have a little more discussion from the Board, if possible, about any pros or cons, objections and about the idea of the middle range. He could tell the Board that they have already modeled it just in case. Mr. Shay said now that he is told that height matters, but actually the difference between an eight (8) story building and a seven (7) story building is pretty hard to read. If they were able to do that, then he figures they could do some of the other things that have been described, which is shift the center of gravity from a visual standpoint and preserve the view from way down Factors Walk that is of some concern; but it would require them using the height bonus which is available to them in order to be able to achieve that goal. Mr. Shay said he was wondering if this would be receptive by the Board in bringing this back to them.

**Dr. Henry** and other members of the Board stated that he would be receptive to this.

**Mr. Shay** said with this being the case, he would like to thank the Board for the input he got today. They have been taking notes and turning the wheels as ideas came forward. He believes that there is a lot of merit to what has been presented today. He realizes at this point that it would be a bit premature given that he and Ms. Ward would have to get together and decide what all this means. He is under the gun to be back before the Board in January and his only gives him ten (10) days to consider all the things that have been presented today and decide which makes sense and which does not.

**Mr. Shay** said given this and what he has heard today, he is willing to ask for a continuance with the understanding that when they come back in January and he will come back with the vest that he can do with what he has heard and present it to the Board.. They cannot do everything, there are a lot of architects in the room and a lot of people who would be good architects if they took it up as a profession, but at the end of the day this is his job and he has to meet the demands of his client, the program, about fifteen (15) City departments, and a bunch of other things that the Board does not have to meet.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Shay to keep in mind that this should function as an entrance; a grand entrance to the Historic District.

**Mr. Thomson** said he did not want to throw anything under the bus, but he wanted the petitioner to understand that there was a discussion about the buildings on the riverfront and he did not hear any clarification from this Board

for them. Mr. Thomson asked the Board if this was or not a part of the thought process at this point. If Mr. Shay is fine with what has been said without anybody saying anything, he will leave it alone right now.

**Mr. Shay** responded by saying that he does not know if he can really do everything that has been asked of him, but he certainly knows what the charge is and he understands the concept. He said he will try and will be back in January.

**NOTE:** Attorney Shearouse left at the end of this hearing.

**Board Action:**

Continue to the meeting of January 9, 2013 at petitioner's request. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

**Agenda B (Items 16-18 will be heard no earlier than 4:00pm)**

14. [Petition of Jose Gonzalez for Gonzalez Architects | 12-000356-COA | 304 East Bryan Street | New Construction, Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Sample Panel Guidelines 120309.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial - looking north.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [HDBR Ward Morgan - 304 E. Bryan Street - 121112.pdf](#)

**Mr. Jose Gonzalez** was present on behalf of this petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Part II Design Details for the Stay Bridge Suites, a four-story 40-unit hotel on the property at 304 East Bryan Street. The existing one-story historic structure on the property will remain and is part of the hotel. Combined, the proposed development will have a footprint less than 8,500 square feet and is not considered Large-Scale Development under the historic district ordinance. The model is on display today. She passed the sample board of materials around to the Board. The Board approved Part I, Height and Mass on October 10, 2012. No changes to the design have been made.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval of the new construction, Part II Design Details, of a four-story 40-unit hotel on the property at 304 East Bryan Street with the following conditions to resubmit to staff for final review and approval with the construction documents:

1. Verify exterior will feature a full brick veneer and not face brick. Consider a lighter mortar color on the brick row buildings fronting Bryan Street to have less contrast with the stucco and trim colors.
2. Upper level entry doors must be recessed a minimum of three inches from the exterior wall surface. Introduce a traditional header and mullion trim between the transom and sidelights on the parlor level entrance to be compatible with historic residential structures.
3. The 5/8 or 7/8 inch SDL (simulated divided light) with spacer bar option must be used to comply with the standard.
4. Provide a six-over-six light pattern in the upper level openings on the east facade to match the light pattern on the front of the residential building form at this location.
5. Reduce the height of the top and bottom horizontal rail on the balustrade to better reflect historic rail dimensions. Reduce the overall height of the railing to not exceed 42 inches or the minimum height allowed by the building code.
6. Balconies project no more than three feet from the face of the building and feature a bracket or architectural support.
7. Provide a section detail of the stucco privacy wall for review and approval with the construction documents.
8. If the HVAC equipment and/or electric meters become visible from the public right-of-way, a Certificate of Appropriateness to screen the equipment must be applied for and obtained prior to installation.
9. Construct a material sample panel on-site in accordance with the Boards sample panel guidelines (attached) for staff review prior to installation of materials.

**Ms. Ward** added that following the distribution of the packets, when the

petitioner received the staff's report, they submitted a CD with their revised plans. They were able to address all the conditions with the exception of condition six (6) concerning the balconies. The petitioner wants to remain with the balconies that they submitted. The petitioner has verified that it will be a full brick veneer; all the windows and doors are able to be recessed; they have modified the door opening to have a traditional transom with sidelights; they confirmed that all the divided lights will have a 7/8 inch simulated divided with a mullion with a spacer bar; the six-over-six windows are proposed on the side elevation where there were two-over-two; they have corrected all of the railings to be no more than 42 inches and the correction proportions; they have provided the section of the screen wall and have confirmed that the HVAC units will be concealed and that the electrical meters will not be visible. They have agreed to construct the material sample panel.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Ms. Ward if the petitioner corrected the dormer drawing.

**Ms. Ward** answered that the dormer drawings was not corrected. This is something that staff had not recommended specifically in their report. Staff identified it and knew that one Board member had this concern, but it was not a condition; therefore, staff was not sure where to go with this. However, staff believes this is something that the Board can discuss in their Board discussion.

**Dr. Williams** said that on page nineteen (19) the stairways drawings, he trusts that this drawing takes precedence over the view that is on the next page. This shows the stringer under the stairs as revealing the profile of the stairs.

**Mr. Howington** said since they are looking at this view, he believes that ordinance states that the base of the stoop is to also to match the base of the building.

**Ms. Ward** answered that is correct.

**Dr. Williams** said this means that the piers under the stoop should match the foundation materials.

**Ms. Ward** said yes and she would note that the additional building that the Board can see a peak of is brick. Therefore, the petitioner could have the brick pier here, but Dr. Williams is correct as they are to match the materials of the foundation.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Ward what her recommendation that the balconies be reduced sixteen inches is based on?

**Ms. Ward** explained that the ordinance requires that residential balconies not project more than three (3) feet from face of the building.

**Dr. Henry** asked if this is a commercial use.

**Ms. Ward** stated yes, but the petitioner is using a residential building exterior for the front facade. Therefore, staff believes that in order to make the back more compatible with the front, following the residential standard is the way to go. They have allowed the petitioner to use the residential floor-to-floor height standards on front of this project. So, it is a merger between the two to

get something that is compatible.

**Mr. Howington** asked if the petitioner has given the staff anything on the height of the roof.

**Ms. Ward** said yes, it is in the staff's report. She believes it is a twelve (12) inch panel with a one (1) inch seam.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Ward to address the letter that was included in the packets.

**Ms. Ward** said she was going to address the letter, but was initially entertaining individual questions at this point from the Board members

**Ms. Ward** explained that following the release of the packets, late last night she received an email from a neighbor at 22 Habersham Street, Ms. Allison Morgan. She has included a copy of the letter in the Board packet. Ms. Ward said Ms. Morgan was supportive of the project if it is done in accordance with the historical design standards. The materials used on the hotel should be consistent with the materials used on homes within the residential neighborhood. This residential neighborhood has a historic significance as it is among the oldest in downtown. Ms. Ward read that Ms. Morgan said she does not believe that the materials being used for this project reflect Savannah and its history; specifically the field seam standing seam panels. She believes there is even greater importance and obligation when a hotel is located within a residential neighborhood that it be held to the same historical standards that the homes in the neighborhood are held to. Ms. Morgan apologized that she would not be able to attend today.

**Ms. Ward** explained that just prior to the meeting, approximately ten minutes prior; an email was forwarded to her by the Historic Savannah Foundation from Deann Donovan who lives at 419 East St. Julian Street. She has not had the opportunity to provide this correspondence to the Board as it was just handed to her. Ms. Ward read Ms. Donovan email into the records: "We have not met. I own the property at 419 East St. Julian Street, which is within a heavily traveled tourist area of the Colonial Historic District. I have owned this property since 2005 and have resided here from August 11 after living in London, England for the past fifteen (15) years. I am a devoted supporter of the historic district here and I am a member of both HSF, DNA and since living here on a more full-time basis, have done by best to appreciate the tourism, political and residential issues surrounding the actual and proposed developments in and around the Historic District. I regret that I am unable to attend the meeting today, but I was in attendance with HSF at the City Council meeting where the new Bay Street hotel was discussed." Ms. Ward apologized for reading the email in this hearing, but it was addressed as 304 East Bryan Street. It was intended for 600 East Bay Street.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that as the Board can see, they worked very closely with Ms. Ward and staff in trying to ensure that they clarify the issues that have come up. He said they had two exceptions and he wanted to clarify what they

were.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said they did not have an objection to the variation of the brick where they have the stone base. He said, therefore, their position is that they agree with Ms. Ward that on this building, the one that is closest to the Board on the right, on this component that they will have the contrasting mortar, but on the building further down, they will actually match the brick as was suggested. Therefore, they have no issue with that.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said he has one issue and it concerns the balconies. As Ms. Ward pointed out, the suggestion to the three foot balconies as a result of what it is on the residential code. However, on the commercial code, this really being not applicable, Ms. Ward was trying to be consistent in the sense that this had a residential character and to keep it consistent. He explained that the reason they went to four feet is that in most of the new codes and with the new standards of ADA, even for non-ADA rooms, the doors have to open and be a minimum of three feet. Therefore, the door, itself, is three feet. In order to have the clearance that is required, even in non-ADA rooms, they went to a four foot balcony. This is the reason they do it and he would like for this to remain. He said if the Board noticed, the balconies have not been questioned on the residential side of the project, but on the lane side, the commercial view of this. Mr. Gonzalez said, therefore, certainly within the letter of the law, they are okay and he knows that Ms. Ward was trying to carryover the residential code consideration and they would agree with her under normal circumstances, but not in this case. Therefore, they would like to keep the balconies at four feet.

**Dr. Henry** said he was confused because technically, he thought Mr. Gonzalez said he could open the doors.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said you cannot open the balcony doors; there is no experience with a three foot balcony as proposed. This is why they have a four foot balcony. The door has to be a three foot, zero door. It cannot be a two-five.

**Ms. Simpson** asked would the door be inset three (3) inches?

**Mr. Gonzalez** said it would be inset, but in terms of clearance, they need to remember that the balcony, itself, the full projection is at three feet per Ms. Ward's request and they understand this completely. But when you put the cast iron railing in, it is inserted, and then you have the door and not enough clearance.

**Dr. Henry** asked if a couple of extra inches would fix this problem.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said a couple of extra inches would probably do it, but he would not do it less than three feet – six inches.

**Mr. Howington** asked if the doors on the balcony swing out.

**Mr. Gonzalez** confirmed that the balcony doors swing out. He explained that the reason they swing out is because they do not encroach on the room and it is better regarding the weather protection and so forth. Therefore, they do not swing the door in.

**Mr. Engle** said they talked about the dormers at the last meeting and Mr. Gonzalez said he would correct them. The cheeks are too narrow to look realistic.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said Mr. Engle was absolutely correct and they have no problems correcting the dormers as long as Ms. Ward is in agreement that they basically narrow the window and provide a wider appearance on the side, they are perfectly okay with this and that if the Board allows this to be a condition, they have no issue with this. He said it is clearly an oversight on their part.

**Dr. Williams** said if he understood the top left image, the component in the middle is the one that he wants the mortar to match the brick as opposed to the one at the top right.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said right. The contrast with the base and with the brick with a lighter mortar works quite well. He is in agreement with Ms. Ward. However, he likes the consistency of the brick on the other side because it is also the language that is a part of the rest of the hotel. Therefore, they like a little of that continuity coming across to this elevation.

**Dr. Williams** stated that would be true of a more industrial character of the building.

**Dr. Williams** said every example he found of the Federal style buildings had contrasting mortar. Maybe there is an opportunity here to have the one on the far right match the stone at the base as a mortar color. All the examples he found, the mortar is legible separate from the brick. The petitioner's sample panel just blends. He said the petitioner wants it to be getting closer to the spirit around the corner.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said this is clearly not a deal breaking issue for them, but a nuance. If they are going to go to a contrasting mortar, he would go to a regular mortar color. No true traditional mortar, but basically a gray, a natural sanded mortar and he will use it consistently. Mr. Gonzalez said he would not worry about matching the stone because as long as you have that kind of contrast, that would be really the purest representation of dealing with that brick. Therefore, if this is okay with the Board, he will draw up this issue.

**Mr. Engle** said gray would not be purest. It would be post 1870 when Portland cement came in. It should be Madouse and should be a white mortar.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said this is true if they are going to go back that far, but in terms of the most recent this is what it would be. However, he is at the pleasure of the Board on this issue.

**Dr. Williams** said it is difficult to see from the petitioner's elevation drawings, but there is a second rail behind and at the top right perspective view, a second railing is against the house and the staircase has a stair rail along the base of the building.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said if Dr. Williams noticed the detail that they are showing which is in response to all the comments and the fine tuning of this, the



rendering is no way representative of what the actual stair and railing looks like.

**Dr. Williams** said it is hard to judge from the elevation, though, because the elevation does not show if there is a second railing behind it or not.

**Mr. Gonzalez** asked Dr. Williams if he was talking about the interior railing.

**Dr. Williams** answered yes.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said they do have to install an interior railing because of a code issue. They have to deal with this. He wanted the Board to remember that this is a commercial building. Therefore, they have to exit and this is the real exit. They must provide the railing.

**Dr. Williams** said there were some issues about the accuracy.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that the only thing that was not accurate was the way the string was as it was not correctly shown as they saw on the detail, which is now shown correctly.

**Mr. Howington** said one thing he thinks that may be accurate is a concern of the last time which was the gable roof. The previous perspective is that it had a big tree in it; but now they can really see that the half gable should reflect that it is a home and should continue to the other side.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said in other words what Mr. Howington is saying is that it should return. He said they can do this and it would be totally invisible. He agreed with Mr. Howington.

**Mr. Howington** informed Mr. Gonzalez that the last time he said you may not be able to see it. However, it shows and can be seen very well. He requested that this be corrected.

**Mr. Gonzalez** agreed.

**Mr. Howington** said the peak of the gable on the drawings shows it very well and the last time there was a concern that the gable should continue over to reflect the true nature of a roof. But, the last time Mr. Gonzalez said they should not be able to see this, but they can clearly see it here.

**Mr. Howington** said maybe this is not the time, but there are a lot of details that he believes need some attention. They can do it now or later, but the soffit on detail 1A 301, number one (1) on the left-hand side shows the absence of a fascia and soffit. This detail needs to be looked at. The beam of the porch stoop seems to be out of proportion. On the stoops, themselves, you don't really notice it here, but on the elevations the baseboard looks out of proportion to him as well. It should have some weight to it, but it looks like it is only a two-by-six.

**Mr. Gonzalez** asked Mr. Howington if he was talking about the floor of the stoop.

**Mr. Howington** answered yes and he believes it should be taller, especially if

they look at the elevations. It is definitely out of proportion. The whole order of that cornice seems a little odd to him.

**Mr. Gonzalez** asked Mr. Howington if he wanted the base to read with more substance.

**Mr. Howington** said absolutely more correctness in the order. The elevation may show this the best, but page 12 of 21 shows that proportionally the base of that stoop is much diminished. Typically, not on the brick, but on the stucco building, the lower sill is a little less.

**Dr. Williams** said in speaking of proportions, both of the stucco buildings have a belt course between the third and fourth floors that is not proportional relative to the corner site. He said he was guessing that the building at the far left [west end of the site] seems to have a two-brick high belt course in brick that seems to be dictating this as the datum moves across the facade. He asked Ms. Ward to pull up the perspective view on the screen that shows the elevation as it really becomes apparent there. He said the band seems really thick. It should be about half this.

**Mr. Howington** said it is odd how that course with the sill setting right on top of that course, to him it seems that this course could take the place of the sill at the window.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said this was in the renderings. This is the correction. In this case, they carried the course consistent.

**Dr. Williams** said it does not work on the stucco.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said if the Board recalls, the band was not in the original design; this was something that was requested by the Board. They can reduce the band in scale, articulate it more or eliminate it. He can do all three; it is just the matter of what the Board prefers.

**Mr. Engle** said the band was added because it gave the illusion that the top floor was added to the building at a later date. This is all over town.

**Dr. Williams** said it should be reduced a bit.

**Mr. Engle** asked if it returns.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said it returns on the Bryan Street side.

**Mr. Engle** agreed that it should be reduced about seven (7) inches.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said he believes it should be reduced by at least a third. He said at least from the top side, not the bottom so that there is consistency on the left side; if this is alright with the Board.

**Dr. Williams** replied okay.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the low level doors have no thresholds at all; they are right on grade.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said these are the existing doors; this is the historic building.

**Mr. Engle** said he was talking about the doors on the elevation. All of them are on grade.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said this is correct.

**Mr. Engle** said there are no thresholds at all.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said there is a slight elevation, but basically, they are on grade.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Paul Hansen** came forward and stated that he resides at 410 East Bryan Street. He has lived in this neighborhood since 1986. If the Board recalls, he was present two months ago. Mr. Hansen said at that time, he basically said that as far as the neighborhood [he believes there are several other neighbors present who will speak on this project], they are not against the project. They feel that the architecture is not compatible with the neighborhood. As the Board knows, this is one of the oldest neighborhoods in the historic district. It is made up mainly of relatively delicate federal type wood frame homes.

**Mr. Hansen** said the project is basically one building. It is not a series of townhouses that were constructed over a period of time. He believes their concern is that the really these entrances off of Bryan Street really do not relate to what is behind there. Whether these entrances will ever be used for any visitors coming in is questionable. He believes that Mr. Howington has raised a lot of points about the overall detailing and the consistencies between the working drawings and the perspectives. Mr. Hansen said there are a lot of things here that have not been coordinated or detailed out, but the Board has brought up. Three years ago when this project came before the Board and again two months ago; it has been the same thing regurgitated with not a lot of thought put into the overall design.

**Mr. Hansen** said, therefore, they would like to see this project restudied more. They welcome the project, but feel that the architecture is suffering and needs some further study.

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they also had a lot of details that they pulled out that they had issues with, but quite a few of them have been addressed based on the revised petition that meets staff recommendations. Ms. Meunier said she would go through and talk about the points that have not been touched on.

**Ms. Meunier** said on the east elevation where staff asked for the six-over-six windows that would match the infilling form [the most right building form] they also felt that six-over-six windows should be incorporated on the rear side of that building form. Additionally, one thing that she wanted to point out is that a lot of HSF's concerns were focused on the central double house form. She knows this is an issue of height and mass and she brought it up at the last meeting, but they feel that the space between the top of the windows at the upper level and where the roof starts is really a large space. The proportion is sort of strange compared to the spacing with all the other windows. She is

aware that Mr. Howington brought up the point that in the renderings, you see the pitch of that gable and she does not know if they would be to make it look realistic where it is not a true gable because they are trying to get over a corridor that is behind it. She said because of the proposed Federal style, the petitioner might want to do six-over-six windows.

**Ms. Meunier** said something that she might suggest [she was only putting this out there as a thought], is to possibly change the style on the period that they are referencing and maybe look at a more Victorian style. In doing this, the petitioner would keep the two-over-two windows, but actually incorporate a mansard roof. She explained that if a mansard roof was used where the roof is not actually trying to pitch and go all the way back, but still have dormers, they could accommodate that corridor behind. They would still have the dormers and the additional height in the story and hopefully maybe they could bring the roof line down a little since they would no longer be trying to get the pitch to go all the way back.

**Ms. Meunier** explained that where the roof starts with the pitch is very high and this is what is creating that large space. She said this is a consideration. If they select to go into this direction, as she has said, they could keep the two-over-two windows as it would be in keeping with that style, but they would also want to make sure that the details of the porticoes are more in keeping with the new style that she is referencing. Therefore, they are somewhat re-envisioning the style of the central bay.

**Ms. Meunier** said the only other additional comments that they have are in reviewing some of the specifications for the lighting patterns for the French doors that would be on the rear door, they appear to have a horizontal orientation. The panes appear to be more rectangular where the horizontal versus vertical. She said that this is just a point that they wanted to bring to the petitioner's attention.

**Mr. Bill Stuebe of the Downtown Neighborhood Association (DNA)** said the porch on the left stucco building space between the two levels is higher than on the adjoining porch. He is concerned about the circumference of the Tuscan columns as they are substantial enough because they are taller. There are no dimensions on the drawings as to what the circumference of those columns is versus the columns in the center house. They just need to be bulky enough so they don't look to spindly. With regards to the second railing on the staircases, instead of having pickets on the inside rail, it would be more appropriate to have just a bar going down. It is typical to have pickets on the inside of a staircase.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Gonzalez if he wanted to respond to the public comments.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said he would be brief. They agree with Mr. Hansen that this is indeed a commercial building that is all one building. As they all know they have discussed this for many years, it is a commercial site and basically adjoins a fine residential neighborhood. For many years, he lived at 504 East St. Julian Street and, therefore, is very familiar with the neighborhood. But, it is a

commercial building and as they responded many years back and are doing so at this time, they felt the best way to respond to the fact that it was an adjoining residential neighborhood is to basically differentiate the forms as they have done and they have had this discussion before.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said regarding the issues that were brought up by various other comments, they did not have any significant objections. The question of the Mansard roof with regards to that proportion, if they look at a true Mansard as the one shown in the photograph, they would agree that the Mansard would do that; but the trouble with the Mansard is that it also tilts on the edge as a true Mansard is usually a freestanding as you see in a classic French design. But, they would not have the opportunity to do that here and it would look kind of bizarre. They do agree that the design in some form compromise the proportions because they are indeed dealing with trying to blend a commercial use with its own restrictions with these sorts of tried and true and well-known residential styles that we have here in Savannah. Mr. Gonzalez said, therefore, they believe the method that they have approached is a good way to do this and be responsive to the neighborhood. If they were to do this from the standpoint of a building that just stood alone as an entity as a hotel that was contemporary in its design, obviously the approach would be totally different. But, this was not a method that the community at-large felt was an appropriate way and, therefore, they did not do it.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** commented that this has been a long haul. How many times has the Board looked at this? He believes Mr. Gonzalez has responded well to all of their comments. This is a tough project; putting a hotel in the middle of a residential neighborhood you are not going to please everybody; but he thinks a good job has been done. There are so many little comments and he does not know how they are going to deal with them all.

**Ms. Ramsay** said there are some inconsistencies in the drawings. Mr. Howington pointed out some of them and the HSF and Mr. Stuebe pointed out additional ones.

**Mr. Engle** said if the Board could approve it with staff's comments and have Mr. Howington give Ms. Ward the list of all the small detail stuff to follow-through with. Can we do it this way? If not, they will end up with a resolution that will have twenty (20) points to it.

**Ms. Ward** said the Board would need to put each of their points into the record so they will know exactly what they are as opposed to just providing her a list after the meeting. Ms. Ward said she would be more comfortable if the Board actually stated each one if this is what the Board is moving towards that.

**Mr. Howington** said he would prefer if they stated each point instead of him providing a list as he would be afraid he might miss some of the points. His motion would be to cleanup those details and then come back. There are so many points that he almost lose track of what he is saying. He said that he cannot do that.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said his comment would be the recollection issue just as Mr. Howington indicated to make sure they had all his comments. His other fear would be that they would not have all the comments to make sure that they have complied with them. Therefore, they have the same dilemma either way. They still do have to itemize the concerns to ensure that they can address them. So whether they are addressed with a subsequent set of drawings or whether they address them as a condition, they still have to identify them clearly today to be sure his firm can bring the appropriate response.

**Mr. Judson** said the Chair could correct him if he is wrong, but if they were to continue it, they would have the opportunity to list the concerns. He said he would not find any details, but they have experts on the Board who could take the time to find those details, get them to Ms. Ward with a couple of days so they will have a comprehensive list.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said they have no problem with continuing this petition. All he wants to do if it is at all possible that the issues get communicated in a way that Ms. Ward could quantify them and then they could address them so that they do not come back at the next meeting with them not being addressed. Mr. Gonzalez said he wants to be responsive, but he wants to be sure they know what the issues are.

**Ms. Ward** said she wanted clarification. What if Mr. Howington submits a sheet of specific details, but they are not what Dr. Williams or Mr. Johnson wanted to see in the plan. Therefore, there is a little risk here.

**Mr. Gay** said they all could submit their sheets to Ms. Ward.

**Mr. Engle** said the Board needs to give the list now because at the next Board meeting, they could be here talking about this same thing all over again.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said the Board needs to decide about the six-over-six windows. He said they were doing the six-over-six on the east side of the building in accordance with the suggestion of Ms. Ward. They are doing this all around. If there are any other places that need to be changed, somebody needs to say so.

**Dr. Williams** said he believed there was a question related to the soffit on the parent double house that dovetails into concerns raised by the HSF. If he understood Mr. Gonzalez correctly, it is between the top of the lentil and the soffit is basically too large.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said this is the one he indicated mainly with regards to the Mansard issue.

**Dr. Williams** said he was not saying Mansard, but as he is addressing Mr. Howington's concerns as he has the roof coming to a knife edge.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said no; the fascia issued they have already discussed that it was incorrect. They should have a fascia and then a soffit return. This was an error, but this will also bring it down which will also decrease it.

**Dr. Williams** said another strategy Mr. Gonzalez might use is that some houses have a band that matches. If it is a wooden soffit, it would actually have

a vertical band under the soffit.

**Mr. Howington** said in looking at the elevation, the head of the windows are aligned, but the sills are not. Therefore, where this space is, maybe the sills of that window could align with the others so that it diminishes the space above it in the double house.

**Dr. Williams** said there is also a mortar issue where the red brick component facing Bryan Street. On the two apparently federal style houses, they did not come to a decision. Staff recommended matching the color of the cast stone. He said he was not recommending white per se. He personally prefers something not so strident; they have seen some repointing jobs in town where there has been some light color mortar.

**Mr. Gonzalez** suggested that if it is alright with the Board that in the building where Ms. Ward has suggested that they match the base, that the mortar matches the base and in the other building, just possibly a Portland gray as the color. It will still have the contrasting color.

**Mr. Engle** said the petitioner has to do a test panel that staff has to go out and approve.

**Ms. Simpson** said the balcony.

**Dr. Henry** said he believes they agreed on 3'-6".

**Mr. Engle** said he was assuming that the Board was going along with the other recommendations of the staff as well. Therefore, they need to change the staff's recommendation to 3'-6" not 3'.

**Dr. Henry** said he is for continuing this petition; but they should not be designing this.

**Mr. Stuebe** said in the middle building are they keeping the dormers and in the Federal style building six-over-six windows instead of two-over-two.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the Board did not answer the six-over-six. Do they want six-over-six everywhere?

**Mr. Gay** said yes.

**Mr. Engle** said all the buildings are not Federal style buildings.

**Mr. Gay** said three of the buildings are Federal style.

**Mr. Engle** said the Federal style building go with six-over-six and the other two-over-two.

**Mr. Judson** said he did not have anything to add other than the comment that any discussion of the Mansard roof is off the table because that would have been in Part I.

**Mr. Merriman** asked if the Board is in agreement of the lighter color mortar. He is fine with everything else.

**Mr. Johnson** said he is in agreement with the Board. It appears that they are building the whole project over.

**Dr. Williams** asked what the Board decided about the windows.

**Ms. Ramsay** said they decided six-over-six in the federal buildings.

The following items were identified by the Board to be addressed by the petitioner:

1. Material of stoop base must match the foundation wall material. Brick columns on easternmost unit should be cast stone to match the foundation.
2. Add a back end to the side gable on the double house unit.
3. Correct cornice and soffit detail.
4. The order of the porch elements needs to be corrected; the stoop floor, entablature, beam depth of stoop.
5. Dormer details showing wider cheeks.
6. Dimension of sill to be diminished.
7. Reduce banding between third and fourth floor on stucco buildings fronting Bryan Street by 1/3.
8. Conflicting notes on bases.
9. Eliminate interior guard rail at high stoop stairs.
10. Increase the column diameter of the second floor stucco porch. This comment was made by the public with regard to the rendering; not the elevations.
11. Too much solid wall between top of window and soffit on double-brick house on Bryan Street. Consider a fascia or band board and/or aligning the sills of the windows.
12. Use lighter mortar on the "Federal style" buildings. Along Bryan Street, Argos, Savannah Ivory, mortar is proposed on the far eastern structure and Argos, Harleyville S. (gray) mortar is proposed in the center double-house. The red mortar is retained for the brick structure fronting Lincoln Street.
13. Balconies extend no more than three feet- six inches (3'-6") and provide an architectural support or bracket.
14. Use six-over-six windows on the double house and dormers.

**Mr. Engle** said he believed the Board was going to make a motion and incorporate the Board's list.

**Mr. Merriman** said Mr. Gonzalez is asking for a continuance.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she thought this was for a motion so the petitioner could come back to staff with all the recommendations.

**Mr. Judson** explained that when Mr. Gonzalez was saying continuance, the Board had not itemized all the points. But now that all the points have been itemized, the motion can be made and incorporate all the points.

**Mr. Howington** said due to the amount of conditions, he has a concern putting this on staff and not seeing those details in consistency. He believes that once they get a certain number of inconsistencies, it should come back to the Board.



**Mr. Gonzalez** said that in the spirit of harmony, they do not have a problem deferring the item so that they can bring it back corrected with Ms. Ward's blessing that everything is done as per the items. He said that he would rather have everyone on the Board on board with this so at the end, they could say they own a piece of it. This is perfectly fine. Everyone can have a wonderful holiday and he will come back in January with the revised plans.

**Board Action:**

Continue to the meeting of January 9, 2013 at petitioner's request. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

15. [Petition of Larry Blige | 12-001054-COA | 509 East Harris Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Paint Colors.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs and Specifications.pdf](#)

**Mr. William W. Bagwell** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to construct a one-story addition on the rear (south facade) of the property located at 509 East Harris Street, in the Beach Institute character area.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that when staff visited the site, they discovered two additional work items had been completed. The principal building had exposed rafter tails throughout. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for boxing in the rafter tails on the principal building and on the addition with luan.

The majority of this work has been completed without review or approval from staff or the Board, including creating eave returns on the front porch.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that for the proposed work, staff recommends approval for the addition, shutters, and paint color changes with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Shutters must be hinged, operable, and sized to fit the window openings. Submit revised color, locations, and quantities.
2. The proposed windows are not compatible and do not meet the design standards. Provide window specifications that are visually compatible and meet the design standards.
3. The rear porch addition post must include a base molding, capital, and the column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave.
4. Provide addition's foundation wall material and design.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that for after-the-fact work, staff recommends defer the after-the-fact work to staff to return the exposed roof rafters to the prior design and provide a porch balustrade that meets the design standards and is visually compatible. The work was identified during the review of the addition. No formal application requesting approval of these items has been submitted at this time.

**Mr. Engle** said he did not see where it was said what the exposure of the wood siding would be. Corner boards are not shown. Will there be corner boards?

**Ms. Michalak** said this would be a question to ask the petitioner.

**Dr. Williams** asked that to defer after-the-work, why is the person opposed to .....

**Ms. Michalak** said this would have been something that would have been reviewed at the staff level.

**Dr. Williams** asked, "after-the-fact approval?"

**Ms. Michalak** explained that if it was something such as a railing, etc., would have been done at the staff level. She said she has not discussed some of the after-the-fact work with the petitioner. She called and left a message, but they have not discussed it.

**Mr. Howington** asked Ms. Michalak if she was saying that before the after-the-fact work was done, it would have been reviewed by staff.

**Ms. Michalak** said yes.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Bagwell** said he was representing Mr. Larry Blige, the owner. He explained that not knowing that the work was in a historic area, is the reason some of the work was done. They are now asking to be able to continue the work and are hopeful that everything will be approved.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Bagwell what the siding is intended to be on the back elevation and what the exposure will be.

**Mr. Bagwell** said the addition will be an eight-by-ten (8x10) or an eight-by-twelve (8x12) enclosed. They will have corner boards.

**Mr. Engle** asked what will the siding be made of.

**Mr. Bagwell** said it would be wood pine. This is what was recommended to him in an email.

**Mr. Engle** asked how wide are the corner boards.

**Mr. Bagwell** said whatever the Board recommends; he can do the corner boards in anything.

**Mr. Engle** said the Board needs to add to the staff recommendation to check the siding and corner boards.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** wanted clarification on the boxed-in rafter tails.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the staff's recommendation is for approval of addition and to return the exposed roof rafters to their prior design.

**Dr. Williams** said, therefore, staff's recommendation is to remove them.

**Ms. Ramsay** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** said deferred is not as opposed to be listed.

**Mr. Engle** said it does not really say.

**Ms. Michalak** said the petitioner did not apply for those.

**Dr. Williams** said staff discovered them in the context of the petition.

**Ms. Michalak** said the petitioner did not apply for them, but staff wanted to

list them instead of getting a separate application.

**Mr. Gay** explained if the petitioner had applied for the rafter tail work, it would not have been permitted. They need to take them off.

**Ms. Ward** said the staff wants them to take them off and return it to the state it was before.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the petitioner can either do this or come back and make an application for approval.

**Ms. Ward** explained that the staff wanted the Board to be informed about what is going on and allow staff to work with the petitioner to get either the after-the-fact submittal in or just return the rafter to the prior design.

**Mr. Engle** said he does not understand why they don't make this a part of the proposed work. They will restore the cornice and work with staff to restore the porch.

**Ms. Ward** said she thinks that the Board has the prerogative, but the work that has been done,, staff wanted to bring it to their attention. She said usually, staff likes to be able to work with the petitioner to inform them of the issue beforehand, but staff had trouble getting a hold of them and this is probably the third person that has represented this project. It took staff a month or two to get the drawings. Staff did not want to bring this before the Board and just recommend an action on an item that the petitioner had not applied for or had not been informed that it was an issue.

**Mr. Engle** said now that it has, why don't they make it a part of their motion to remove it.

**Mr. Gay** said this is what the staff has recommended, take it off.

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for the addition, shutters, and paint color changes with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final review and approval.

1. Shutters must be hinged, operable, and sized to fit the window openings. Submit revised color, locations, and quantities.
2. The proposed windows are not compatible and do not meet the design standards. Provide window specifications that are visually compatible and meet the design standards.

3. The rear porch addition post must include a base molding, capital, and the column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave.
4. Provide addition's foundation wall material and design. - PASS
5. Return the exposed roof rafters on the historic principal building to the original design.
6. Provide staff with balustrade details for the front porch that meet the design standards and are visually compatible.
7. Provide staff with detailed information on the exposure dimension from the proposed beveled pine siding on the addition.
8. Provide cornerboards on the addition; provide staff with detailed information regarding the material and size of the cornerboards.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

[16. Petition of J. Leander, LLC | 12-001400-COA | 502-508 East McDonough Street | New Construction Part II, Design Details, for two-story townhomes](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial - Looking North.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Materials and Specifications.pdf](#)

**Mr. Matthew Allan** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Part II Design Details, of a two-story residential row at 502-508 East McDonough Street.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval for Part II, Design Details because the project is in compliance with the Visual Compatibility Factors and Design Standards with the following conditions:

1. Provide a base and capital on the porch columns that extends forward of the architrave.
2. Provide material for all cap and color for wooden gates.
3. Relocate electric meters to interior of wall, if permitted by Georgia Power.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the doors were recessed the last time the Board reviewed this project.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Allan** said he was representing J. Leander, LLC, the property owner. He said he and the staff have discussed the recommendation. He is in agreement with the recommendations. As usual, they will do their best to comply with the recommendations.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **Board Action:**

Approval for Part II, Design Details because the project is in compliance with the Visual Compatibility Factors and Design Standards with the following conditions:

1. Provide a base and capital on the porch columns - PASS that extends forward of the architrave.
2. Provide material for wall cap and color for wooden gates.
3. Relocate electric meters to interior of wall if permitted by GA Power.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

17. [Petition of Jim Wubbena for Wubbena Architects | 12-001412-COA | 601 East Broad Street | New Construction, Part 1 and II](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Materials Board.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Specifications.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Surroundings Structures.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

**Mr. Jim Wubbena** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I Height and Mass, and Part II Design Details, of two (2) two-story residential apartment buildings at 601 East Broad Street. The buildings will consist of 10 apartment units. The property is bounded on three sides by East Huntingdon Street to the north, East Broad Street to the east, and Nicoll Street to the south. The northernmost building is oriented to front Nicoll Street.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass because the project is in compliance with the Visual Compatibility Factors and the Design Standards, with the condition that the petitioner re-orient the stair on the westernmost stoop of the southern building to correspond to the unit to which they are associated (switch the stair to the other side of the stoop.)

**Ms. Michalak** reported also that staff recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals of the 30 foot structured setback parking variance required under Sec. 8-3030(n)(14)b. to allow a two (2) foot setback in this location.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that staff recommends approval for Part II, Design Details because the project is in compliance with the Visual Compatibility Factors and the Design Standards, with the following conditions:

- a. Provided a mortar color sample to staff for review and approval.
- b. Ensure that the balustrades and railings for the rear stair on the northernmost building meet the standards for height and baluster spacing.
- c. Use a single lite, four lite, or solid four panel door to be compatible with the proposed building style, window configurations, and surrounding historic

structures.

**Mr. Engle** asked Ms. Michalak if the petitioner forgot to put a window in the elevation. He was assuming that the little square windows on the first floor are bathroom windows. However, there are no windows on the left at all.

**Ms. Michalak** said this would be a question for the petitioner.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the petitioner is now within the inside of the property line.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Michalak to show on the site plan what she means by two-foot setback.

**Ms. Michalak** [pointing to an area] said the property line is right here. The building is at the zero lot line. Basically, the depth of the building brings the start of the parking about two feet back from the property line. The structured parking requirement is thirty (30) feet. The petitioner needs the variance to get within two feet of the property line.

**Dr. Williams** asked why they don't have the two feet.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that a wall is here. The outside of the walls is on the zero lot line.

**Dr. Williams** asked if there were other parking spaces on the ground floor behind the walls in the previous iteration.

**Ms. Michalak** said the parking did not change.

**Dr. Williams** asked, therefore, the two easternmost two spots were there before.

**Ms. Michalak answered yes.**

Dr. Williams asked if the windows were here before also. Are they real windows?

**Ms. Michalak** said yes, but they open into the parking structure. One more bay was added on the northernmost building.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Wubbena** stated that they have worked with the staff. They have met with the staff and went over the items discussed in the last Board meeting to ensure that they met the standards. They do not disagree with the few comments that the staff has now. They will be more than happy to comply with them. If there needs to be an approval with a contingency, they will be happy with this as well. He believes Ms. Michalak did a fine job explaining the project, but if the Board has any questions for him, he would be happy to answer.

**Mr. Judson** thanked Mr. Wubbena for the work he put in the project last month. It is



transformation of where they were last month and where Mr. Wubbena is now. Obviously, Mr. Wubbena has wrapped up a lot of details.

**Mr. Johnson** asked about the small window that was discussed in Part I.

**Mr. Wubbena** explained that the counter tops reside in the corner, they have a range that either goes on the Huntingdon Street side or on the back wall. Instead of removing the window that is on the Huntingdon Street side, which is the most prevalent street, they took the window off of what would be a lane [there is no lane here]. This is less noticeable; there is a two-story house right here. The entire back facade is not seen from the street at any angle.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the parking spaces in the parking lot on the ground floor are all open bays and there are no doors.

**Mr. Wubbena** answered correct and those bays are actually seven (7) feet high. Therefore, they come below the fence line [the sliding gate line] to basically eliminate them from being from the street as well. Therefore, the heads of the garage openings are at seven (7) feet and no doors; they all are open bays.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** said after hearing Ms. Michalak presentation and imagining being on East Broad Street and thinking that those garages, but no doors are going to have, especially the north building with the sun coming from the south is going to illuminate the cars in the garages as you are walking down the street because from the ground floor windows on the southern end of the north building reads from the outside as residential windows. But, as you walk down the sidewalk, you will have a brighter interior than a normal interior and a view of cars. Dr. Williams said he knows the Board asked the petitioner to add the windows, but he was just trying to imagine how this would look. Is symmetry so important that they need to have windows over the garages? He was trying to visualize the pedestrian experience of that view and those windows more than any other windows because that view will be back lit. He was trying to visualize how it would look without those four windows.

**Mr. Howington** said there is another map of this. He was not sure if they would agree to it, but sometimes you can sheet rock those and as long as the glass is clear, you cannot hardly tell the difference that the window is different than the others. He said this would be solution in keeping the rhythm of the window. Put sheet rock behind it, paint it back and apply plywood. The sheet rock will give a clean finish and from the exterior, it is almost impossible to tell.

**Dr. Williams** said what Mr. Howington just explained might be a better solution.

**Mr. Engle** said you would have to hinge it.

**Mr. Wubbena** said currently they are, but they have entertained the idea what Mr. Howington brought up about actually building the wall out behind the window. Therefore, the window on the exterior would look like a normal window and passers-by would not be able to tell if nobody isn't in that unit. Consequently, this would be something that they

will most definitely entertain and actually would prefer. He said they do have large oaks and hopefully the elimination would be two a minimum because of the shading. The shading is wonderful on the site. But, nonetheless, they would be happy to do this.

Mr. Howington said sheet 13 shows a rowlock and a bottom band board. But, it is not typical to have a rowlock and then a band board. He believes it is just a mistake as the elevation shows it correctly. Therefore, he believes the rowlock should be eliminated.

**Mr. Wubbena** said eliminating the rowlock is no problem at all.

**Mr. Engle** said whatever they do to block the inside of the window has to be removable.

**Board Action:**

Approval for Part I, Height and Mass because the project is in compliance with the Visual Compatibility Factors and the Design Standards, with the condition that the petitioner re-orient the stair on the westernmost stoop of the southern building to correspond to the unit to which they are associated (switch the stair to the other side of the stoop.)

Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals of the 30 foot structured setback parking variance required under Sec. 8-3030(n)(14)b. to allow a two (2) foot setback in this location.

Approval for Part II, Design Details because the project is in compliance with the Visual Compatibility Factors and the Design Standards, with the following conditions: - PASS

1. Ensure that the balustrades and railings for the rear stair on the northernmost building meet the standards for height and baluster spacing.
2. Use a single lite, four lite, or solid four panel door to be compatible with the proposed building style, window configurations, and surrounding historic structures; submit to staff for final review and approval.
3. Eliminate the brick rowlock at all foundation walls; submit to staff for final review and approval.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

18. [Petition of Joe Kesler | 12-001816-COA | 21 East McDonough Street | Signs/Rehabilitation](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Fascia Signs.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Projecting Sign.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - ATM Alteration.pdf](#)

**NOTE:** Mr. Gay left the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for two principal use fascia signs for "McDonough's," a principal use projecting sign for "Billy's Place," and to install an ATM on the exterior wall along Drayton Street for the businesses located at 21 East McDonough Street.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval of the principal use fascia signs because they meet the standards and are compatible with the condition that the proposed fascia sign on the East Perry Street facade be resued in size to meet the ordinance.

**Ms. Michalak** reported also that the staff recommend denial of the ATM on the Drayton Street facade because it does not meet the standards and is not visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.

**Dr. Williams** asked how many principal use signs are allowed.

**Ms. Michalak** answered one sign per business fronting street.

**Dr. Williams** said this would be two signs.

**Ms. Michalak** said the businesses have three fronts.

**Dr. Williams** said, therefore, this will be three signs.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** stated that in the wording, staff is calling each letter a sign and they have measured square footage as each sign is four square feet.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that the signs consist of individual letters at four square feet.

**Dr. Williams** said McDonough's as a word is one sign. But, staff is not measuring the spaces between the letters. They are only measuring the square footage of each letter.

**Ms. Ward** explained that if the sign was mounted on a background, you would count the entire background, but individual letters are calculated by the dimension of the letter and this is determined by the Zoning Administrator. Therefore, staff just follows the Zoning Administrator's lead on how to calculate the square footage.

**Dr. Williams** said this seems like a slippery way of doing this.

**Ms. Ward** said it has been done this way since she has been here.

**Dr. Williams** asked if this is the square footage of the overall dimension.

**Ms. Ward** said a box is drawn around the letter.

**Dr. Williams** said there are ten letters. Therefore, it would appear that are twenty signs here, not two. If this was a mounted sign, you would count the space between the letters. It just appears that the scale of these words is huge.

**Mr. Howington** said just to clarify what Ms. Ward said, on their previous submittal for Levy's for example, they had all individual letters. Therefore, they counted them as individual letters as well.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Ms. Michalak does she want the size of the sign on East Perry Street to be the same as on Drayton Street?

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes. She believes if one sign is reduced, then they both should be the same size.

**Ms. Ramsay** said it is allowable that one be bigger, but it would appear that they would want the signs to be the same size.

**Ms. Michalak** said she believes the signs should be the same size.

**Mr. Howington** asked staff if they are counting the frontage all the way to the door. He believes you can go into that door and into McDonough's as well.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that it is the three streets fronting parts of McDonough's and then Billy's Place. She said she went here and literally

measured the distance with a tape measure.

**Mr. Howington** asked Ms. Michalak if she measured it to the door.

**Ms. Michalak** answered it went to the end of the windows and then to the corner of building and then across the front facade, turning at the corner. She confirmed these distances on SAGIS, too. The petitioner gave her a measurement of 180 linear feet, but she wanted to check. She measured 158 linear feet. Ms. Michalak showed the Board how she measured the distance.

**Mr. Johnson** asked if the business is allowed to keep the three signs.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that these are two different businesses. Billy's Place is on the second floor.

**Dr. Williams** said the photo shows the word "McDonough's" on the awning, but is it removable as McDonough's is all over these awnings.

**Ms. Michalak** said she believes it is because of the sunlight. She believes it is shown this way because of how the sun is hitting. She said she documented all the existing signage. Ms. Michalak said she does not know what else is say about it as most of the records could not be found. If it was, it only showed when this awning was added on this side. It was approved to match this side.

**Dr. Williams** said his point is that in each of the photos, it is documented by eight slides and you can see the Drayton Street elevation has two McDonough's.

**Ms. Michalak** said there is a total of six (6) McDonough's on the awnings.

**Dr. Williams** asked if these would count as principal use signs.

**Ms. Michalak** said no. You are allowed the awning signage in addition to the principal use signage. For a restaurant, you are allowed an awning sign, supplemental like these signs, and announcement signs.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Absent.**

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Carey** said he was hoping that the petitioner would be present as he has the same questions that Dr. Williams had regarding how many signs the business can have. He realized that staff has documented it all, but when you take the total, can it handle that.

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for the principal use fascia and projecting signs, with the following conditions submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. The proposed fascia sign on the East Perry Street façade be reduced in size to meet the ordinance.
2. The proposed fascia sign on the Drayton Street facade be reduced in size to match the reduced size - PASS of the East Perry Street fascia sign.

Denial of the petition for the ATM on the Drayton Street façade because it does not meet the standards and is not visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is Visually Related.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

[19. Petition of Trey and Deanne Skinner | 12-001813-COA | 318 East Broughton Street | Rehabilitation/Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Description and Photos.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings and Renderings.pdf](#)

**NOTE:** **Mr. Johnson** left the meeting at 8:40 p.m. and **Mr. Engle** left the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

**Ms. Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations and additions to the western-three bay addition on the building at 318 East Broughton Street.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval of the exterior alterations, canopy and trellis additions because they are visually compatible and meet the

design standards. This approval does not include any mechanical equipment or signs.

**Ms. Ward** reported also staff recommends that the Board recommends that the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) approve the 11 inch variance from the 11 foot maximum height permitted for the trellis.

**Dr. Williams** asked what happens to the free-standing sign that would be in the fore ground.

**Ms. Ward** answered that it has no bearing.

**Dr. Williams** said none of the existing conditions drawings show it; yet they talk about the transformers stay in the background.

**Ms. Ward** answered to the best of her knowledge, these are not going anywhere. However, this is a question that the petitioners can answer, but she does not believe that they are proposing to eliminate it at this time.

**Ms. Ward** reported that she was informed by zoning that they did take this proposal to site plan review and there were comments from the traffic engineer about "in and out" that they would prefer them to re-stripe this going the other way. This has no impact or bearing on this Review Board, but she thought it should be brought to the Board's attention.

**Mr. Engle** said the handicap parking is in the front which means that you can turn left from Broughton Street into the space, but the other parking is coming out onto Broughton Street. Therefore, you have a direct conflict among the two. It is either one way in or one way in. He said no lighting is shown. Will this not be open at night?

**Ms. Ward** answered that based on what she has been told, it will not be opened at night. The petitioners have not proposed any lighting.

**Mr. Merriman** asked where will the HVAC units be placed if they are not going on the roof.

**Ms. Ward** answered that none has been submitted at this time for review. This is why she wanted to bring this up that if the petitioners do need this equipment, that it does require review and approval.

**Mr. Merriman** said there has to be a grease trap such as all the other restaurants.

**Ms. Ward** said she does not believe that the petitioners are that far presently in the details. But, she wanted them to be aware that these elements require review and approval if they are visible from the exterior.

**Ms. Ward** said a question was raised about the lighting, but staff did receive an application prior to this review asking for awnings over the openings and

gooseneck fixtures. This was approved, but it conflicts completely with this design. It will be either the awnings and simple lights approved by staff or it will be the trellis. She believe the trellis is what the new tenant would like to do.

#### PETITIONER COMMENTS

**Mr. John Clegg of Barnard Architects** came forward and said they prepared the drawings for this project. Mr. Clegg said they recognize that they have to apply for the 11 inch variance. There is no exterior lighting. The interest is focused on a lunch menu and, therefore, they do not need lighting. The sign at the corner will remain. The petitioners are leasing the site and cannot remove things. The mechanical equipment is on the roof and for the most part, they want to try to reuse this. If they do add anything, they are aware that it must be screened from the right-of-way.

**Dr. Henry** told Mr. Clegg that this is a clear presentation.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Clegg if the planters are affixed to the ground.

**Mr. Clegg** answered no, but they will be of such weight that it will be hard to move them around.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

**Mr. Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said he, too, agrees that this is a good clear presentation. The only issue that the HSF has is with the projecting trellis over the sidewalk and right-of-way. Mr. Carey said the trellis projects a little on a line and then there is the curve along the sidewalk. This seems to be too much. The HSF's suggestion is twofold - instead of projecting and then curving, if it just curves from the edge of the sidewalk, will bring it in a little and it will not be as dramatic or curve as deep. They believe this will help the entire project. Presently, it resembles a tongue sticking out a little too far. Therefore, a true curve needs to be drawn rather than a projection and then a curve. Mr. Carey believes that this would tighten it up a little.

**Mr. Carey** said the Board denied a mural on this building and now they have this which is a vast improvement over a painted sign. Therefore, the Board's courage in making a good decision in a way has led to this.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Clegg if he wanted to reply to the HSF's comments.

**Mr. Clegg** said they appreciate the comment on the curve. They do like it in that it adds some elegance to a structure that is fairly straightforward. He believes that it emulates something that happens across the street at SCAD's building. However, if it is at all controversial, if the need to reduce the depth of the projection, they will certainly entertain that or shallow up the depth of arch. Right now it projects out four feet (4) and then goes into a two foot (2) arch. Therefore, overall it is six (6) feet deep; but if the Broad wants this



decreased a little, they will certainly entertain this.

**Ms. Simpson** asked how much does this protrude to the Art Store.

**Mr. Clegg** answered that he did not measure this.

**Mr. Skinner** said three feet.

**Mr. Engle** said it does reflect the library.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Henry** asked if it is legal to be in the City's airspace such as this.

**Ms. Ward** said the petitioners are required to get an encroachment permit from the City.

**Dr. Williams** asked staff if there is an issue with the planters.

**Ms. Ward** answered no.

**Mr. Howington** asked if the Board is okay with it sticking out six (6) feet.

**Dr. Williams** explained that with it sticking out six (6) feet and with someone walking down the sidewalk, it will actually soften the red awnings beyond. He believes, therefore, the projection might be more effective. He said he was trying to articulate why he does not like the planters.

**Ms. Simpson** said the planters are removable.

**Dr. Williams** said the planters are heavy enough that they will be fixed.

**Ms. Simpson** said the planters are reversible.

**Mr. Merriman** said he believes that Dr. Williams was saying that they are too heavy for someone to steal them.

**Dr. Williams** said the planters look so temporary. Broughton Street is a major corridor. It reminds him of something that may be setup out a shopping mall and you are trying to carve out a patio space where none exist. Here you are on private property, but it feels half-hearted.

**Mr. Engle** said if the right materials are gotten, you will not see the planters.

### **Board Action:**

1. Approval of the exterior alterations, canopy and trellis additions because they are visually

compatible and meet the design standards. This approval does not include any mechanical equipment or signs. - PASS

2. Recommend that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve an 11 inch variance from the 11 foot maximum height permitted for the trellis.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Ebony Simpson

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Not Present

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

**VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS**

**IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS**

20. [Petition of Sign Mart |12-000832-COA | 14 Barnard St. | Staff Review - Sign Face Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 14 Barnard St. 12-000832-COA 11-20-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 14 Barnard St. 12-000832-COA 11-20-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

21. [Petition of Stephanie Lindley for Byrd Cookie Co. |12-001342-COA |213 W. St. Julian St. |Staff Review - Recover Existing Awning Frame](#)

Attachment: [COA - 213 West St. Julian Street 12-001342-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 213 W. St. Julian Street 12-001342-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of Sherri Hartsell |12-001590 | 25 Bull St. #100 | Staff Review - Existing ATM Cabinet](#)

Attachment: [COA - 25 Bull Street 12-001590-COA 11-8-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 25 Bull St. #100 12-001590-COA 11-8-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 12-001601-COA | 411 E. River St. | Staff Review - Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 411 East River Street 12-001601-COA 11-9-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 411 East River St. 12-001601-COA 11-9-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Anthony VU | 12-001631-COA | 513 W. Jones St. | Staff Review - Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 513 West Jones St. 12-001631-COA 11-20-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 513 West Jones St. 12-001631-COA 11-20-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 12-001633-COA | 304-308 E. Broughton Street | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 304-308 East Broughton Street - 12-001633-COA 11-13-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 304-308 East Broughton St. 12-001633-COA 11-13-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 12-001635-COA | 19-21 E. River St. | Staff Review - Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 19-21 East River Street - 12-001635-COA 11-15-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 19-21 East River Street 12-001635-COA 11-15-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of John Deering for Greenline Architecture, PC | 12-001661-COA | 102, 104, 106 W. Congress St. | Staff Review - Existing Awning Frames](#)

Attachment: [COA - 102, 104, 106 W. Congress St. 12-001661-COA 11-9-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 102, 104, 106 W. Congress St. 12-001661-COA 11-9-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Matthew S. Hallett | 12-001664-COA | 401C Tattall St. | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 401C Tattall St. 12-001664-COA 11-13-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 401C Tattall St. - 12-001664-COA 11-13-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Sarah Fritts | 12-001687-COA | 345 East Broad St. | Staff Review - In-Kind Repairs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 345 East Broad St. 12-001687-COA 11-20-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal packet - 345 East Broad St. 12-001687-COA 11-20-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Ameir Mustafa | 12-001736-COA | 16 W. State St. | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 16 West State Street 12-001736-COA 11-20-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 16 West State Street 12-001736-COA 11-20-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 12-001828-COA | 411 E. River St. | Staff Review - Door Replacement](#)

Attachment: [COA - 411 East River Street 12-001828-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 411 East Rivert Street 12-001828-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of John Deering for Greenline Architecture, PC | 12-001859-COA | 102, 104, 106 W. Congress St. | Staff Review - Awning Frames](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 102-106 W. Congress St. 12-001859-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [COA - 102-106 West Congress St. 12-001859-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Amy Howell for Coastal Canvas | 12-001875-COA | 310 W. Congress St. | Staff Review - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 310 West Congress St. 12-001875-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 310 W. Congress St. 12-001875-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Reed Dulany | 12-001877-COA | 4 W. Taylor St. | Staff Review - Wooden Gate](#)

Attachment: [COA - 4 West Taylor Street 12-001877-COA 12-3-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 4 West Taylor Street 12-001877-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 12-001890-COA | 15 Drayton St. | Staff Review - Stucco Repairing/Repainting](#)

Attachment: [COA - 15 Drayton Street 12-001890-COA 12-3-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 15 Drayton Street 12-001890--COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

## X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

### 36. [Report on Work Performed Without a Certificate of Appropriateness \(COA\)](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Ward Michalak Work Without COA 121212.pdf](#)

**Mr. Merriman** said he believes Mr. Howington might have asked this question at the last meeting, but he wanted to know what the Juliette Gordon Lowe House is doing.

**Ms. Ward** said they are repairing the masonry. They have already replaced the stairs.

**Mr. Howington** said he was talking about the front yard across from the Juliett Gordon Lowe.

**Ms. Ward** answered that nothing has been submitted to the Review Board for this.

**Mr. Engle** said this will be a parking lot until they build their visitor's center.

## XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

### 37. [Report on Items Deferred to Staff](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Ward Michalak Work Without COA 121212.pdf](#)

## XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

### Notices

38. [Next Meeting - Wednesday January 9, 2013 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

39. [2013 Historic District Board of Review Calendar of Deadlines and Meetings](#)

Attachment: [HDBR CALENDAR YEAR 2013.pdf](#)

### Acknowledgements

40. [Certificates of Appreciation for Mr. Gay, Vice-Chair, and Mr. Johnson](#)

**Ms. Ramsay** presented a certificate of appreciation to Mr. Gay for seven years of service. This is Mr. Gay's last meeting. The Board thanked him for his years of service.

**Mr. Sidney Johnson** was also presented a certificate of appreciation for his years of service to the Board. However, City Council has not selected a successor as of this meeting to replace Mr. Johnson. Therefore, he will

remain on the Board until such time a successor is chosen by City Council.

### XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

#### Unfinished Business

##### 41. [Elect 2013 Officers](#)

#### **Board Action:**

Approval of the Nominating Committee report for the HBR officers for 2013: Linda Ramsay, Chair - PASS and Ebony Simpson, Vice-Chair.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion:	Brian Judson	
Second:	Nicholas Henry	
	Reed Engle	- Not Present
	Ned Gay	- Not Present
	Nicholas Henry	- Aye
	Keith Howington	- Aye
	Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
	Brian Judson	- Aye
	Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
	Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
	Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
	Ebony Simpson	- Aye
	Robin Williams	- Aye

#### New Business

##### 42. [City of Savannah | New Construction | DOT Streetcar Building and Storage Area](#)

Attachment: [Staff Memo to Board.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Request for Comment - Notification Letter.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Request for Comment - Scope of Work and Photographs.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Request for Comment - Building Image and Drawings.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Request for Comment - Fence Specifications.pdf](#)

**Mr. Terry Koller** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ward** explained that the City of Savannah is proposing to install a structure on River Street to cover the streetcar trolley. They are exercising their right to opt out of the design review process because in their view this is a temporary

structure. They just need to put it up for the unforeseen future until they get a permanent structure for it. However, because of state enabling legislation, they are required to submit the plan to the Review Board and give the Board the opportunity to comment on the design.

**Ms. Michalak** gave the staff report. The representative for the City of Savannah is providing notice to the Historic District Board of Review of the proposed project within the Historic District and allowing the Board the opportunity to comment pursuant to the Georgia Historic Preservation Act of 1980. The City is replacing the existing Streetcar storage structure in the southwest corner of the west River Street and MLK Jr. Boulevard intersection with a new metal structure. This property is within the Factors Walk character area.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends the following modifications to the pre-manufactured building to be more visually compatible with the district: change the roof pitch and material; change the horizontal siding to vertical (which is more compatible with historic metal buildings in the district, such as the one on the Kehoe Ironworks site); select a compatible building color (such as black or Savannah Green); replace the link fence with a more compatible fence material (such as iron); and align the building with other buildings in the block face.

The open, one-story pavilion-type structure may have a place along River Street as that is what is existing historically.

**Mr. Judson** said as he understands it, this is completely recommendations even if the Board agrees with everything that the staff has recommended. Nothing is binding.

**Ms. Michalak** said yes; this is to give the City our feedback. No voting is needed and the City is not required to take any of the recommendations.

**Mr. Koller** said he wanted clarification on the 30 day waiting period.

**Ms. Ward** said the 30 day waiting period is done.

**Mr. Koller** said he would get the information to the Permitting Department.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Koller if this is a temporary structure.

**Mr. Koller** explained that even though they cannot give a removable date, the City is working on a permanent solution to restore the streetcar elsewhere.

**Board Action:**

Draft a letter incorporating recommendations for the project to The City of Savannah with regard to

the visual compatibility factors and design standards in the ordinance.

The contemporary, pre-manufactured design of the new DOT Streetcar Building and Storage Area is not compatible with the site, the Factors Walk Character Area, or the historic district.

Staff recommends the following modifications to the pre-manufactured building to be more visually compatible with the district: change the roof pitch and material; change the horizontal siding to vertical (which is more compatible with historic metal buildings in the district, such as the one on the Kehoe Ironworks site); select a compatible building color (such as black or Savannah Green); replace the chain link fence with a more compatible fence material (such as iron); and align the building with other buildings in the block face. - PASS

The open, one-story pavilion-type structure may have a place along River Street as that is what existing historically.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle	- Not Present
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

**XIV. ADJOURNMENT**

43. [Adjourned.](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Ms. Ramsay adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.



Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah P. Ward  
Historic Preservation Director

SPW:mem

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