



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
July 11, 2012 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

JULY 11, 2012 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Linda Ramsay, Chair
Ned Gay, Vice Chair
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Keith Howington
Sidney J. Johnson
Zena McClain, Esq.
Stephen Merriman, Jr.
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Members Not Present: Reed Engle
Brian Judson
Ebony Simpson

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: Tiras Petrea, Zoning Inspector
Diana Gonzalez, Zoning Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Order](#)

Chair Ramsay called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance.

Ms. Sarah Ward introduced the new Historic Preservation Planner, Ms. Leah G. Michalak. The Board welcomed Ms. Michalak.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. [Approve Minutes of May 31, 2012 Special Called Meeting](#)

Attachment: [05-31-2012 Special Called Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the May 31, 2012 Special Called meeting - PASS
minutes.

Vote Results

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

3. [Approve Minutes of June 13, 2012](#)

Attachment: [06-13-2012 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve minutes of June 13, 2012. - PASS

Vote Results

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

III. SIGN POSTING

IV. CONTINUED AGENDA

4. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc. for Screamin Mimis | H-12-4669-2 | 10 Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

Board Action:

Continue item to August 8, 2012 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Nicholas Henry

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Robin Williams - Aye

5. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc. for Screwie Louie's | H-12-4678-2 | 10 Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

Board Action:

Continue to August 8, 2012 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Nicholas Henry

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Robin Williams - Aye

6. [Petition of Twin Rivers Capital, LLC | H-12-4672-2 | 702 West Oglethorpe Avenue | New Construction](#)

Board Action:

Continue to August 8, 2012 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Nicholas Henry

Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

V. CONSENT AGENDA

7. [Petition of Feiler Associates, Inc. | H-12-4693-2 | 120 Habersham Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the freestanding principal use sign at 120 Habersham Street as requested because it meets the standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Keith Howington

Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

8. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-12-4697-2 | 209 West Congress Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Board Action:

Approval for the fence and stage with the condition

that the wood decking be stained or painted to blend with the main building and samples submitted to staff for approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Keith Howington
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Robin Williams - Aye

9. [Petition of David Spitdowski, Sr. | H-12-4700-2 | 301 West Jones Street | Fence](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval of the replacement screen because it is replacing an existing wood screen, not attached to the principal structure. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Keith Howington
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Robin Williams - Aye

10. [Petition of Neely Powell and Katie Johnson | H-12-4706-2 | 412 Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

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

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Keith Howington

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Robin Williams - Aye

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

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

Agenda A (Items 8 - 12 will be heard at 2:00 p.m.)

11. [Petition of Kevin F. Rose for Lominack Kolman Smith Architects | H-12-4695-2 | 325 East Bay Street | Addition of a front stoop](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Description, Photos, & Finishes.pdf](#)

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

Mr. Kevin F. Rose was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to replace the balcony on the east façade of the building fronting Habersham Street with a new ground supported entry stoop and portico.

Ms. Ward explained that the petitioner, upon receiving the staff report, attempted to address the comments. Staff has provided drawings for the Board's consideration enclosed in their addendum file. They have shown two different ways they are proposing as possible alternatives to address staff's concerns.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for the stoop addition because it is replacing a missing feature which helps restore the center hall five-bay character of the front façade with the condition that the six-by-six inch square wooden posts within the stair, not extend through the stair run and railing, but stop below and continue above to be more compatible with historic wood frame stoops in the district and reduce the verticality of the high stoop.

Dr. Williams asked staff if they knew of any precedent for the base of the stairs to be beyond the outer edge of the house. Is the rise to run ratio of these stairs standard? There are 21 steps and this is a lot of steps.

Ms. Ward explained that there are a lot of steps because the height is taller than most and because this has to meet the current building code. If it was a historic stoop, it would be grandfathered in.

Dr. Williams asked if it extends because of the height.

Ms. Ward answered this is her belief, but they can ask the petitioner this question when he makes his comments.

Mr. Gay asked staff if they knew whether the petitioner had any plans for the window that is sort of hidden behind the stairs. Are there any plans to bring this window back in align with the other windows?

Ms. Ward answered that this is not something that the petitioner has proposed. But this, too, is a question to ask the petitioner.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Rose agreed with the staff's recommendations. He wanted to address the questions first regarding the vertical element of the stairs. They are meeting current code which is the reason the stairs go a little further. Fortunately, they have an extension that was added to the building which is currently here and is stuccoed that helps to mass this. They were lucky that this is where it ended and not further. The one that did not show any vertical elements coming above the stringers will be tricky to meet the code as for as handrail stability. This is why they are trying to bring the elements inside and help to connect this so that public safety will fall in line. As far as the window, they are not doing anything with the facade.

Mr. Gay asked Mr. Rose if he was saying that section B is where the columns do not come up through the staircase as they do now. It appears that they are there to support under the stairs. He asked Mr. Rose if he said this is not viable.

Mr. Rose answered that he is aware that sometimes they see these and some metal pieces stick out on the stairs. But these do not work. He believes the post is probably the most straightforward way.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Rose that on the piers below the stairs if he could bring some bricks down from the top to below and could the stairs be brought over a little so that the rail would be in line with the column above.

Mr. Rose asked Mr. Howington if he was saying cut through them.

Mr. Howington answered "yes" so that they will die into the column on the second floor.

Mr. Rose said they will explore this. He asked Mr. Howington if he was saying at the very top.

Mr. Howington explained typically a rail that dies into the column.

Mr. Rose said they have been going back and forth with the City on clearances and how the sidewalk works. But, they will try to move the edge of the column and widen the stairs a little. It is pretty wide already.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Rose if he was saying the reason they have it as such is because the City will not allow them to bring it over.

Mr. Rose answered no. The stairs are getting a little wide and they are trying to walk the line between what they thought was here and from the map. He asked if scheme A was agreeable to have the posts inside the stringers to help support the upper rail.

Ms. Ramsay asked should the rail run on the outside of the intermediate support.

Mr. Rose stated that the rail does not have to. He would actually like to see it stop in the middle of the post, if possible.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she believes this would be more typical.

Mr. Rose said they were looking at the staff's recommendation and were second guessing the entire time.

Ms. Ramsay said for example someone could be walking down and holding the rail and suddenly it is no longer there, especially on that longer stair during the rain.

Mr. Rose said he agrees.

Dr. Williams asked about the bricks instead of the CMU.

Mr. Rose answered that stucco is here now. It makes sense to just let this blend. This is the approach they took. The brick on the building is not ready for prime time. At some point, they will probably cover this up. It will be hard to match and not have it be a sponge. The bricks are soft Savannah grey.

Ms. Ward explained that the design standards for stoop require that stoop piers and base walls be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street. Therefore, the petitioner is required to do this with stucco.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said beyond the central hall arrangement, they are not convinced that there are any historic precedent for a traditional raised stoop here. It will be a particularly tall raised stoop. The HSF suggests that consideration be made to the removal of the portico and make it a stair and a simple stoop. In looking at the

evidence, the HSF is not sure that this is something that would have been here.

Mr. Gay asked Ms. Meunier if the HSF was suggesting that no cover be over the door.

Ms. Meunier answered yes; no roof or column support. She said if they look at the property at 7 Habersham Street, it is just a simple stair and stoop without a covered portico.

Mr. Gay said he believes a cover was here to keep people from getting wet while standing at the door.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams asked staff to show the neighboring structure on the screen that Ms. Meunier mentioned on Habersham Street. He asked staff if there is any difference on the Sanborn Map between the two as Habersham Street still has a stoop.

Mr. Gay said they can see that the first floor is much lower.

Dr. Williams said the Sanborn is ambiguous in terms of whether or not a portico is over the stair. All this tells them is that the structure is one-story tall, which is typical. Therefore, the stoop could be with or without a roof. Therefore, he believes it is at the discretion of this Board to decide which stoop they feel would be an appropriate solution.

Dr. Williams asked staff that the roof that is over the door now he believes will be replaced by the stoop's roof.

Ms. Ward said this is a canopy now and will be removed.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward if she had any idea of the vintage of the canopy.

Ms. Ward answered no. Staff did not have any historic photos. The earliest photo staff has is the 1970 something photo in the *Historic Savannah* survey book.

Mr. Rose stated that it is very hard to tell from the photo, but the roof is probably from the 1980s.

Mr. Gay asked if there was a precedent to shorten the stoop somewhat when you have to step up to go into the house. In other words, may be the porch would be a foot or so below the door. Therefore, one would have to step up to go into the house off of the porch.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she believes code wise, this would be an issue.

Mr. Merriman questioned the columns that are extending up.

Ms. Ramsay said she understood the petitioner to say that he would be amenable to not having the rail run outside.

Mr. Gay stated the petitioner said if the columns are not here, the railing will not be stable.

Ms. Ramsay asked staff if the Board ran into this type of trouble on the buildings on Taylor Street.

Ms. Ward explained that they have had a couple of new construction projects on Montgomery Street and Taylor Street where intermediate posts were installed to add support.

Dr. Williams asked what does the Board want to do regarding the rail and the post.

Ms. Ramsay said she understood that the petitioner is amenable to having the rail die into the intermediate support and then start again on the other side rather than having the rail completely on the outside of the intermediate support.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for the stoop addition because it is replacing a missing feature which helps restore the center hall five-bay character of the front façade with the following conditions:

1. The six by six inch square wooden posts within the stair, not extend through the stair run and railing, but stop below and continue above to be more compatible with historic wood frame stoops in the district and reduce the verticality of the high stoop. - PASS
2. The upper posts be centered or on the outside of the railing.
3. The railing die into the stoop column.

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Ned Gay

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

12. [Petition of Jim Wubbena | H-12-4696-2 | 204 East Hall Street | Rehabilitation, alterations, and fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Ms. Teri Cornelius was present on behalf of the petition along with the owner, Mr. Kurt Urban.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a rehabilitation and privacy walls at 204 East Hall Street.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for the rehabilitation and new fencing as requested with the following conditions:

1. Any repointing or surface cleaning must meet the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Historic Properties and consultation with Preservation Brief 2: Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Buildings must be undertaken and submitted to staff prior to execution.

2. Window muntins must simulate a putty glaze and not exceed 7/8 inch in width.

3. All new windows must be recessed three inches from the exterior wall. Provide a section detail through the new stucco wall on west elevation to verify placement of windows, trim and stucco exterior.

4. Eliminate the additional gate and curb cut on Abercorn Street and use the existing curb cut which could be expanded not to exceed 20 feet provided that the sidewalk serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

Dr. Henry asked if the petitioner had plans to do something with the window in the far left middle.

Ms. Ward answered that the petitioner plans to remove this window. This is the infill of the porch area and they are proposing to remove all of this and

open the porch. Existing French doors are in the openings. The upper portion will remain as is.

Dr. Henry asked if this section is original.

Ms. Ward answered that it is not original to the date of the building, but it is old. The petitioner is proposing to put a new railing within this area. It is a simple design with square pickets and a base rail and cap, four inches on center. They will be painted to match the other accent pieces on the building. They are proposing to construct a new privacy wall along Abercorn Street. There is an existing brick wall that is here now and they are proposing to remove this and introduce a new privacy wall. They are proposing a seven foot-ten inch (7'-10") stucco wall and columns approximately every ten feet.

Mr. Johnson asked what materials will be used for the windows.

Ms. Ward answered that the historic portion of the windows need to be wood. The petitioner is using a clad window which is allowed in the new infill portion. There are four windows, but two windows need to replicate the original windows being wood true-divided lights, single glazed.

Mr. Johnson asked if all the windows will be the same.

Ms. Ward answered that all the windows will be the same light pattern. All are six-over-six.

Dr. Henry wanted to know what is a clad window.

Ms. Ward explained that a clad window is wrapped which means that it is wood structure, clad in aluminum. This helps protect the window from the weather.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Urban stated that they requested the three curb cuts on the Abercorn Street side because they are eliminating the curb cut on Hall Street. They believe the overall distance of the curb cuts would be centrally equal. They have no problem of accepting the staff recommendation of just two. Obviously, they would like to have the three curb cuts, but it is not that big of a deal.

Mr. Gay asked Mr. Urban if he would be using the backyard for parking.

Mr. Urban said yes, this portion would be parking pads and the remaining portion of the yard would be for their use.

Mr. Howington asked if the window on the upper left hand corner underneath the porch that is being requested to open up if an existing window is on the north wall.

Mr. Urban stated that it is existing.

Dr. Henry asked if the existing aluminum window that faces Hall Street will be restored as a porch.

Mr. Urban answered yes.

Dr. Henry told Mr. Urban that he is pleased with what he is doing. He lives a couple blocks down and he walks by here often. The two hundred block of East Hall Street is a beautiful block.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Urban if he was comfortable with the staff's other recommendations.

Mr. Urban answered yes.

Dr. Williams said he questions the drawing of the roof over the projecting bay on the garage/carriage house. The drawings are peculiar in terms of how they represent the roof. He just wants to be sure that this is not how it will actually be built. He asked the petitioner to explain this drawing.

Ms. Cornelius explained that it is an existing condition that is not being changed. It is a modeling issue along the plan.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Cornelius, therefore, the storefront window is being removed.

Ms. Ward stated that she does not believe that the petitioner is doing any work on the carriage house.

Dr. Williams stated he believed it was said that the storefront window will be removed.

Ms. Ward said the storefront window is not in the carriage house. It is in the main building.

Mr. Urban explained that what they see on the drawing as referenced by Dr. Williams is the carriage house. There is somewhat a bay window here.

Mr. Howington asked the petitioner if there was a reason he did not want to go back with a brick fence. He realizes the center porch is stucco. Normally, on brick buildings and infill porches you see clapboard siding as opposed to stucco. He said to him, a brick fence would be more appropriate. He asked Mr. Urban if he would be against a brick fence and a wood claded infill siding.

Mr. Urban said they like the stucco infill on the existing porch over wood. They believe making the wall stucco to match this would be appropriate. There are some cost issues they considered with doing the brick wall.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they feel just as Mr. Howington regarding the infill wall along Abercorn Street. It is not appropriate and will look like stone, but this should be a material of high order. She said that the HSF suggests wood siding. They also believe brick would be more appropriate than stucco as it would match the brick fence that is on Hall Street.

Mr. Urban said the existing fence on Hall Street is not brick. It has a ten inch brick base and an iron fence. Therefore, in his opinion, this is not really a brick fence.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said there are a lot of commendable components, but the main issue is what Mr. Howington has pointed out.

Ms. Ramsay asked staff to show this area on the monitor.

Mr. Howington explained that he is not against stucco, but believes it needs to be wood siding and a brick fence.

Dr. Henry asked Dr. Williams if he concurred with what Mr. Howington said.

Dr. Williams said yes. He believes the HSF makes a good point about hierarchy in a sense that scored stucco evokes masonry. This is sort of a minor element; the middle part would be secondary.

Dr. Henry asked if they were saying replace the stucco boards.

Dr. Williams said yes, with cladding.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Urban what is his opinion regarding replacing the stucco with hardi-board.

Mr. Urban said they looked at the options when they did the drawings. But, they thought the stucco looked better. Therefore, from an aesthetic sense, they preferred the stucco.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for the rehabilitation and new fencing as requested with the following conditions:

1. Any repointing or surface cleaning must meet

the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Historic Properties and consultation with Preservation Brief 2: Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Buildings must be undertaken and submitted to staff prior to execution.

2. Window muntins must simulate a putty glaze and not exceed 7/8 inch in width. Windows in historic buildings must be single-glazed, true-divided light, wood frame windows. - PASS

3. All new windows must be recessed three inches from the exterior wall. Provide a section detail through the new stucco wall on west elevation to verify placement of windows, trim and stucco exterior.

4. Eliminate the additional gate and curb cut on Abercorn Street and use the existing curb cut which could be expanded not to exceed 20 feet provided that the sidewalk serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

13. [Petition of Tim Kinsey | H-12-4699-2 | 544 East Harris Street | New Construction, Part I, Height and Mass, Carriage House](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Aerial Map.pdf](#)

Mr. Tim Kinsey was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Part I Height and Mass, of a two-story carriage house at

544 East Harris Street. The accessory structure is proposed at the rear of the property and will provide two garage openings off of the lane. The existing wood fence on the east and west property lines will remain. The petitioner submitted a model and it was reviewed by the Board.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass, of the proposed carriage house because it meets the applicable standards and visual compatibility factors.

Dr. Williams asked if this is large enough to constitute a Part II review.

Ms. Ward answered that this is left to the discretion of the Board. At the Board's retreat last year, they had this discussion and it was said that even with carriage houses that the Board definitely wanted Part I and II. However, if the petitioner had all of his materials ready, she would have brought all (Part I and Part II) of it to the Board today for consideration.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Ward to restate the dimensions.

Ms. Ward said the site plan shows 25 feet - five inches (25'-5") wide; 24 feet - six inches (24'-6") deep.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

None.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for Part I, Height and Mass, of the proposed carriage house because it meets the applicable standards and visual compatibility factors. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Ned Gay

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

14. 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 - Description and Application.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Model.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Materials and Examples.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. This application is a little different than the ones the Board normally reviews. The petitioner is requesting conceptual approval for demolition of the non-historic appurtenances on the south side of the hotel at 201 West Bay Street and replacement with a colonnade structure and vehicular canopy. Final section drawings, details, colors and material specifications will be submitted to the Board of Review upon approval of the concept. The petitioner has provided a model of the colonnade that they are requesting. This is a little different from the Part I and Part II. The petitioner is asking approval for the concept before they move forward into the detailed drawings that are required to be submitted to the Board.

Ms. Ward said the staff had some concerns about the materials that were being used. Therefore, staff wanted the petitioner to come before the Board before they got to their detail drawings which will need to come back to this Board for review and approval. Consequently, as she has stated, today the petitioner is seeking approval from the Board of their concept design. She does not believe that the Board is locked in to heights and exact placement. But this is an overall concept.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends conceptual approval of the colonnade, bar, trellis, vehicular canopy and lighting fixtures with the condition that a masonry material be incorporated into the colonnade as it fronts onto the street and lane to be compatible with the subject property and surrounding materials found in the ward. The awning design over the principal entry must be submitted in detail for review.

Dr. Henry asked staff what is going to be removed.

Ms. Ward explained that there is an existing brick pier fence with an iron railing.

Dr. Henry said he wanted to understand the idea of the conceptual approval.

The Board today is not approving the material. What is the Board being asked to approve today?

Ms. Ward answered that the Board is being asked to approve the design concept. She believes the Board needs to talk about the materials that will be used. Staff has concerns with the materials and the petitioner has stated that the materials they want to use are a big part of this project. Therefore, the petitioner wants some feedback from the Board before they get to construction documents and design details. Normally, this would be just a one review.

Dr. Henry asked, for clarity, that the concept that the Board is being asked to approve is essentially a bar.

Ms. Ward answered she believes they are being asked to approve the concept of the colonnade having the chains go up to column and the use of the recycled materials.

Dr. Henry stated, therefore, the Board will be approving the materials.

Ms. Ward answered that the Board will be approving the concept of the materials. Staff needs the Board to discuss materials. However, this is not like Part I, Height and Mass where the Board would be locked into the actual placement or design. This has not been fully developed yet, but staff got into discussing this with the petitioner. Staff had concerns with the materials and how they fit in with the surrounding contexts. The petitioner indicated to staff that the materials are a big part of this project and inspire the design. But, before the petitioner went to the expense and trouble of taking this all the way to the design details, they wanted to come to the Board and see if conceptually this is something they should move forward with.

Dr. Henry explained that he believes Ms. Ward stated that when the Board talks about concept, they talk about materials. What else would they talk about?

Ms. Ward answered that the idea of the colonnade; and she believes something that is a little out of the norm is having the chains that connect to the building. Therefore, the Board needs to see if conceptually this is okay. The Board does not have the specifications on the light fixtures. Therefore, they are not approving the actual thing.

Dr. Williams stated that he believes the idea here is whether the Board approve, regardless of the chains, wires, ropes, and so forth, the idea of the canopy. Would the Board approve the idea of vertical post of some fashion as in this case, the reclaimed wood?

Dr. Henry asked, for clarity, that what is being done now is that the Board is not necessarily approving the reclaimed wood.

Dr. Williams answered correct and the Board is not approving the exact placement of every column.

Ms. Ward explained again that this is different than what this Board normally does. The idea here is should the petitioner continue moving forward with this design or if there are things that he needs to reconsider at this point.

Mr. Gay said it appears that the staff has a concern with the wood.

Ms. Ward said the staff has a big concern with the wood.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the Board approves this conceptually, are they approving the wood.

Ms. Ward answered yes; basically, this is a part of the conceptual approval that the petitioner needs to know whether or not it is okay.

Mr. Gay asked if the petitioner is not willing to use something other than wood.

Ms. Ward answered she does not know. Staff wants the petitioner to address their comments. But, the wood is a big element of the design.

Dr. Williams said there is a separate issue of staff's recommendation of the subordinate area across the lane. Should these elements be included regardless of how they are designed?

Mr. Johnson asked Ms. Ward if there is an issue of recycling.

Ms. Ward answered that the materials the petitioner is proposing are all recycled materials.

Mr. Merriman asked Ms. Ward if there is something else in this area that the petitioner could supply a picture that looks like what he is proposing.

Ms. Ward answered no.

Dr. Williams said it is interesting that the inspirational photographs are all from peripheral of the downtown area; such as River Street, Forsyth Park and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. There is nothing from the inside of downtown among the precedents.

Mr. Gay said it appears that the columns are more rectangular and the model is round. Which is correct?

Ms. Ward stated that the detail drawings show it as a round column, but the petitioner can answer this question.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay said his design associate, Ms. Maggie Sammons, was present today also. When they brought this forward with their preapplication conference with

the staff, there were concerns about the complexity of what they were bringing forward and the materiality. Especially, using the repurpose materials. There was a desire on the staff's part, which they agreed with, to come before the Board before they go to the trouble of doing a complete set of construction documents to ensure they were headed in the right direction. A conceptual approval is really he wants the Board's feedback. If the Board does not like it, then he will have to take this under consideration. If the Board likes it, he has to take this under consideration. As far as what the Board is approving, is technically nothing. They will bring back a complete set of drawings, but before they go all the way down this path, they want to be sure that they are headed in the right direction. Their request today is to have the opportunity to make their presentation and show the Board the logic behind what they want to do and as he has said, get the Board's feedback.

Mr. Shay stated that he would explain the model. He said, pointing to a section on the model, this building is actually 60 feet deep (imagined that it has been sliced as you would bread) and was built in the early 1980s. A motel was here which was one of the original Day's Inn. This family actually lived in Chatham County. At the time it was built, there was actually a little restaurant that was on the corner called the "Day Break." If someone wanted to check-in this hotel, you went behind the hotel to a little office, paid for your room; you were given a key, and you let yourself in at the hotel across the street. Not long after it opened, it became successful enough that they decided to expand into the historic building that they call the "Guckenheimer Building." They used the upper three floors of this building for suites that were basically small apartments. However, since that time, they have been repurposed into suite hotel rooms.

Mr. Shay said that about seven (7) years ago, a decision was made to demolish this building, at least in part because it started to crack in half. It was decided to go ahead and convert the ground floor of the existing historic building, the Guckenhemier Building, which had been abandoned for many years that had one time been called the "Bargain Corner." This was a wholesale grocery chain store. They decided to turn this building into the guest service area. Because of the traffic, coupled with the fact that Bay Street over the years had been widened to the point where there was almost no sidewalk on this side of the street, it was not possible to make the entrance to the overall hotel facing Bay Street. The entrance ended up being put in the back area as you were able to get out of the traffic and check-in at the guest service area. To say the least, the entrance to this building was set back from the main street in a lane. This is Bay Lane and not Bay Street or Bryan Street.

Mr. Shay explained that the desire now is to bring the entrance of the hotel visually from the back. If someone was arriving, then they would be able to see the entrance to the hotel. This is why they chose the colonnade and something that has a better shape to draw one's eyes in that as you arrive you would see this as conceptually being the front porch to the hotel. In the future, it would be valet parking rather than self parking. He said reversing this, when you have checked into the hotel and now it is time to explore downtown Savannah, they have a sort of floor court, the front porch, all the way along this side that is full

of interesting areas. If someone wanted to go here in the mornings and have coffee and a danish, it would be set up as a breakfast bar at this time of the day. If you wanted to just sit in the area where the trellis is and read a book or wait for your family, you could do so. Mr. Shay said that this is really a unique opportunity, he believes, for a nice hotel in downtown Savannah as all the rest of the hotels are literally jammed all the way up to the street; there is never a place where you can have these outdoor spaces that are pleasant that are frequently associated with the nicer hotels. He said, pointing to an area, that the entrance to the building will still be back here. They believe they can do a very simple metal awning similar to the Kress Building on Barnard and Broughton Streets. It is a very thin metal awning supported by some rods and so forth. However, they will come back with this if the Board allows them to do so. When they sat down to work on this, Maggie and he spent some time trying to figure out what the materiality ought to be. Having the massive wall of brick (it is a modern brick) that is similar, but not identical to the historic brick. He said looking at what is here now is a little swimming pool with a sort of brick fence, they decided early on that they did not want brick to be in the pile of materials that was here because it would disappear. It was very difficult for them to try to figure out from a preservation standpoint how to do a brick that related to the building that did not sort of also become something that might be confused as being something that was original to the building. They did not want to go with a thoroughly modern material, but they were familiar with a lot of the materials they had seen when they made several visits to Ramsay Khalidi's area on East Broad Street. They looked at the available materials that were here and they fell in love with some of repurpose materials. They immediately started thinking of ways to make this into a colonnade, but make it out of something that had more character and obviously differentiated from both the 1890 hotel and 1980 parking deck, but would provide a pleasant place for shelter.

Mr. Shay stated that his client has watched the entirety of the development of what they now think of as "Ellis Square." One of his client's observations is who will use Ellis Square and how. However, one thing that is clearly obvious is that it is still lacking in shade. The people that are here are out in the blistering hot sun. Therefore, as they approached this, they decided that what they wanted to do was not to build a roof over it because then it would be an addition, but put canvas awnings over there, but not as the canvas awnings that are here now. Some of the awnings would shield the rain completely. Therefore, for example, if someone was sitting at the bar having coffee and a down burst of rain came, the person would not get wet. The awnings in the trellis are retractable. Therefore, during the winter, the awning could be pulled all the way back. Mr. Shay stated that there is much more he could tell the Board about the rhythm and reason behind the interior disposition of the spaces. But, the idea of using repurpose materials and the other materials they would like to use for the project extends to more than just the columns. Mr. Shay showed the Board the beams that would be placed across the top of the colonnade and will be made from resawn timbers that would be slightly beveled so that the rain would fall off the top and, therefore, they would not rot. From the outside, they would be hollow as they want to run electrical conduits

through it and have a nice lighting effect on the colonnade. He said from the onset, they did not want to use bricks as they felt it would get lost against the sea of brick that is behind it. They propose that the paving in the area will be something that would look okay when it gets wet and older.

Mr. Shay said with regards to the staff's comments, he agrees that the letter of the standards say that you need to make a fence out of the same material as the main building. But, he does not believe that the drafters of this ordinance contemplated that this being a seven-story brick building that was one hundred and eighty (180) feet long. He believes it to be more like the situation the Board just reviewed where someone was having a small fence that was next to a residential structure. He does not believe that the intent of making whatever the fence is made out of be the same material as the house is relevant under these circumstances. They want to remain with the timber and repurpose materials for the space. Mr. Shay said he recognizes that within Decker Ward, itself there aren't timber of structures like the one they proposed, but one of the things he wants to tell the Board is that the area that they are trying to relate to, the Old City Market area, was historical (and it goes all the way back as one of the original six squares) and industrial in character until about 25 or 30 years ago when City Market was made from an area of brick and timber warehouses into a tourist attraction. He heard a presentation not too long ago and listened to an architect that he respects from North Carolina described to people how River Street and City Market were the two main historic elements that people came to Savannah to visit. He was merely struck by the fact that actually both of these were things that were created by his former partners Bob Gunn and Eric Meyerhoff within Eric's lifetime. Therefore, the real history of this area is actually more rough, more industrial and more mercantile than what they give it credit for. Mr. Shay said an example of this is the Guckenhemier Building, itself, which is a masonry bearing wall and a heavy timber structure. Mr. Shay said he realizes that this Board does not have providence over what is on the inside of the buildings, but he wanted the Board to understand that conceptually, the idea of this is to draw people off the street and there are something on the order of four million people that walk along here, getting from here to City Market on foot every year and draw them into the building so that they could see the inside of the building. On the inside of the building they are going to back and expose all of the timber structure that was here in the Bargain Corner before it was renovated seven (7) or eight (8) years ago. Mr. Shay said, therefore, if the Board wants to reference the materiality of the exterior being something that relates to the building, it is actually referencing itself, but only on the interior of the building.

Mr. Shay, pointing to an area, said with regards to the staff's comments about there being an entrance here on this corner which does not lead to some place as near compelling as the entrance on this corner, they agree this is fine. This does not have to have an expression as an entrance when you enter, but they do they want to keep the shape on both sides because as you move by the building and a lot of people arrive here by automobile (whether it's by taxicab, rental car or private cars), reads clearly that it is an entrance from this point. Consequently, this is why it is mirrored from one side to the other. The staff

commented about whether or not they had to do the colonnade out of the masonry material. Mr. Shay said that he wanted to tell the Board that if they say it has to be made out of masonry material, it will not be what the Board sees here today because this materiality does not lend itself to this. He informed the Board that he could not promise them that his client would be willing to go out and have columns carved out of limestone. This will not happen. If it has to be made of masonry, then it would probably be a little low masonry fence similar to what presently surrounds the pool and this would be a shame. Mr. Shay said he would answer any questions the Board might have and he solicited the Board's feedback. If at the end of the day if this is the dog that won't hunt, then he will go back to his client and said may be they should keep the swimming pool. He said they thought hard with some of the people that were in the hotel business to say no you don't need a swimming pool, you need some place that is really a classy place where you can draw people that are walking from one place to another.

Ms. McClain asked if the structure will only serve the clientèle or will the general public be able to purchase liquor, sit here, etc.

Mr. Shay said very decidedly the idea is to attract locals to this place. Everything about this is designed so that people who are staying at the hotel could have an experience that involves as many local people as possible. There are a lot of other features about the program, food and so forth would be designed to attract young people especially from the local community.

Ms. McClain asked if this will be a club atmosphere at night.

Mr. Shay answered that it will be a club atmosphere at night and will be a brunch atmosphere at breakfast.

Ms. McClain asked how would this work. Would they have to get a license?

Mr. Shay said a liquor license is already here; they have the ability to sell alcohol now. This is in a BC-1 zone. Therefore, this is probably the most appropriate zone in Savannah for this kind of opportunity.

Ms. McClain told Mr. Shay this is why she was getting confused when she heard him mentioned that it liquor would be sold. She thought the purpose was to add an additional experience for the clients who are staying at the hotel.

Mr. Shay confirmed that it is, but he wanted to tell them that a great deal of what their design intent is (both here on the inside of the hotel) that when people come here, that they will have a chance not only to experience other tourists, but will have a chance to experience us. If locals want to come here, this will be very positive.

Dr. Williams said Mr. Shay mentioned that it is not a building nor an addition. He asked Mr. Shay to clarify why not make an addition, something more architectural.

Mr. Shay stated that there are a number of reasons for this. He explained, pointing to a section, that the windows are on the hotel rooms.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Shay about the ground floor.

Mr. Shay said the area never had any guest services area. Therefore, it is rooms all the way to the ground. They wanted to create something here where they could use green screening and landscaping to sort of buffer the view. If they built a roof here because there is only an eight foot, six inch floor-to-floor, then the roof would be very low and would be a very unappealing place.

Dr. Williams said right now they will call it a structure (lack of a better term) will affect the upward views of rooms over two-thirds of the ground floor facing the south. Therefore, in principle, they could have a color structure doing exactly what the petitioner is doing, but the impaired two floors rather than one. Dr. Williams said one of the biggest issues is the scale of this. It is too cleavage by the 1980 building and would not succeed in attracting the attention that the petitioner is seeking; maybe a structure that runs equivalent to seventeen (17) feet to two of these stories rather than one. He asked therefore, in principle, since they are dealing with a conceptual proposal, what part of the petitioner's explanation is an appropriate expression that this is an appropriate scale. He asked if now is the appropriate time to give this or wait until they are in the Board's discussion to get the kind of feedback that the petitioner is seeking.

Ms. Ramsay answered she believes the Board needs to give its feedback after they hear from the public.

Mr. Howington asked if the columns would be round. His concern would be whether the petitioner likes the idea of masonry on the columns or if not, his other comment would be the concern of how these pieces would be joined together. Would the round ones be cleaned up?

Mr. Shay answered that this one is essentially cleaned up. It was much rougher than this, although it has not been dressed. The colonnade will have to be made out of repurposed materials.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ramsay Khalidi said he was contacted by Mr. Shay and Ms. Sammons to show them some materials. He said he wanted to cover some points. He wanted to show some examples that are used in Mathew, Arizona that has a very important historic district. He said tucked away in a lot of areas are spaces that did not seem to have much use.

Mr. Khalidi said he wanted to speak to Mr. Shay's interpretation of the space. There seems to be a lot of discussion concerning what the space can and cannot be used for. He said if they look at the history of Savannah and understand the balancing contrast, years ago in one of the examples Mr. Shay used for the

River Street Market Place building which was paired from an 1885 postcard and put back what was missing. The areas that Mr. Shay discussed were industrial and functional in nature; and represented commerce and a number of things where people interacted. He wanted to speak to the use of the materials and the actual use of the space and/or materials. It seems to balance a contrast of space, sculpture and art sometimes become necessary usable art; usable sculpture. Mr. Khalidi said he wished that Ellis Square had shade like River Street. Even parts of City Market have an arbor or trellis.

Mr. Khalidi said the materials that Mr. Shay and Ms. Sammons selected maybe a use of art form. Possibly, something that functions. This brings it to a human scale. He believes that Dr. Williams is correct that maybe some balancing is needed and he believes Mr. Shay is the individual who can do this. Nevertheless, he wanted to tell the Board that the materials came from the River Walk which was a City project. Therefore, it is very local to the building. The big beams came from two blocks down. These were in the News-Press. Therefore, the materials that Mr. Shay and Ms. Sammons have looked at are probably going full-circle in speaking to the context and historic of the site. If the materials were there and if there is a way of using them, he believes this space might be a way of using them.

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation said they share the Board's curiosity about the conceptual approval. He believes conceptually speaking that the notion of this addition or construction (whatever they want to call it) is good. He believes it would add something to the space and would be enjoyed. Mr. Carey believes also that it would be positive. The HSF also shares staff's concerns about materials. He believes it is actually a stronger feeling for him now that he has seen examples of what materials might be used. Mr. Carey said the HSF is not necessarily opposed to wood as they believe wood could work in its most finished and sort of angled state. In other words if they had a more rectilinear form and had real finished products like the box beam that would be on top as opposed to the piling look. Geometrically, if he has the right understanding of what Mr. Howington is saying, it does seem odd how these work together and maybe they don't work together. But, certainly the more finished boxy look would be better. The HSF endorses the use of using repurposed material at every level. However, he does believe that when they talk about the finished product, they have to be respective of the context. Maybe the colors can be introduced to work with the existing brick and still use wood. They were looking at IPE on Bull and Liberty Streets not too long ago. This is a finished product that might work well against the brick context. If this seems a look vague, then he guesses that it is as this step is a little vague to him. As he has said, the HSF is not opposed to wood if it is finished and looks less rusticated and more in keeping with the finished buildings that surround it. Conceptually, they agree with the idea, but when you get to the materials and how they will be finished they have some hesitations.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry asked staff if using distinctive materials would apply in this case. It

is not a certified building.

Ms. Ward answered that staff believes that the Secretary of Interior's Standards do apply because their main principle building on the property is a historic property and is rated.

Dr. Henry said he understands that the building is problematic in this case, but it is clearly attached to the 1981 building. Maybe he should have asked Mr. Shay this question, but he wanted to know what is the little structure that is standing alone here.

Mr. Gay explained that this sort of matches the entrance to lead a person in.

Dr. Williams said he, too, believes that the use or recycle material is fine. He believes that both Mr. Shay and Mr. Khalidi have made a good point that some of these materials come from the area. In interpreting the structure interior of the historic building and other buildings in the area have merit, but if they are going down this path, then he believes they need to respect the way those materials came together. Therefore, the rounded corners for example would never have happened inside a building. It would all be diagonal joints. Therefore, he believes that it becomes confusing and misleading when you try to introduce essentially a masonry corner out of wood. He said in his opinion the scale is too short for such a big structure and will be essentially lost; even though he believes the wood would actually stand out against the brick. However, he advocates, especially on the corner to purposefully attract the attention of the ones in Ellis Square, something is needed liked they talked about on Mr. Shay's other hotel; something more monumental. Maybe not the full length. Maybe it steps down almost as if there is a two-story structure that steps down to one at some point.

Dr. Williams said in Mr. Shay's examples of inspiration, it is interesting that all the examples lean towards a very modern aesthetic and yet the reclaimed materials have a more rustic aesthetic. He asked staff to show the picture on page 2 of the portal from the SCAD museum and to the right is a pergola milled wood. He said for example imagine the boxes being coupled with concrete, slate or some kind of vertical material other than perhaps the pilings. This would create a nice contrast of modern, real old and rustic. Dr. Williams said essentially what is being done is reinterpreting a lane that would be strictly an utilitarian space into something more of a civic street. But, he believes that the rustic quality could actually speak to the more historically utilitarian nature of the lane and the more modernistic contemporary or finished aspects could acknowledge that it has a new role in that it is no longer just a lane.

Ms. McClain said she likes the combination of the modern and rustic. She does not know if this could be done, but she would like to see more greenery here. She believes this is a unique concept for this area and she believes it would do wonders for this area because there are so many buildings here. If more greenery is here, she believes it will draw more people here, especially more women.

Dr. Henry said the material is wonderful, but he has some reservations about the compatibility with the criteria. The concept is fine. He can live with the chains.

Dr. Williams said the part that seems least compatible with the area would be the chains. The example that Mr. Khalidi showed looked like a civic space. These are the kind of canopies they expect to have in a public park over a stage. He said to him it is strange having the chains anchored between the second and third floors of building. However, it seems that the petitioner was trying to reach up with some kind of gesture. His advise would be to use the timber framing and a little masonry; whatever combination materials on a grid-like quality as opposed to chains which somehow, even though they are chains, makes it seem like he is down on the waterfront with sailing ships and sails. This just does not seem right for this location.

Mr. Merriman said he loves the antique pine. Just as they talked about a few weeks ago regarding the IPE on Bull and Liberty Streets, he really liked it, but it just did not seem to fit with the area. Consequently, he has the same question here. He likes the idea about the colonnade and believes it is great, but as far as using the reclaimed lumber, he does not believe it fits with anything in this area.

Dr. Williams said it is almost that the structure of the building were sort of evoked; these are joists from a building that evoked but used in a more playful way in that you know it was not the survival of a building that used to be here.

Mr. Merriman said this would look good for a place as Joe's Crab Shack, but he does not know how it would look here.

Mr. Gay said to get the connection, you would have to go inside the hotel.

Dr. Henry said the mission of this Board is not to rebuild buildings nor re-create wonders, but to approve the design.

Ms. McClain stated that she believes what Dr. Williams has said about the combination of modern and rustic will work well; and add some greenery here. She said hopefully Mr. Shay will come back with a much better design.

Ms. Ramsay said her feelings are the Board is conflicted about a conceptual motion. She believes that the Board does not need to make a motion. They have been given plenty of input.

Mr. Merriman said he believes the Board likes the concept of the colonnade, but it is just the details.

Dr. Williams said he hesitates to say necessarily the colonnade with pilings as it might be colonnades with slate or brick.

Mr. Gay said the petitioner is aware of what the Board has said. They are just

not going to make a motion to say they love what he is doing.

Mr. Howington said he believes the colonnade of not just a round column representing the pier needs to be cleaned up, squared off and a combination of masonry and a square column would be a possible solution.

Dr. Williams asked if the Guckenhemier Building original timber framing all square piers. Is everything squared?

Mr. Shay answered that they use pilings under the ground. But what they will see when they walk into the hotel lobby would be squared.

Mr. Gay said there will be hard pine and finished to some extend.

Mr. Shay said he appreciated all the input and asked for a continuance.

Board Action:

Continue the petition as requested by the applicant to consider the following Board comments:

1. Build an addition, something at a larger scale, possibly two-stories.
2. Consider joinery of wood in forms of colonnade; more rectilinear columns and forms.
3. Designs are modern, but material finishes are rustic. - PASS
4. Chains may not be compatible material.
5. Consider more vegetation.
6. Concept seems good, but materials may need to be reconsidered.

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Nicholas Henry

Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

15. Petition of Charlton Cottages Condominium Association | H-12-4703-2 | 528-542
East Charlton Street and 535-549 East Macon Street | Alteration

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Support Letter and Examples.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Johnson Left the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

Mr. Larry Hess was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval to install wooden landings at the base of the porticos fronting Charlton Street and to install 90 degree wood lattice panels, with a semi-transparent stain under the brick porticos and stairs for all of the units at 528-542 East Charlton Street and 535-549 East Macon Street. This is a series of four multi-family attached one-story cottages. Two units are on East Charlton and two on Macon Street in the Beech Institute Neighborhood. Additional site work includes plantings, mulch, and pavers which do not require a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the revised lattice portico foundation infill and the wooden platforms with a stained finished at the base of the portico stairs on East Charlton Street because it is a compatible treatment in the historic district.

Dr. Williams asked if the request is after-the-fact.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Dr. Williams asked if the white color is what the petitioner is requesting or is it primary.

Ms. Ward answered that the petitioner installed a plastic vinyl lattice that will be removed and replaced with wood 90 degree lattice that is recessed.

Dr. Williams asked if the lattices will have a frame. He asked if the color will be darker.

Ms. Ward said she does not know without going on site. Staff talked with the petitioner about doing a dark color so that it would recess. Staff is supportive of the stain that the petitioner has selected. It is not black, but it is dark and should be okay.

Dr. Williams said it will not read as black once the sun hits it.

Mr. Gay asked if this would be wood as all the examples shown are brick. If the bricks are tilted just a little, the water should run away from the house.

Ms. Ward stated that the staff was originally recommending that the petitioner continue the paver materials at the base, but it was because they did not have an example of how this was done before in the district. Mr. Gay is correct, it is brick and they had the historic wooden platform that was here and the stairs are wood. Staff is recommending approval; however, she understands Mr. Gay's point.

Mr. Merriman asked staff what is the reason this is after-the-fact.

Ms. Ward answered that this is question that needs to asked of the petitioner.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Hess why is this after-the-fact.

Mr. Hess answered that they thought it would be landscaping and they were told they did not need a building permit. Therefore, they thought this was a part of landscaping. He apologized.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Hess who told them this.

Mr. Hess answered that he believes the building inspector told them this; from Mr. Tom Bolton long ago when they did some fencing. They made some courtyards behind the buildings and got a building permit for this, but were told that they did not need one. He has checked on this again and they still don't need a building permit. Mr. Hess said but the lattice panel infill sort of came up at the last minute. He apologized for this. They had several reports of people hiding under the stairs and some of the tenants/owners were complaining. Therefore, they tried to come up with something quickly and they did not really process this well enough.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Hess if he would be amenable to something without a mock-up seeing how the gray would look. What you have chosen is a medium gray?

Mr. Hess answered yes; they picked the darkest gray they could find on the chart. However, they would be happy to work with staff on picking a different color.

Dr. Williams said whatever color was on the other house appeared to work well in making the lattice almost disappear. The worry is that the stain is not going to be quite dark enough.

Mr. Hess said again that they will be glad to work with staff and come up with an appropriate color.

Mr. Gay said this is already done, however, he asked Mr. Hess if he would be open to another material.

Mr. Hess said they certainly could look at it. He said one of the members of the association wrote that "you have to take into account the history of the Beech area. This was a poor area from its inception. It is historically African-American community. Free Blacks built most of the structures after the war and later for those who worked generally as domestics for families across Price Street and for the railroad that borders Beech to east. These cottages were built about 1906 on some former railroad land. The first occupant of 528 East Charlton Street were two African-American sisters both of whom were domestics. These cottages were simply built and were not adorned with brick stoops; stone landings or other similar materials. They would have used wood to keep out mud or perhaps some type of loose gravel or shell. An interesting historic photograph is attached." Mr. Hess said he guessed what they are saying is that the wood is more historically appropriate than the other, plus they have already paid for it.

Mr. Gay said it seems that the petitioner will continue replacing this and this will be a problem.

Mr. Hess said it is pressure treated wood and will last for a long time. When they begin replacing it, they could look at using something else. This not attached to the building and, therefore, is not something that could not be replaced or addressed differently in the future.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams thanked Mr. Hess for bringing the historic photo and supplying the comments of the consultant regarding the wooden platform. He said this type of information helps the Board make their decision when historical information is furnished to them that they might not be aware of.

Board Action:

Approve the petition of the revised wood lattice portico foundation infill and the wooden platforms with a stained finish at the base of the portico stairs on East Charlton Street with the condition that a - PASS darker color be used on the lattice and submitted to staff, because it is a compatible treatment in the

historic district.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Keith Howington

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

16. [Petition of Gonzalez Architects | H-12-4704-2 | 13 East Perry Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Mr. Sean Dillon was present on behalf of the petition representing Gonzalez Architects.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. She informed the Board that they have seen this property before and therefore may look familiar to them. The petitioner is now requesting approval to construct a second story addition on the concrete block addition at the rear of the building at 13 East Perry Street. Because it is constructed on top of the existing rear addition, it is setback 60 feet from Perry Street.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the second story addition on the non-historic lane structure at 13 East Perry Street upon verification of the proposed height exposure from Perry Street and with the following conditions:

1. Reduce the height of the parapet roof to the greatest extent possible to be compatible with the neighboring structures and to reduce visibility from Perry Street.
2. Double-hung sash windows are installed in new punched openings.
3. Extend the parapet roof around the south elevation to hid the shed roof.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dillon said they had no problems with making some of the recommendations that staff has asked for. Changing to a double hung window is simple. It is not a big issue if this is something that the staff and Board want. They can do this. Concerning the issue of the parapet wall, there are

requirements for fire codes to separate the roof structure from adjacent buildings is the reason why the parapet is as high as it is. The way they have designed it is generally they are not touching the existing buildings. They are building the structure through it. Mr. Dillon said the existing structure will not support a second story the way the building is now. Therefore, they have to account for some extra height to be able to get the structure in there to fully support the structure. This is why it is a little higher than they want. Obviously, they want it to be as low as possible as well. They do not want it to show from Perry Street and it does not't even when standing far in the back. He said regarding extending parapet wall – all the roofs are gabled roofs and are shedding off onto the back lane area. They have tried to keep this same concept with not providing the parapet on the back side. They are trying to keep it in line with what is here now instead of putting another parapet up higher between this and adding more mass to the back side.

Dr. Henry said he is happy that the petitioner is adding a second story to hide the air conditioning units.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said that they do not agree for overall approval of this addition. They believe that the visibility of the second story from Perry Street which is the primary façade will completely alter the visual character of this building. Ms. Meunier said it has been stated in the staff report that it will be visible and the height is not subordinate to the main structure. Consequently, the HSF feels that it will greatly impact the visual compatibility.

Dr. Henry asked staff if they agree with the HSF's statement.

Ms. Ward answered that staff is recommending approval with the conditions that have been stated.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Ward if she believes there is a point in the HSF's statement.

Ms. Ward said staff raised this in their staff report. It is taller than the main building and you will be able to see it from Perry Street. Staff feels that it almost appears as a separate building as it is so far back.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Howington felt the building would be seen very easily from the square and it will look odd to him.

Dr. Williams said looking at the cross-section view as a site line. He asked staff to pull this diagram up on the monitor. He said the diagram shows a two foot - six inch(2'-6") parapet above on the north face. He said the petitioner stated that the parapet rises above the roof because of fire codes. Dr. Williams asked if the parapet wall needs to be on the north side of the addition for fire code reasons. He could understand east and west which would be invisible from the street. But with the north parapet which is a third of the height of the

wall, could it be removed.

Ms. Ramsay could not think of a fire code that would require a two foot – six parapet on the north wall.

Mr. Dillon said there should not be an issue with removing this. It was put there for continuity for the side ones. But, they can remove it.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Dillard what is the actual height above the roof.

Mr. Dillon answered that he believes it is 10.5 feet.

Dr. Williams said therefore this will take it down to eight feet. Therefore, it is eight feet as opposed to nearly eleven or 10.5 feet above the roof, the other strategy might be to take a cue from the lattice. He asked the petitioner what color they are planning to paint the north wall.

Mr. Dillon answered that the entire addition will be painted white. Therefore, it will blend in with all the surrounding structures.

Dr. Williams said the problem is if you have a white parapet on Perry Street. If it was black or dark would be a plus. No one will see it and it provides a kind of silhouette effect, this is predicated on the assumption that it gets approved. If they go back to the photo of the elevation of the main front, the concern is the little pediment on the historic building. If the same color is behind it, then the legibility of the little pediment disappears. Now, there is a short eight (8) foot wall. He asked if this photo is from mid-square. He asked Mr. Dillon where you would be standing when looking at this.

Mr. Dillon answered that it is well passed Perry Street. They are standing back in the street in the square is probably another twenty (20) feet. No one can see the addition from Perry Street.

Dr. Williams said the site is on the second largest square downtown. He said the question becomes how much would be seen at eight feet.

Mr. Howington stated that the gable here can be seen. He said if another six feet is added, they can imagine where the line will be. It will be up to the stringcourse on the other building. Therefore, it will block the entire area.

Mr. Gay said the view is above the existing now.

Mr. Howington said his concern is this will be a big block here. He said his other concern is as shown on the monitor, the lane in number three where the gable roof is, if they look at the drawing the parapet is going to be well above this six or seven feet of the corner.

Mr. Dillon said it will not be that high.

Mr. Howington wanted them to look at the drawing.

Mr. Dillon said if they look at the dimensions, if they were to add the parapet on, it will be approximately three feet above this and then you would add another couple of feet if the parapet was inclined to be here.

Mr. Howington stated that it will be quite blocky here.

Dr. Williams asked if they could remove the lateral parapet and not just the north one.

Mr. Dillon said he does not know if they can because of the fire codes. They will be getting into the grey area.

Dr. Williams said if they look at the parapet relative to the front of the building and see the perspective of the windows sloping down in the background, the question is if this is two feet, eight feet will be here. How high would it be? It would be great if there was a section with an advantage point from the opposite side of the square. This would be helpful. This is one of the sticky points.

Mr. Dillon said you would have to go very far back to see it.

Dr. Williams asked what is the street on the other side.

Mr. Dillon answered McDonough Street.

Ms. Ramsay said she believes it is Hull Street.

Dr. Williams said one said, therefore, one issue is the visibility from closer to the Board of Education building looking down.

Mr. Dillon said you will see some. They are not saying that it will be sticking way up there where it will be a huge impediment.

Dr. Williams said another concern is what Mr. Howington said about the blockness.

Mr. Howington said there are two side gables. Therefore, they will end up with something higher than both of these. He feels strongly that it will be seen.

Dr. Williams asked what is the height of the proposed second story.

Mr. Dillon said it will be minimal; it is approximately eight (8) feet. It is more of a storage space so that extra space is on the site since it is zero lot line there is no place inside for them to keep any extra equipment, food stuff and so forth. They just wanted to have more flexibility on the site.

Dr. Williams said it appears that at the top of the roof membrane, it is eleven foot-three inches (11'-3"). He asked if there is a need for the second story to be that high.

Mr. Dillon answered because either you tear down the building and redo it completely or build just above it. They did not want to completely demolish the building just to rebuild it.

Ms. Ramsay said it appears that the Board has a lot of unanswered questions such as if the building is reduced to eight feet or if it is painted a different color. Ms. Ramsay advised Mr. Dillon that the Board cannot ask him to continue his petition, but he can ask for a continuance in order to clarify some of the issues.

Mr. Dillon asked for a continuance.

Dr. Henry asked the Chair to clarify what are their questions.

Ms. Ramsay said it is too tall; they believe it will be a lot more visible and the two gables on the lane.

Dr. Williams asked if a continuous rectangle is the same height on the lane elevation as it is internally on the block. A slopping roof is going down towards the lane.

Mr. Dillon said a minimum flat roof is here.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Dillon if the lane elevation could be dropped and not only make it lose a parapet on the north side, but in a sense to address Mr. Howington's question, maybe consider slightly lower even internal elevation towards the lane. This may be a strategy; and from his point of view in addressing HSF's question, something that demonstrates that this will negatively impact the Perry Street elevation.

Mr. Gay said maybe if you get that far into the square, there may be tree canopies, etc. that may obliterate being able to see above this building. May be the petitioner needs to get back there and take some pictures.

Mr. Dillon said you cannot see it from inside the square because of the tree canopies. He cannot say off hand about being two blocks away about what you would see.

Dr. Henry said if they are stuck between too tall a building and an air conditioning units, he goes for the too tall addition.

Board Action:

Continue the petition at the petitioner's request to address the following Board comments:

1. Provide more photos and illustrations showing visibility from Chippewa Square, Bull Street and McDonough Street. - PASS
2. Eliminate the parapet on the north facade.
3. Use a darker color on the north wall of the addition.

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

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

17. [Petition of Brian Robin | H-12-4705-2 | 20 East Bay Street | Rehabilitation and alteration to pedestrian bridge](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Brian Robin was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward reported that Mr. Robin has shown extreme patience not only in sitting here for the Board to hear his petition, but working with staff regarding his application over the last two to three months. She wishes the petition could have been on the Consent agenda. This is a very simple petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to modify the historic pipe rail on the pedestrian bridge over Factors' Walk in front of the property at 20 East Bay Street. The concrete bridge is spalling from the metal structure and will be replaced in-kind to match the existing design and materials. The existing pipe rail does not meet the building code and the City Building Official is requiring that the rail be code compliant.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the request to modify the historic pipe rail on the pedestrian bridge over Factor's Walk adjacent to 20 East Bay Street with the condition that the existing rail be retained and simple vertical and horizontal members be added so that the original is distinguishable from the new elements and the new work is reversible.

Mr. Merriman asked staff if they had pictures that some of the work has been done.

Ms. Ward answered yes, but it is with a later petition. The work will be done in a different manner. But, it does happen on River Street and Factors Walk where there are historic railings and they are required to bring it into code compliance.

Dr. Williams asked if there is a better detail that shows the spacing of the verticals and what are the materials composition.

Ms. Ward said the petitioner is proposing to match what is here with metal railings with three and three-quarter inch spacing. However, the petitioner does have to put on a new handrail that is tall enough to meet the code. Therefore, what staff is asking that they keep the historic pipe railing intact as much as

possible and just add the new members where they need to so that if in the future it becomes necessary, it could be reversible treatment.

Mr. Merriman asked if some pieces would be cut and welded here so they can come into compliance.

Ms. Ward answered that based on the plan that has been submitted, and the petitioner can attest to this, it looks like they are going to weld them inside the railing.

Dr. Williams asked staff if they are aware of any examples where it is on a different plain.

Ms. Ward answered yes; the petition that the Board will see later on the agenda is attached to it. Staff is recommending that they attach to it as much as possible and just retain the existing railings so that it can be reversible.

Dr. Williams asked if the space is three and three-quarters. Is this code requirement?

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Mr. Merriman said you cannot get a four inch bulk in between. This is what it is supposed to be.

Ms. Ramsay said it could be four inches on center. But for some reasons they are putting it closer.

Dr. Williams asked if there is code requirement less than four inches between, but is there a requirement for the minimal diameter of the elements.

Mr. Howington stated just the spacing.

Dr. Williams asked what are the diameters of the pieces. The drawings show they are represented by three lines.

Ms. Ward said the sectional review shows the round post and, therefore, she thought the drawings were attempting to show it in the round. However, staff rather that it be attached instead of welding it inside. Therefore, it could be reversible.

Mr. Merriman asked if it is not attached by welding it, how would it be attached.

Ms. Ward explained that it could be attached by welding, but not into the interior bars.

Dr. Williams asked if the upper handrail is presently not high enough.

Ms. Ward answered that based on what was submitted, it appears that it has to

be 42 inches.

Dr. Williams asked if the other petitioner has a separate handrail attached.

Ms. Ward answered yes and they can look at it as a separate petition. What they have now is actually vertical members that extend past the top railings so that it gets to that height, but the petitioner is requesting to change this so that it can be horizontal.

Mr. Gay said they must remember where this is. You have to hunt for it to see it. It has a great big air conditioning unit right next to it. It is not like this is a prime spot right on Bay Street.

Ms. Ward said she believes the petitioner is willing to do what needs to be done to satisfy this Board and the Building Official. The petitioner is caught in a place where he just needs to repair the structure.

Dr. Williams questioned if the height of the posts would be extended to get the balls up higher.

Ms. Ward explained that she does not believe that height of the posts are being extended.

Dr. Williams assumed that they are too low.

Mr. Gay said said probably they were made a little taller from the bottom not from the top.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Robin said it is an existing pipe rail. It will be reused and elevated. Therefore, they will have the same top, but the members will be welded in between to meet today's code. This is what is required by the City of Savannah Development Services Department.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Robin what will be added.

Mr. Robin said it will be a new bridge. As they are talking down, the present bridge is dropping to the ground now.

Dr. Williams asked that the posts that terminate the balls are on the railing are tall enough.

Mr. Robin answered no.

Dr. Williams asked if the extension will be added at the bottom.

Mr. Robin answered yes. There will be new plates fastened into the new concrete bridge. He explained that basically it will be extended at the bottom..

The three lines is the existing round to the pipe. It has the vertical members welded in between the three and three-quarters to meet today's code.

Dr. Williams said the Board has not seen the other project yet. They do not know how this project will do it.

Mr. Gay explained that he believes the staff is saying instead in essence, build a railing inside of these railings and attach to it at a couple of points.

Mr. Merriman said this will preserve the railing and not alter the historic fabric.

Mr. Robin asked the Board if they were saying on the outside of the railing.

Mr. Merriman explained to Mr. Robin that what is being said is go ahead and build the bridge, put this back on and build the code compliant railing and put it up against the interior.

Mr. Howington said he recommends the interior.

Dr. Henry commended Mr. Robin for his patience and good will in all of this.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approve the petition to modify the historic pipe rail on the pedestrian bridge over Factors' Walk adjacent to 20 East Bay Street with the condition that the existing rail be retained and a new railing be installed next to the historic railing to comply with the code requirements and be submitted to staff for review. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Robin Williams

Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye

Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

18. [Petition of Robert Portman for Barnard Architects | H-12-4707-2 | 133 Montgomery Street | Rehabilitation and alterations |](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photos.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Elevation Studies.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Garage Doors.pdf](#)

Mr. Robert Portman and Mr. Scott Barnard were present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the report. The petitioner is requesting approval for site work and exterior alterations to the ground floor of the Parking Garage and Chatham County Courthouse at 133 Montgomery Street. The work is being undertaken in an effort to convert the ground floor from office and support spaces to parking and storage. The two buildings that the Board is reviewing today are not rated historic within the Savannah Historic District. These building were constructed in 1979.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval for the exterior alterations at 133 Montgomery Street as requested with the following conditions:

1. Relocate the refuse area from the northwest corner of the site. This corner is a major intersection of two redevelopment corridors, Broughton Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. Greater effort to provide pedestrian enhancements at this corner should be undertaken. The refuse area could be kept in its current location or relocated elsewhere on the property.
2. Reduce the width of the garage door to not exceed 12 feet.

Dr. Williams asked staff if their first recommendation for the trash receptacle area would also be a need for a new curb cut.

Ms. Ward explained that she was not sure. The garage door is needed to get into the parking spaces.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Barnard said there are two issues. One is the door width at 14 feet. He explained that the reason they used 14 feet is because of the existing precast panel joints. They will be glad to install a twelve foot door, but by going to those two joints, this is exactly fourteen feet. Cutting a foot or two feet could actually damage the precast and make the job more difficult or less clean. Twelve will be fine, however, as he has said they went to fourteen for what they feel is a good reason. Mr. Barnard said a little more complex, is the garage

enclosure. As Ms. Ward reported, this is Phase I of three phases of work. They just completed the schematic design on all three phases. They are sequential on purpose. They needed to accomplish certain things that the judiciary wanted now; a couple of extra court rooms. They started on this project in 1994 with a needs assessment for the Chatham County courts that said "they desperately need more court rooms and more chambers." They finally got an approval to move forward with it.

Mr. Barnard said when they started the actual design work with the primary architect out of Washington, DC as a court architect they looked at various options, including moving to the south side of Savannah. The County said they wanted to stay downtown and wanted to utilize the existing infrastructure to the extent possible, but the new courtrooms could not be put into the existing building. State and Superior courtrooms structural grid is a thirty (30) foot column to column two foot wide concrete column. A reasonable courtroom has to be a minimum of thirty-four (34) feet, preferably thirty-six (36) feet wide. Therefore, this pushed them to a new court building which will be here where they will tear down the former jail. This will be Phase II. When State and Superior courts move out, they will be able to go in, and over a two year period, in five different phases, renovate the existing courts building. The plan which they brought explains why their service yard for this court's campus is where it is. They are trying to create energy on all three streets around this new building, although they can have only one entrance. Therefore, they have created an entrance to a plaza; and an entrance to a plaza where security comes in. Therefore, they are trying to occupy all of Oglethorpe Ave. They have a judicial automotive entrance on MLK and drop-offs on Montgomery Street.

Mr. Barnard said by default they sort of said this is not a good area for their service yard. They are trying to consolidate the service yard for the entire campus, which is this building, the existing building, and the parking deck into one area. The west lawn on MLK of the existing court building is reserved for what they call the next expansion, twenty (20) to thirty (30) years from now. They visualize a renovation of Liberty Square. He said, pointed to an area, that they have tried to get the parking moved from here to here about eight places. This will give them half of the width of the road here and increase the green space.

Mr. Barnard explained that by removing this berm, and one berm has already been removed and pavement materials, at least visually showing State and York Streets right-of-ways as the correct width that they will be. They will be pedestrian only. He said, pointing to an area, that he guessed what he was saying is that here and on York and State Streets it did not seem compatible to put garbage enclosures. They share sally port entrances here and into the parking garage. They have been told that garbage cannot be anywhere near here. Therefore, they have sort of eliminated the east side of the parking deck and they did not want to do it on Broughton Street. So, by deductive reasoning is why they ended up with the service yard here. Mr. Barnard said, pointing to a section, they have created a new tunnel and will put a new tunnel to this building so that all deliveries, federal express mail, US mail, all custodial services, garbage out, will go via the tunnels into this building. The

tunnel comes up in this building to a security checkpoint. They have provided a corridor through here into the parking area. One of the additional reasons for the location of the garbage enclosure is that by putting it here, they can have a door from inside the parking area into the enclosure so that the custodial staff can take in deliveries without opening the big doors on the garbage enclosure. He explained that what is happening now is the custodial staff has to come outside, open the doors, deposit, and they are not closing the doors as they will be back in an hour. This process made it easier on them. They have worked with the refuse company to do something unique here. They have front and back sliding doors. Only one door can be opened at a time and they can only front load one container at a time. The traffic engineer and the refuse company have requested that they not front load in this direction. What is being done now is they are coming down, turning in and unloading. Then they have to back out into MLK to come over and unload and then back out to go in. They do not like this as it is dangerous. Therefore, what they want to do is come down and enter the service/delivery yard and address one container by opening one side; back up and address the other container; back up and then they can leave and go in that direction. This is the logical reasoning behind where they are.

Dr. Williams said the drivers drive-in. He asked if the drivers are picking up the containers from the front.

Mr. Barnard answered yes. These are front loading compactors units. It has been questioned where else can they put this. They have said it is possible to that here. They believe that the drivers can come down and make the turn and address; readdress; and leave out of here. Therefore, it is possible that they can put it here.

Mr. Barnard said in offering to the response of the staff's comments that if they put it here, it could work. The logical downside to this are this is the exit from the garage. As cars come out, the vision of cars coming down MLK will be blocked and would make for turning out into traffic a little more difficult. He does not know if traffic engineering would like it, but he believes it will work. It is a negative. They have really been pushing for the corridors to remain open as possible. Therefore, to box in here, he personally would like not to. Mr. Barnard said he understood the comment here on Broughton Street; but he suggests that Broughton Street is unique in that the buildings go from lot line to lot line. This building sits back twenty (20) feet.

Mr. Gay asked if it would be known what is behind here.

Mr. Barnard said it is solid stucco; eight feet high and is six feet behind the facade. In essence, it is a continuation of the Broughton Street facade; although he admits the downside is these are storefronts and this is not. This is something that they cannot fix today.

Dr. Williams asked whether the sheriff's office or whoever occupies the ground floor of the parking garage ever considered the idea of having a series

of shops on the ground floor. This will obviously secure that people would not be able to get into the sheriff's area.

Mr. Barnard thanked Dr. Williams for mentioning this because he neglected to say one thing. He said he brought pictures with him and this is one of the most egregious problems they have visually on this site which is their service vehicles. This is dedicated for ICS which is the computer technology. There are vehicles all over here, including at the parking garage entrance. He said the sheriff has said that those vehicles are immediate in and out from court, taking subpoenas and the only way they are able to negotiate a successful retreat from the sidewalk was to give him these parking places where he comes through the tunnel and is in and out. Before, it was occupied by Child Services. Now, they do have bulk storage here which is desperately needed. In addition, maintenance is occupying this, custodial services is here and a security checkpoint that is 24/7/365 that will man all the county's buildings. This is the function.

Dr. Williams asked if the building on Broughton Street comes to the property line.

Mr. Barnard answered correct. Currently, a new space is here. In their Phase III as Ms. Ward said, they will be using the MLK standards. This one section will put the pressure on the county to move forward with Phases II and III so that when they do all the site work, it will have to meet up to these standards. They anticipate at that time to take out the greenspace. Broughton Street will be more of an appropriate brick/paver from storefront. He is somewhat getting ahead of himself, but they have a blank block and anticipate putting an awning that sort of emulates the entrance to retail. Because of the new transit center, it will not be as busy as it is now, but there will still be a bus stop here. There are some thoughts in the future.

Dr. Williams said the reason he asked this is in terms of how this might impact the garbage receptacle issue at the corner and whether it should be recessed six feet or even come out in line with the building; or if the petitioner's long term plans had an additional six or eight feet being added to the building so that the north elevation becomes more sympathetic to Broughton Street and how this might impact the petitioner's plans now. Is there anything that can be done now that might help ameliorate the Broughton Street facade long term?

Mr. Barnard, pointing to an area, said they tried to put the door here. It is a steel frame building and those poured concrete stairs are the lateral support. The structural engineer said no, even as minor as one door, they do not want them to mess with it. Therefore, they are keeping the door and the sidewalk is currently here and the closure is as close to Broughton Street as reasonable within those parameters.

Dr. Henry said the staff reports on page 3, greater effort to provide pedestrian enhancements at this corner should be undertaken. He said he believes that the petitioner has made a reasonable case of the logistics of the location.

However, he asked Mr. Barnard if he could get some more pedestrian enhancements here.

Mr. Barnard needed clarification regarding this question.

Dr. Henry explained put more pedestrian enhancements by the garbage cans.

Mr. Gay said the mass eight foot wall is something else. He asked Dr. Henry if this is what he means.

Dr. Henry explained the staff has better ideas than he has. But, put some greenery here.

Dr. Williams said plans show both greenery and bushes.

Mr. Barnard said this is existing landscape. Shrubs are here now. This is a walkway.

Dr. Henry asked where is the refuse collection located now.

Mr. Barnard said it is to the left of the sidewalk.

Dr. Williams said it may be helpful to go to page 3. He said in the top left-hand photo, half of the photo will not change, but where the drip line comes off the little canopy is where the wall will go.

Mr. Barnard explained that the wall will actually come to edge of the walkway.

Dr. Williams asked if the wall will rise up to the canopy.

Mr. Barnard said it will be eight (8) feet high. Therefore, it will come up to the horizontal precast line.

Dr. Henry said there is a sidewalk going to the door, but he assumed that it was a pedestrian sidewalk.

Mr. Barnard said it will be built from that point to the right.

Mr. Gay said it is not a regular sidewalk, but a path.

Dr. Henry said he believes what the staff is concerned about and so is he is what is on the left of those hedges.

Dr. Williams said it is Broughton Street.

Dr. Henry asked if a sidewalk is not along here.

Ms. Ramsay said a sidewalk is here.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Barnard if he was saying that there is nothing he can do to enhance the pedestrian experience.

Mr. Howington said this is not what the petitioner is proposing at this time.

Dr. Henry wanted to know what the petitioner is proposing.

Mr. Howington said what the staff was meaning by enhancing the corner, he did not want to speak for the staff, but the petitioner has done a lot of work to enhance the corner already by putting in new paving, sidewalk, etc. The corner, without the encroachment, would be somewhat more pedestrian. The corner without the garbage enclosure would enhance the corner. This is a prominent corner.

Dr. Williams said the entire garage was basically sheathed on Broughton Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard as some kind of new facade that came out to the lot lines, but had openings for the trucks to come in and out. He said in a sense the down pressure almost becomes internalized behind the facade.

Mr. Barnard said they have had a lot of fun with what they have termed the re-skinning of the Courthouse box. They all know what it looks like now. It has been fun working with Historic Savannah Foundation and Ms. Ward. They look forward to coming back to the Review Board. They have pushed as much as they can. It has been said that they are doing a new building and are re-skinning this. Can't the parking deck be re-skinned? Everybody will say that would be wonderful, may be in the future. Mr. Barnard said economically, the project is roughly \$106 million dollars now, which is just hard for the county to swallow.

Mr. Gay said they hate to see something that was built torn down, but the jail is probably the ugliest building in Savannah. This will be a plus no matter what.

Mr. Barnard said Judge Kurt did ask the question that has been asked and in response they did have their structural engineer confirm what he thought was true, which is the structure of the parking garage is fine. They have been reasonably well maintained. The concrete and the steel are fine. The aesthetics and the skin are not fine.

Dr. Williams said in getting back to the question of the location of the garbage collection, if it was moved to the left of the gray zone and took up a little of the green space; and if it was the same dimension it would probably be okay. But roughly it comes about two feet short of the brick pavement on the sidewalk.

Mr. Barnard said they tried to leave a little green space here.

Dr. Williams said if this is moved over and, as the petitioner said, they could conceivably do it, does not change the little path and the bushes necessarily on the Broughton Street and MLK corner, but it makes change possible here. He asked Mr. Barnard if his concern was the visibility for people coming north on Montgomery and from the sidewalk, the eastern edge of the new brick

sidewalk, the ramp where people come out of the garage coming westbound. How far is it from the eastern edge of that sidewalk to the curb? Is it about fifteen feet?

Mr. Portman explained that it is an eight foot wide sidewalk and an eight foot tree lawn.

Dr. Williams said it is almost a car length before the nose of the car gets out into the traffic. Then the guard things are setback and now it is sixteen feet. Therefore, cars coming down the ramp passing the face of the garbage collection, which will be behind two doors; the garbage gets rotated 180 degrees faces north; will be on that little green space; the exit ramp from the garage will cross the face of that and exit.

Mr. Gay said there is no parking on this street.

Dr. Williams said the concern was visibility. But, he is thinking that as you pass the garbage collection and get clear view of the wall, obviously the driver has to be able to see, but a normal car – you are looking at may be six or seven feet from the front bumper before the person passes the garbage collection. Therefore, the front of the car will not be out into the street yet. You might have to look for pedestrians, but not so much for oncoming traffic.

Mr. Portman explained that this corner is a little tough for pedestrians than for cars.

Dr. Williams said his concern is whether the net gain worth it for this corner. It is a lousy corner any way, even if they move the trash. This is a miserable corner.

Mr. Barnard, pointing to an area, said this is the corner that Dr. Williams was talking about.

Dr. Williams said in the long term plan, the wall will be setback from the pedestrian restored street.

Mr. Howington said to go back to Dr. Henry's question; he asked Mr. Barnard if they are actually redoing the sidewalks eventually on Broughton Street.

Mr. Barnard answered yes. Phase II with the new construction of this, they are going to do site improvements. He said, however, he needs to be clear as the county is not doing this work out in Liberty Square. They are simply envisioning this and hoping to plant seeds with the city so that it will come along.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, he believes the question for the Board is if moving the garbage receptacle area yields something down the road; maybe not in Phase I; maybe not even in Phase II, but at some point in the grand scheme would moving the trash collection to the south to the green area allow something to happen at Broughton Street and MLK Jr. Boulevard.

Mr. Gay said it allows nothing.

Mr. Howington said it possibly it will be a nicer corner.

Dr. Williams said it will give more wiggle room in the long term to do something with this corner.

Mr. Barnard said they designed the service yard to be a reasonable place to look at. It will be concrete pavers and storefront. But, this where FED-Ex parks; it is where deliveries are made and so forth. He suggested that while this is certainly available and there are certain down sides to it, he personally thinks this is better because from Broughton Street, they are not seeing when these are open and they are really shielding the service yard from the retail sidewalk on Broughton Street.

Mr. Gay said in enhancing the corner, you still got the doorway and the path going out here that will be here one way or another. Now, they might tear up the cement and put bricks here, but it will not make a big difference.

Mr. Barnard said they are right in the same area that was intriguing to him because he has envisioned the re-skin of this building. But he has to admit that it would be interesting if when the building is re-skinned if you did not create something that came to the lot line; especially where the service yard is.

Dr. Williams said imagine that the Federal Court House faces Wright Square. The delivery yard is actually embedded in the building.

Mr. Barnard said he would argue that this is the preferably the location so that they back up to Broughton Street instead of opening to that interchange with the garbage. He believes it is problematic blocking the corner with vehicles coming out here. A five-story parking garage generates a lot of traffic. Therefore, if pedestrians are coming down, they are less visible.

Dr. Williams asked if the height of the wall will be sufficient to block the view as the containers are lifted up and over the truck. One advantage to what the petitioner has said is that it will create a sound buffer as the trucks when they lift the containers will create noise. Will there be some benefit to having a taller wall if they are going to keep it here? If they are going to be dedicated to blocking noxious aspects of this from Broughton Street, eight feet does not sound sufficient.

Mr. Gay asked how often the garbage trucks come here.

Mr. Howington said he believes the truck come about seven days a week.

Mr. Barnard asked if it was being suggested that instead of the eight feet height here what if the wall extended on up. They stopped it that joint which was one lot. They can go up another foot.

Mr. Gay said go up to the canopy.

Mr. Barnard said they can go up to the canopy and carry it across.

Dr. Williams said basically if they had a wall that extends the line of the canopy westward, if they are keeping it here, would actually knit it together better with the existing building than stopping at the precast concrete seam.

Mr. Portman stated he agrees; this is a logical architectural visual point.

Dr. Henry asked in taking the wall to the canopy how high will the wall be.

Mr. Howington said it will be probably twelve feet.

Mr. Portman answered may be eleven or twelve feet. The wall will match the top of the canopy.

Ms. Ramsay said the wall cannot be more than eleven feet unless they get a variance.

Mr. Barnard said in this case, he believes the correct parameter visually would be to match the top of the canopy. He does not know if it will be eleven feet or more.

Ms. Ramsay stated, therefore, if it is more than eleven feet, the petitioner would need to seek a variance via the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).

Dr. Williams asked the petitioners if they had some wiggle room with how close they come to the door. They could push it southward to the next seam or even a little further over.

Mr. Barnard said he would like to say yes, but regretfully no. The logic for not doing this is they have a stand off and they are trying to maintain as much space here so that this door really does provide usable space for custodial staff to come and go without opening the big doors. They are kind of squeezed where the door is located.

Dr. Williams said the only reason he made the suggestion was to allow a little more room to the south of the path so that something could be planted that might soften the wall. There might be sufficient space here already to do this.

Mr. Barnard said they have talked about this already, but they would be happy to modify and make it a green wall.

Dr. Henry said one thing the petitioners could do is grow taller hedges. This would be a pedestrian enhancement.

Mr. Barnard said they could easily grow fig vines on the wall.

Mr. Howington asked to clarify if the petitioners were in favor of raising the wall to the canopy.

Mr. Barnard answered yes; they are in favor of raising the wall to the top of the canopy point.

Dr. Henry asked the petitioners if they said they could handle the glass door issue.

Mr. Barnard answered no. He was under the impression that it made sense leaving it at the existing precast joints of fourteen (14).

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Barnard if he said they could work with a twelve foot and put a spacer or something inside the precast framework.

Mr. Merriman said he understands if the petitioner could not make it wider, but why not make it narrower.

Mr. Barnard, pointing to a section, said this precast joint and that precast joint, they had a fourteen foot door just to fit in those two precast panels. They could try to cut two feet off one of those precast panels and replace it. But, to them it seemed more logical to do a fourteen foot door.

Mr. Gay said they would be making it smaller not bigger. The big columns will not be touched.

Mr. Barnard explained that these are the two existing panels. There is a joint here.

Mr. Howington said the Board is asking that the petitioners go to the next joint.

Dr. Williams stated why not cut at those joints and come in with one foot on either side with some kind of stucco frame.

Mr. Barnard stated that he believes that whatever material that is stucco will weather differently than the precast and will look like an addition. He believes it would be cleaner to stay joint to joint.

Mr. Gay said if the petitioners are going to re-skin it, it will not make a difference anyway.

Mr. Howington said the petitioners option is to get a variance from ZBA.

Dr. Williams said the staff made a comment about the materiality of the door. He said the Board needs to talk about this.

Mr. Gay said they did not want the doors to look like garage doors in a lanes. It should be exactly as they have said, some sort of louvered type that comes down and goes up which does not look like what is seen on a carriage house.

Dr. Williams asked staff what was the issue they had with the petitioners' proposed doors.

Ms. Ward explained that it is staff's opinion, because they fronted a street, they should appear as a nicer, more refined door instead of the utilitarian door that is being presented. There is a whole conflict on the side because it is a service yard and they have to accommodate those needs, but it just happens to also front onto MLK. Therefore, staff was asking for a better design that was a little more refined than just a service door roll up door that was here. But, not a carriage style door.

Mr. Barnard said one of the reasons they chose this door was the six inch dimension. The sort of standard eighteen, two feet panels to him is typical industrial. They felt the six inch panel gave a texture that would fit in with the louvers that will be going left to right. The six inch panels that are adjacent to the louvers are bronze would be painted bronze. From a distance it would look like a continuous element.

Dr. Henry said he is not qualified to make this judgment, but the staff is. He wanted the petitioners to get with staff on the matter.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said the Board has discussed a lot of the HSF's comments. They were concerned as staff pointed out the location of the trash. They are aware that it is on two redevelopment corridors. The HSF has spoken with Mr. Barnard about this. They realized logically why the petitioner has chosen to put it here. But, at this point the HSF suggests that any efforts that can be made to minimize the appearance whether it is greenery or making it a green wall. Ms. Meunier agreed architecturally that raising the height of the wall in this case might make sense to meet the canopy.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry said the Board has talked about taller heads, a green wall on the other side; and raise the wall to meet the canopy.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board needs to make it a finding if they agree to letting the petitioner have the fourteen (14) feet wide door that it is visually compatible.

Ms. Ward explained that the Zoning Inspector has pointed out that the discussion appears to be that the Board is going to require that the wall be as tall as the canopy. Therefore, this would be a good time if the petitioners need a variance from the standards to do this if it is over eleven (11) feet.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for the exterior alterations at 133 Montgomery Street with the following conditions:

- a. A green screen be provided on the exterior of the trash enclosure wall. - PASS
- b. The trash enclosure wall be elevated to meet the top of the existing canopy on the northwest corner of the building.
- c. The garage door design be submitted to staff for final approval.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

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

Board Action:

The Savannah District Board of Review does hereby find that the proposed height of the trash enclosure wall which might exceed 11 feet in height to reach the top of the canopy and the 14 foot wide garage door entry are visually compatible on this building. The Board recommends that the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals approve any variances needed from the design standards for *Fences, Tressises and Walls* [8-3030(n)(12)b.] which provide for a maximum wall height of 11 feet and *Lanes and carriage houses* [8-3030(n)(13)d.] which provides for a maximum garage opening width of 12 feet. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Ned Gay

Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

19. [Petition of Speedi Sign | H-12-4708-2 | 701 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Sign](#)

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

Mr. Flint of Speedi-Sign was present on behalf of the petition

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for non-illuminated supplemental identification signs on the freestanding teller for Carver State Bank located at 701 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.

Ms. Ward said staff recommends approval for one supplemental identification sign on the freestanding teller provided that only one sign be installed that does not exceed nine square feet, or the maximum permitted under the ordinance as determined by the Zoning Administrator. The location and/or any signage proposed over the maximum aggregate square foot permitted may require a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals; this is determined by the Zoning Administrator.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Flint said he was in agreement with the staff's recommendation. He has spoken with their client and they will maintain one sign on Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for one supplemental identification sign on the freestanding teller provided that only one sign be installed that does not exceed nine square feet, or the maximum permitted under the ordinance as determined by the Zoning Administrator. The location and/or any signage proposed over the maximum aggregate square footage permitted may require a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals; this is determined by the Zoning Administrator. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.
Second: Ned Gay
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

20. Petition of Richard Wissmach | H-12-4709-2 | 508 East Factor's Walk | Rehabilitation and alterations

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Richard Wissmach was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations to the third floor north elevation fronting River Street of the Olde Harbour Inn at 508 East Factors' Walk.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the exterior alterations to the third floor north elevation fronting River Street of the Olde harbour Inn at 508 East Factors' Walk with the following conditions:

1. The door and window sash material and glass configuration replicate the old design and material with wood sashes, frames, and single-pane glass.
2. The balcony projection is consistent with the existing balconies on the fourth floor.

Mr. Merriman asked staff that instead of the petitioner using the Marvin materials they have proposed, staff is recommending that the petitioner use sashes to match the ones that are already here.

Ms. Ward said the petitioner would not necessarily have to do customs sashes. She believes that Marvin also makes a single glazed wood sash. It is not a clad window and not a simulated divided light.

Merriman asked if these windows would look like the rest of the windows.

Ms. Ward answered no. This is the only strange thing. The Review Board, in 1998, approved the replacement of all the windows in this building with aluminum clad windows.

Mr. Merriman asked if the windows were replaced.

Ms. Ward answered yes. The windows that are here are not original. She believes that what the petitioner is attempting to do is to try to restore the original openings and the original sizes. So, the sashes and doors that are replaced should try to do this as well; even though they will not match the rest.

Mr. Gay asked if the petitioner wanted to change the shutters and maybe have them square. He said the petitioner has written that "therefore the proposed alteration to window shutters." Mr. Gay said he believes, however, that the

petitioner meant window/shutter.

Ms. Ward explained that the petitioner will have to install new shutters so that they will be sized to fit the opening. But, she does not believe that the petitioner is proposing to square them off, they are still round. As the window gets longer, the shutter gets longer.

Dr. Henry asked staff if they knew the percentage of the aluminum windows that are here.

Ms. Ward answered 100%.

Mr. Merriman asked that since all of the windows have been changed, do they think it is more important to try to go back with the original single pane, even though they will be different rather than remain visually compatible.

Ms. Ward said the window openings are going to be different. Therefore, she believes that if the gesture is that the petitioner is trying to restore it back to the original, they should do this with the sashes as well. They are looking at a building that is under one property ownership, but in times past it might have been multiple ownership. However, she believes it was always one owner. Ms. Ward stated that a previous Board did approve the aluminum clad windows and it was allowed. The ordinance just that "windows in historic buildings should replicate the original in design." Therefore, this is what staff is recommending that the petitioners do.

Mr. Merriman asked staff if they know why the Board approved changing the windows to the clad aluminum.

Ms. Ward said in the staff's report, a photo that was submitted in 1998 with the request. She said in reading the staff report of 1998 (she was not on staff at that time), there were different windows throughout the entire building. On the upper floor, there were single-hung aluminum windows. The windows on the lower floors were mostly wood, six-over-six. She is not sure why the light pattern was chosen to go to two-over-two. The building was built in 1892. Therefore, it would have had a more Victorian pattern which is two-over-two.

Mr. Gay said the windows are here and there is not much the Board can do about it now.

Dr. Williams said in looking at the first bay, the third floor window is open. It looks almost like a casing.

Ms. Ward stated she believes that if the Board chooses to allow the petitioner to go back with the aluminum clad windows they have the ability to allow this as it was approved by a previous Board and the petitioner will be basically replacing what was here. However, she would recommend that if the petitioner is trying to replicate the old openings, that they go back with what was there. However, she believes that the Board can approve either.

Dr. Williams asked staff if they could clarify why the two windows on either side are being lowered.

Ms. Ward explained that the petitioner is working on improvements in this area, but if the Board looks at the historic photo versus this photo, the windows on the third floor look a little taller. There is evidence on page four (4) that they are bricked in on the interior. She believes a survey was done not too long ago of the entire floor and they are bricked in on this entire floor. Presently, the petitioner is just doing improvements at this location.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Wissmach gave the background on this project. Presently, this is the first phase of a multi-phase improvement for the building. There are four stories. The lower levels are retail on River Street. The second and third floors are the Olde Harbour Inn. If you are walking east to west, there are nine (9) bays. Therefore, there are 27 bays total. There are 24 rooms; the three contiguous bays on the third floor in the center are the guest services. This comprises the receptionist office, the kitchen area and a breakfast area. This is the area that is the first phase of these improvements. They are taking these three bays and basically gutting them to go back to the original materials. There are beautiful columns, beams, wood ceilings, hard pine floors and the brick walls on the north end of the facade. With these improvements, they thought it would be appropriate to go back and improve the wall. The large windows bring in light. There will also be a breakfast area with the table height setting that allows for the visual connection to River Street. Mr. Wissmach said of course the actual balcony will provide direct access to the river in this guest area. This is the reason they are dealing with the four windows. The current double windows will be the pair of doors for the balcony.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Wissmach if he had a response to the staff's recommendation to go back to wood windows.

Mr. Wissmach said the wood windows would not be a significant difference on the exterior. They are looking at a 5/8 and the frame will be similar in size. He said it would only be close up when someone will notice a significant difference. Therefore, they can go either way with this. Mr. Wissmach said he is opened to the staff's recommendation.

Dr. Williams said Mr. Wissmach has mentioned that people will be inside these windows eating breakfast or whatever; they will be in close proximity to these windows. Therefore, they need to have something that looks close to the historic windows as opposed to aluminum clad.

Mr. Merriman said the wood would be on the inside.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Wissmach how he felt about the balcony recommendation.

Mr. Wissmach said they are improving the others. It is always interesting to go back and try to figure out what the rationale was for certain improvements. It is interesting that the top rail is at 42 inches. Therefore, it was not a code requirement, but there is some other rationale why this was done. However, their goal is to remove it on the three above that exist and come back with the half inch square pickets and go horizontal. He said one change he would recommend is rather than the half inch square on the outside face, bring them in on the inside so that it reinforces the tube steel from River Street.

Mr. Gay said the balcony will be set out four feet instead of three feet.

Mr. Wissmach said it will be the same projection as the ones above. They are basically duplicating the three that are on the top floor.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with the staff's recommendation for approval. Ms. Meunier said they did have some concern about the horizontality of the rails that are being added. The Architectural Review Committee and a few others brought up the issue of the Factors' Walk proposal about potentially mirroring what they are doing there, do it here also. She realizes that the pipe railings are a little different and this one does not have finures. But, for consideration, the HSF suggested have more vertically oriented rails instead of horizontal rails.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said he believes the question would be which would allow the legibility of the original pipe rail better. If the bars are behind the pipe rail, would the original pipe rail be more legible with the petitioner's proposed horizontal orientation or with the other proposal that had the vertical orientation.

Mr. Howington said the petitioner has agreed to modify pulling it inside. Therefore, he believes this will make it much better.

Dr. Williams asked the Board members if any of them shared HSF's concern that the horizontal might be less compatible. If they look at the photo on the lower left, they can see the original pipe vividly. Is is going to be equally true of the horizontal proposal? Dr. Williams said, personally, he finds it harder to read especially the original members of the pipe rail with the horizontal. He believes the verticals especially if they are cutoff. He does not know if they have to be cutoff at the top or whether they have to rise up to the tip of the curb.

Mr. Gay said they appear to be a little closer together.

Dr. Williams said evidently they do not have to rise up above the pipe because they are cut in the lower scheme.

Mr. Gay said there is nothing there.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, if the verticals or replacements were cutoff at the level of the top rail, he believes this would allow the legibility of the historic better inside and also vertical and cutoff at the top rail.

Mr. Howington said he agrees.

Mr. Gay said vertical certainly makes it stand out.

Board Action:

Approve the exterior alterations to the third floor north elevation fronting River Street of the Olde Harbour Inn at 508 East Factors' Walk with the following conditions:

1. The door and window sash material and glass configuration replicate the old design and material with wood sashes, frames, and single-pane glass. - PASS
2. The balcony projection is consistent with the existing balconies on the fourth floor.
3. Balcony balusters be vertical and inside the pipe railing.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

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

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

21. [Amended Petition of Mark Albee | H- 12-4604-2 | 401-403 Whitaker St. | Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4604-2 Amended 7-2-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4604 Amended 7-2-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of John Palmaccio | H-12-4685\(S\)-2 | 246 W. Broughton St. | Security Cameras](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4685\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4685\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Russell Kern | H-12-4687\(S\)-2 | 405 E. Huntingdon St. | Roof, Color Change, Shutters](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4687\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4687\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Coastal Canvas Products | H-12-4688\(S\)-2 | 52 Barnard St. | Color Change, Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4688\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4688\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of Nathan Pollard for Kern-Coleman, Inc. | H-12-4689\(S\)-2 | 12 W. Oglethorpe Ave. | Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4689\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4689\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Wells Anderson | H-12-4690\(S\)-2 | 549 E. St. Julian St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4690\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4690\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Sign Mart, Inc. | H-12-4691\(S\)-2 | 214 Drayton St. | Sign Face Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4691\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4691\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Gregg and Jane Harris | H-12-4692\(S\)-2 | 525 Eas Harris St. | Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4692\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4692\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Virginia Chambers | H-12-4694\(S\)-2 | 537-539 Hartridge St. | Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4694\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4694\(S\)-2 7-6.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Doug and Angela Bean | H-12-4710\(S\)-2 | 324-326 East Bryan St. | Color Change, Roof Repair](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Amy L. Howell for Coastal Canvas | H-12-4711\(S\)-2 | 41 Whitaker St. | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4711\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4711\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Amy L. Howell for Coastal Canvas | H-12-4712\(S\)-2 | 303 W. St. Julian St. | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4712\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4712\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Lois Gruberger | H-12-4714\(S\)-2 | 309 W. Hall St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4714\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4714\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Larry and Betsy Lehner | H-12-4715\(S\)-2 | 208 W. Huntingdon St. | Color Change, Shutters](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4715\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4715\(S\)-2 208 West Huntingdon St..pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

35. [July 11, 2012 Report](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Ward Work Without COA 071112.pdf](#)

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

36. [Next Meeting - Wednesday August 8, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

Dr. Henry reported that the one of the members of the Historic District Review Board is running for public office. He said that Ms. Zena McClain is running for District Attorney. Early voting will begin on Monday, July 16, 2012. The actual election day is Tuesday, July 31, 2012.

Dr. Williams asked if the Board received a petition to do the work in the Old Lerner's Building on East Broughton Street.

Ms. Ramsay confirmed that the petition came to the Board. They are restoring the property for Levy Jewelers. They are restoring the storefront glass. The original drawings were submitted to the Board.

Ms. McClain asked if the Board approved the sign that Blick Art installed.

Ms. Ward said the freestanding sign was not approved. She reported this to zoning. The sign company asked them to give them two weeks to remove the sign face and save face with their client as they realize they were in error and will have it corrected. They are not allowed to have this type of sign.

37. [Historic Preservation Commission Training, August 23rd, in LaGrange, Georgia](#)

Attachment: [HPCAUGUSTLAGRANGE.pdf](#)

Ms. Ramsay reminded the Board that the Historic Preservation Commission Training is August 23, 2012 in LaGrange, Georgia.

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

38. [August 31, 2012 - HDBR Annual Retreat - Clarence Thomas Center for Historic Preservation](#)

Ms. Ramsay reminded the Board that their annual retreat will be held at the Clarence Thomas Center for Historic Preservation on August 31, 2012. The center is located on East Broad Street.

Ms. Ward said she will draft an agenda for the meeting.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

39. [Adjourned.](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Ms. Ramsay adjourned the meeting at 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ms. 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.