



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
November 14, 2012 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

NOVEMBER 14, 2012 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

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

MPC Staff Present: 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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Called to Order](#)

Ms. Ramsay called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. [Approve Minutes of October 10, 2012](#)

Attachment: [10-10-2012 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve October 10, 2012 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

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

III. SIGN POSTING

IV. CONTINUED AGENDA

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

Board Action:

Continue to December 12, 2012 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Ebony Simpson

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

- [4. Petition of Mike Schulz | 12-001054-COA | 509 East Harris Street | Addition](#)

Board Action:

Continue to December 12, 2012 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Ebony Simpson

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

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

Board Action:

Continue to December 12, 2012 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Ebony Simpson

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

V. CONSENT AGENDA

6. [Petition of Gregory E. Harris | 12-001359-COA | 523/525 East Harris Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

Approval of the seven foot (7') high brick privacy fence at 525 East Harris Street as requested because it is visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

7. [Petition of Karen Jenkins for Savannah Tree Foundation | 12-001371-COA | 516 Drayton Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the 48 inch tall aluminum fencing and gates at 516 Drayton Street because it meets the preservation standards, design standards, and is visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

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

8. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | 12-001411-COA | 230 Bull Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Package - Lighting Specifications.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Color Samples.pdf](#)

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Brian Judson

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

9. [Petition of Bloomquist Construction | 12-001416-COA | 424 East Charlton Lane | Fence](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval of the CMU and stucco wall at 424 East Charlton Lane as requested because it is visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

Vote Results

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

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

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

Agenda A (Items 11-12 will be heard at 2:00pm)

10. [Petition of Savannah FDS, LLC | H-11-4458-2 | 610 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. | Amendment to New Construction for windows](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attorney Philip McCorkle and Mr. Jason Matthews were present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to amend the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for new construction of the commercial building at 610 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for eight (8) aluminum, one-over-one, single-hung sash windows by Wojan Window and Door Corporation, M-950 Series Windows in a clear anodized finish.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends denial of the single-hung sash windows because they are not visually compatible with surrounding historic structures and do not meet the design standards in the historic district zoning ordinance [Sec. 8-3030(n)(7)]. She reported that staff recommends approval of the wall location because it aligns with the building face, is visually compatible, and meets the design standards in the historic district zoning ordinance [Sec. 8-303(n)(12)].

Mr. Engle told staff that he was of the belief that one of the criteria that the Board asked for was that the petitioner use clear film in the storefront windows. The windows are so opaque that you cannot see inside the store from

the outside.

Ms. Ward explained that the clear film was required where the petitioner was using transparent glazing. There were other areas of the building where they had proposed the opaque glazing. They have installed some interior walls behind the glazing, but staff did not notice this on the front facade. Ms. Ward, pointing to an area, said on the sides they had an issue where the petitioner put drywall and batt installation against the glass. Staff did approve a film to go on the windows to cover the installation. It has a reflective quality, it is not flat, is not facing the street and is not on the primary facade. But, on the front, staff did not approve it.

Mr. Engle said you cannot see inside the store from the outside. A dark film is on the glass.

Ms. Ward said the staff did not approve a dark film on the front.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Attorney McCorkle explained that he was representing Mr. Matthews of Durban Development, the developers who built the store. He said that Mr. Matthews is present to answer the Board's questions.

Attorney McCorkle said they were not present about the film in the front window. However, he was at the store yesterday and believes you can see inside the store. It appears to him that one can see not only the lights, but below it as well. Mr. Matthews assures him that there is no dark film in the window. If this is an issue, they will look at it after this meeting.

Attorney McCorkle said that Durban Development is proud of this structure. They have built sixty-two (62) Family Dollar stores around the country. This is by far the most elaborate and only two-story structure it has built, as it had to be two-story to meet the requirements. It is the only store with upper windows. There is nothing up there, but the building from the outside takes on the historic appearance that is necessary to fit in with the district. Certainly, they had no intentions to avoid the requirements of the ordinance for the double-hung commercial windows. As a matter of fact, he believes that in September when this was approved, he was told that the staff commented on how well Durban had worked with them and had done a great job accommodating all the requirements of the staff and ordinance. Durban apologizes for the position they find themselves in today having to come back to the Board with this issue. They did not intend to do this when they walked out of the meeting in September.

Attorney McCorkle said as Ms. Ward stated, the windows were not scheduled on the COA. It was decided that they could be approved as long as they met the requirements of the ordinance after the COA was issued. Therefore, it was a condition of approval and they know this. They also know that there is very little experience in this community at this point with commercial impact resistance which is required of double hung windows. The ordinance

provision came into effect in December 2009. As they all know, there has been very little commercial development in the community since December 2009. Hopeful next year there will be more developments. He does not believe that the people appreciated the difficulty of finding the type of structure, the type of window that is being called for. Double hung impact resistance commercial grade aluminum windows are not in the market. They did not know this. As he said, this was the first structure of this type in the historic district with two floors that Durban Developers had attempted. In September when they left the meeting they had full intention to comply with the ordinance. They got their building permit. It is his understanding that the City did not send the plans to the MPC staff for the COA stamp. His client would not have known to have this done. Secondly, it was not their responsibility. This was an oversight by another City department that it happened. If someone at this point had brought to the developer's attention the need to deal with the window issue again because what they had on the plans did not fit, they could have dealt with this back in March whenever the plans were submitted. The plans were approved and they started building. This is a prefabricated structure. It is pre-made out of metal and then the skin is put over it. A store as such was put up recently on President Street and they are being put up all over town. Some places no skin is put up at all and some places a brick facade is put on. But on this store, there is an elaborate brick facade. The building is ordered to specifications and this building had a design and openings for eighty (80) inch windows. At the normal time to get the windows, their contractor tried to order the windows. But, before he ordered the windows, he called the City and wanted to know if his understanding was correct that the windows had to be impact resistant, not just double-hung commercial grade windows, but also impact resistant for hurricane and high winds. He was told at that time that the windows had to be so to meet the code and commercial application; not in residential, but in commercial. The contractor started looking for the windows, but there were no windows available in the market to meet all those qualifications. The contractor found that the windows could be built (custom made), but there would be a twelve (12) week lead time. This construction started in March and was due to be completed the end of August so that the tenant could move in. Consequently, the contractor did not know what to do. What they chose to do was to do the best they could and try to come up with a really good looking window that was impact resistant, commercial grade, and looks like a double-hung window. Therefore, they looked and looked and found what has been described by specifications from Ms. Ward and put those windows in. They just did not have time to wait and they did their best to comply with the requirements of the ordinance.

Attorney McCorkle said today they are seeking after-the-fact approval. This is not a case where someone has started work and then gets a stop order from the City and they have to report that they did not know they had to get approval because they live in the historic district. He said that this is not what this is; this is somebody who went through all the steps; did the best they could and found themselves in a predicament that they never would have predicted because they did not know these types of windows were not available in the market. Therefore, it is not a bad situation as much as it is a circumstantial

situation. He informed the Board that the building looks good to him. The windows look good as well. It is not that the glass is on one plane. There is an upper plane out further than the lower plane. He said that he is not an architect nor a historic preservationist, but he stood in front of the windows yesterday thinking that he does not get this. It took him the longest time to understand that technically there could be another inch of depth on the upper sash and maybe a little wider sash. One really has to be a professional or someone accustomed to looking at these types of windows to understand that this is not a double-hung window as it looks like a double-hung; it is a single-hung window, but it is very much in keeping with the windows in the neighborhood. He showed photos of buildings and stated these are all buildings showing double-hung, older buildings with windows. However, he wanted to say that there is not much difference between what they put in and what these buildings show. Attorney McCorkle said they were not trying to save money or anything of this nature. But, they got themselves in a predicament because they did not realize that the product was not available. Their windows certainly look better than the windows across the street which were allowed although the ordinance required double-hung. In looking at the Food Lion building across the street, they can see that the windows are all on the same plane. They are not hung windows, but fixed glass windows.

Attorney McCorkle said as he has stated, the windows look good to them; they are sorry that this happened. If they must replace the windows, it will cost \$30,000 to do so and will disrupt the business that is going on inside. The windows look the same for all practical purposes and they will never be opened; there is no floor up there; it is just windows there to make the building look good from the outside. Mr. Matthews wishes he was not in the predicament he is in today and is present asking the Board for relief from having to spend this money. Attorney McCorkle told the Board he was hopeful that they all had been by to see this building as it really is a good looking building. He asked the Board for their consideration. Attorney McCorkle entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Engle asked Attorney McCorkle to inform the Board of what happened with the wall.

Attorney McCorkle said Mr. Matthews would inform the Board about the wall.

Mr. Matthews said he believes that staff had originally recommended that it be in line with the building. There were a couple of conflicting comments as they went through the process. He understands in looking back that the Board wanted it on the zero lot line. It is unfortunate that in the miscommunication that it did not get carried over to the plans. There was no intent not to comply; they thought they were doing what the Board was asking them to do.

Mr. Engle said what the Board passed was specific in that it was supposed to maintain the line of continuity, not the building. The wall was supposed to be in line with the street. He said he finds this as a very significant issue.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Simpson said when the staff inspected the building in July, she assumed a red flag was raised before the windows were installed. Therefore, the developer should have looked twice at what they were doing.

Mr. Gay said when the staff realized that a final review of the plans was not conducted, they contacted the petitioner.

Mr. Engle said it was inconceivable that when they realized it, they did not call the staff and reported that they were having a problem getting the windows. Other people get the windows.

Ms. Ward explained that the petitioner had a building permit. Therefore, an entire construction team was present on site with the building permit and a schedule moving what they thought had been permitted and was allowed to do. The identification between the wall going up and the windows going in, was about two weeks. During this two weeks, staff was in close contact with Mr. Matthews, Zoning, and the Building Department to figure out what was going on. Staff could not understand what happened. The petitioner had plans in the field that showed one thing. When did these changes occur to the plans? They all were discovering this as it was happening very quickly. When the staff reviewed this in their first inspection, the wall was already in place. A couple weeks later staff went to the site again and saw that the windows were in. Therefore, at this point they probably had already been ordered and it was a little worrisome from staff's standpoint as well. Staff went through its report identifying the conditions of the approval. It appeared that everything else was done with the exception of the double-hung windows and the wall being placed on the zero lot line. Upon staff learning this, the petitioner was notified that the Certificate of Appropriateness stamp was not on the plans, but that those things were already installed.

Ms. Simpson said a step was missed as the petitioner did not come back to have the windows approved. She said developments are going on all over Savannah. She asked staff if other companies have issues ordering the windows.

Mr. Merriman said a petitioner building a hotel earlier this year showed the Board a sample of their windows that they were having custom-made.

Ms. Ward said she wanted to clarify something that was stated earlier. The burden is on the petitioner to come back and get the stamp on the plans. Ms. Ward showed the Board the approval letter that is sent to the petitioner. The signed approval letter is submitted with the plans and the City had a copy of the letter. On the last page where it is signed by the Chair of the Historic District

Board of Review and the Executive Director of the MPC states that "prior to the issuance of a permit, both sets of permit plans must display the stamp certifying the permit plans ." Ms. Ward said staff realizes that this may be hard to see sometimes, therefore, in addition, staff includes a Notice sheet along with the approval alerting the petitioner that it is their responsibility to submit their plans to the Preservation Officer for the Certificate of Appropriateness stamp prior to submitting them to (Inspections) Development Services. It was said that no notice was given, but as she has stated a notice was given to the petitioner.

Ms. Ward explained that staff has seen a couple of projects come through recently. Embassy Suites Hotel sought approval and was granted approval of a single-hung sash window, but it was not without much debate and discussion. The Board will be looking at another request today where the petitioner has a double-hung window and a hotel with a window made by the same manufacturer. This item is next on today's agenda. The Board has approved other commercial grade double-hung windows in the Historic District, especially along Broughton Street.

Ms. Simpson asked staff if these petitioners have come back and told staff that it was hard finding these types of windows.

Ms. Ward answered that the only time staff heard this was with the Embassy Suites and this application.

Dr. Henry asked staff if there is a problem with the recess of the windows.

Ms. Ward answered that this is the main issue.

Dr. Williams said there are two pieces of glass on different planes like a double-hung window.

Ms. Ward said it is the sash and not the glass.

Mr. Merriman said the upper sash appears to stick out further than the lower sash.

Ms. Ward, pointing to an area, said it is this piece. It is all one single-hung sash. But, with a double-hung, the top part and the bottom part would be a separate sash. It has a recessed glass panel. Ms. Ward said to the credit of the petitioner, they were trying to use something that they felt was as close to a double-hung as possible.

Dr. Williams said there is an upper sash, but what appears to be more like framework is on the plane with the upper sash and continues down. He asked if the window is operable.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Dr. Williams asked if the low sash moves. If so, it has its own sash

framework separate from the piece that comes down from the top.

Ms. Ward showed the Board a detail of the interior of the window. It is all one sash and the interior part where the glass is located slides out.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, it is one frame with the operable lower sash. Therefore, he is somewhat puzzled and does not know why the manufacturer calls it single-hung. Double-hung is when both sashes move. Most of the time the upper sash gets fixed, but this is operationally like a double-hung. The lower sash sits behind the upper sash and can slide up behind it. If double-hung, both sashes move. But, almost never do you see the upper sashes being pulled down.

Mr. Gay said if the petitioner had notified staff, they might have been able to go ahead and say they meet the standard or they could do something else quickly so the petitioner could remain on schedule. However, this was not done.

Mr. Merriman said he believes the issue is where the upper sash is on a normal regular window would also have a piece of blind stop and then another piece of brick molding to come further out. Is this the issue?

Ms. Ward answered that it could be that there is no frame to hide this. Therefore, all the frame is in one piece.

Mr. Merriman said usually there would be two more pieces and would be set further back into the brick to give the three (3) inches.

Mr. Engle said this is what the Board discussed at great length when reviewing the windows for the Embassy Suites Hotel. The Embassy Suites had a custom-made window that looked basically right. But, this store does not and this is the issue. If the Board says this is fine, then they might as well forget enforcing the ordinance. The ordinance is explicit. It says they have to be double-hung and this is not.

Dr. Henry said this reminds him of his first meeting five (5) years ago where a hotel did not install any recesses. This was completely against what the Board asked the petitioner to do.

Mr. Merriman said he was not on the Board when the Food Lion building was built. He asked how did this store get the windows they ended up with.

Ms. Ward said this was a complete oversight on all the review parties. They did not identify it at staff, the Board did not identify it at the Board meeting, and nobody from the public brought it up. At this time, they were working with a new ordinance. Therefore, she believes there was a lot of concern with getting the petitioner to meet the large scale development standards, so when it came to some of the other design standards in the ordinance, they were using old templates. Consequently, it was not identified as a standard that applied to

the project, but it should have been.

Dr. Williams asked about the wall.

Ms. Ramsay said whoever makes the motion could incorporate the wall.

Mr. Engle asked Dr. Williams what were his thoughts on the wall.

Dr. Williams said his concern is more with the wall than the windows. But, to him it appears that the Board is more concerned with the windows.

Ms. Simpson asked Dr. Williams what are his thoughts.

Dr. Williams answered that he remembers the debate pertaining to this. At the time, he took issue with the Tree Department insisting that the entire building be pushed back from the lot line. He said he would have liked for them to trim the tree and put the building right on the lot line. Therefore, he believes the line of continuity is fundamental to a streetscape. It would be like Broughton Street. Would they accept this kind of pushing back on Broughton Street? Dr. Williams said he believes that the Board would not accept this on Broughton Street - tree or no tree. He is somewhat irritated that one department in the City can dictate how they align buildings, but this is the reality of the situation. He believes the compromise that they are seeking in this context was that at least the wall would help retain the lot line along MLK and this is why this was such an issue for them. Of the two items, this is what he is more concerned about. The reality of the windows, he believes in the great scheme of things, which will have a bigger impact on the urban effect of this building in its context. To him the brick wall for the parking lot is a more significant issue.

Mr. Engle said he agrees with Dr. Williams. He wanted to know how the remaining Board members felt about the issue. He said that the Board spent a great deal of time trying to deal with the line of continuity on this project, which has been totally ignored.

Dr. Henry asked staff if this Board was overruled by another City department.

Ms. Ward explained that she believes Dr. Williams was making reference to the building setback. The Park and Tree department required that the building be setback because of the tree within the public right-of-way.

Dr. Henry said, therefore, this Board was overruled.

Dr. Williams stated that the Board was not overruled, but constrained by another department.

Ms. Ward said the property owner was being required to be setback.

Dr. Henry stated that Dr. Williams is saying "constrained," but actually they were "overruled."

Mr. Engle explained that the Board had not acted on this yet. Therefore, "overruled" would be after the Board ruled actively. The Board said if the building could not be put on the line, then put the wall on the line to at least continue the line of continuity. But, the petitioner did not put the wall on the line. Now, this causes a push back on MLK; but they were trying to keep a consistent line.

Dr. Henry said it sounds to him that the Board deferred. He is sticking with the windows.

Mr. Judson said he believes they are missing a subtle distinction in the process that they are talking about. This Board deferred to the City in terms of the specified lot line for the building. They held an extensive discussion where this Board did have the purview to determine the line of the wall and they made a ruling that it ought to be at the zero lot line. The City's trees were not involved in this portion of the decision. Prior to this coming to this Board, the site plan because of the City's trees, moved the building back. However, it was entirely within this Board's discussion, their approval, and their petition on the placement of the wall. Therefore, they did not defer to another department on the wall.

Board Action:

Denial of the single-hung sash windows because they are not visually compatible with surrounding historic structures and do not meet design standard in the historic district zoning ordinance [Sec. 8-3030(n)(7)]. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ebony Simpson

Second: Reed Engle

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

Board Action:

Denial of the wall location because it is not in compliance with the visual compatibility criteria and standards set forth in the historic district ordinance nor does it conform with the Certificate of Appropriateness issued by the Board. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

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

11. Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | H-11-4569-2 | 412 Williamson Street | New Construction Part II, Design Details

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [HSF HDBR Memo 412 Williamson Street 111412.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Johnson left the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

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

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction Part II Design Details, of multi-story hotel at 412 Williamson Street. Signage and lighting are not proposed at this time and will be submitted to the Board for approval at a future meeting. Amendments to the design were submitted and approved, with conditions, at the Board's September 12, 2012 meeting.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for Part II Design Details, of the proposed hotel at 412 Williamson Street with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final approval:

1. Construct a sample panel on-site to be reviewed and approved by staff

prior to construction and installation in accordance with the HDBR Sample Panel Guidelines.

Revised the mortar colors to have less contrast with the associated brick and eliminate

the gray color indicative of a cement composition.

2. Remove the screen track from the Peerless, Model 9350 window, to provide greater

visibility for the variation in sash depth.

3. Recess the ventilation panels a minimum of three inches from the face of the brick to

reinforce the shape of the opening and to provide greater depth within the facade.

4. Submit awning/canopy details to staff for final review.

5. Within the wall along Williamson Street, the cast stone coping shall overhang the brick and add more ornament within the metal grills. Vertical piers, introduced between bays three window groupings) are recommended to provide a rhythm more consistent with the bays established on the building exterior.

Dr. Williams asked if the Board identified in the second pavilion the outer two bays. He asked if the Board talked about the outer bays having the windows the same width as the ones above and below them.

Ms. Ward said this might have been apart of the discussion, but it was not included in the motion.

Mr. Merriman asked staff, "how does this window differ from the window they just looked at?" They both are on different planes and looks like a historic sash. He thought the only problem with the other window was that they were not built out like a normal historic window. How is this window different?

Ms. Ward explained that her concern with the other window and with this window is (pointing to a section) this piece here; it is straight all the way down and flattens out the sashes. If this was removed, you would actually see this sash on one plane and this sash recessed on another plane.

Dr. Williams asked if a part of the issue was also the depth of the reveal around this. Did they not talk about that there should be another layer framing that gives the whole upper sash and the entire thing in depth?

Mr. Merriman said he, too, thought this was the issue.

Dr. Williams said it is more than just the lower half of the window having a frame align with the sash. There is no second layer of framework.

Mr. Merriman said the pieces being talked about would need to be removed so the sashes could be seen. But, there would also be two other layers of molding here. Otherwise, it would be pretty much the same windows as in the other picture from Family Dollar.

Mr. Gay stated that he believes that the glass at Family Dollar was actually flat to the frame on the top section.

Mr. Merriman said they could not tell because there was just one-over-one. There was no mullion in there and you could not see the glazing.

Mr. Gay said it appeared to him that the upper glass window was flush to the frame on the outside.

Dr. Henry asked staff if this is the same as what is at Family Dollar.

Ms. Ward answered no and explained that her concern with the Family Dollar windows was that there is a continuous piece and removes the ability to see that this was pushed back. They all were shown on the same frame. She said, pointing to a section, that if this comes off, the screen flange would have a frame on this plane and then this frame would be setback on the outer frame. However, she believes that there is another point that Mr. Merriman is raising. But, this was not what staff would have initially identified with either of the projects. This is something that the Board needs to consider.

Dr. Williams asked if there is a flange behind the track. He was not sure whether removing the screen track would resolve the problem. He guesses that the screen track is attached to a second layer that is flush with the upper sash.

Mr. Engle asked if this is reflective glass. He did not believe that this is clear glass.

Ms. Ward said she needs clarification on the glass.

Mr. Engle said it appears that there is a film on it and it is reflective.

Ms. Ward stated that she is not sure whether it looks reflective. In her opinion, it looks like it has a tint; it appears to be a little darker.

Mr. Engle said this is an issue.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay said that they concur with the staff's comments and recommendations. A sample panel will be built and will have the final window in it to be reviewed and approved. They have worked with staff closely in the past on other projects to ensure that their contractors do not forget. The removal of the screen track is a good comment and they have consulted with the manufacturer and they are willing to remove it. This makes a standard window custom again, but, it is a custom window anyway. Mr. Shay said in addressing the issue of the windows and he does not have a dog in the Family Dollar's issue, but all the windows that would meet the standards that they are presenting today would have to be custom fabricated. However, in a world where pretty much everything is now fabricated on demand, he was not sure if

this is an honest requirement. Nobody is making thousands of these windows and putting them in a warehouse somewhere and waiting for someone to "maybe" sort of want to buy them. Some are residential stock windows, but commercial windows generally speaking are not fabricated before they are ordered.

Mr. Shay reported that their windows will be impact resistant, insulated, clear glass regardless of whether the sample is exactly clear glass or not. It is hard to get the manufacturer to volunteer to make a sample for a custom-made window when it has not been approved. However, they are able to lean on Peerless because they have used them for other projects.

Dr. Williams said the question came up in both this discussion and the previous petition [Family Dollar] that if the tracks are removed, basically the front plane of the upper sash would basically hit the brick and there is no secondary kind of framing molding. He asked if this manufacturer can add any further depth speaking of custom windows.

Mr. Shay said there would be a way to do this if a brick molding was introduced. This is one of the reasons that when you try to translate from historic wood windows and they made them and the opening regular enough, they used a molding to close up the difference. In an anodized aluminum window, you do not need this and, therefore, they don't ordinarily have that. He believes that it is in the nature of a 21st century aluminum window that it is going to have a profile that is similar to the one they see here today other than it is not at all unreasonable to remove the screen track. Mr. Shay said he was not aware of any buildings downtown, generally speaking, with window screens in them; especially commercial buildings. He said that it will be a double-hung window and both sashes will be fixed. Neither sash in all likelihood will be operable.

Mr. Shay said the next issue was to recess the ventilation panels a minimum of three inches. They agree with this and have actually prepared some revised details to show this. Basically, it takes the screen element that was in the forward plane and moves it back into the same plane so that the sashes of the window and spandrels would align. He said the next issue pertains to submitting awning canopy details to staff for final review. Mr. Shay said their drawings indicate that the canopies are going to be metal and will have black edged steel frames, but they agree to the point where they can get shop drawings fabricated, then they will be happy to submit these so the Board will be able to see more details of this or specifically if the Board wants them to put a dimension on here that shows that it is eight feet high. However, in essence, they are on the drawings now, but they do not necessarily have all the notations the Board wants. They will be happy to submit these sooner or later to make sure that the Board and everybody else know they are here.

Dr. Williams asked if the metal screen under the window is what the Board sees on the upper part of the materials board.

Mr. Shay answered yes.

Dr. Williams asked if this is the color.

Mr. Shay replied that what they want it to be is very similar to the anodized aluminum clear so that it will be a silver color, but a matte finish.

Dr. Williams asked if the windows will be this color.

Mr. Shay (pointing to an area on the materials board) explained that all the windows will be this color. He said pertaining to the staff's recommendation for item #5, they agree with it and have done an example and will be happy to keep working on this and submit it to staff. They intend for this to be overgrown with vines. Therefore, more vegetation will be seen than ornamental metal work. They have adjusted the coping at the top to have a slight overhang as a result of the suggestion. Mr. Shay entertained questions from the Board.

Ms. Ramsay said a question was raised about the window openings on the five bay River Street facade. She asked Mr. Shay if he considered this and rejected it.

Mr. Shay said they like what they presented to the Board today and it met the intent, as they understood, of the requirement that the space between the windows be reduced.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Shay if they will use vertical piers between the bays.

Mr. Shay stated that they will use vertical piers between the groups of three to divide the wall into something that is more articulated.

Dr. Williams asked if this is the first time that the Board has seen the schemes with the alternate red and dark brown colors.

Mr. Shay answered that he could not speak to what the Board has seen or not seen, but he wanted to tell them that this is the first time that this has been presented with the coloration and delineated as carefully as it has been on these drawings. However, they have been presenting two colors of brick to staff throughout this process.

Dr. Williams asked if the recessed area will be the darker brick and the pavilion will be the lighter brick? He said he was curious about the decision regarding all the recessed areas. He wanted to know if this is to accentuate the depth that basically the recessed area will be the darker brick and to pull out a more three dimensional effect.

Mr. Shay said certainly to create a more three dimensional effect. He said if they remember along the River Street facade, they are not actually recessed. They were asked to bring these out into the same plane to make the building more consistent with some of the buildings that are further down the range. Mr. Shay said they would like to do this because it breaks up the

massing of the building into segments, visually, in a way that starts to breakdown the scale of the building. The other side of the building which faces in the general direction of Bay Street, faces Williamson Street, in these areas the recesses are actually pronounced. This was approved in Part I, Height and Mass. They will use the brown color to accent this even more.

Dr. Williams said he believes that it seems to work better on the north elevation than the west elevation because the recessed areas seems subordinate.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) gave the Board members a copy of a memo that the HSF wrote containing their comments regarding this petition. She apologized that the Board was now just receiving a copy of their memo, but they receive the packet the same time that the Board receives it and their architecture committee does not meet until the day before. Consequently, they were not able to get the comments to the Board before today. (See attached memo from the Historic Savannah Foundation outlining their comments).

Dr. Williams said regarding the HSF's comment about the screen, he believes that Mr. Shay said the screens would not be shiny.

Mr. Shay answered that this is correct.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Shay if he wanted to respond to the HSF's written comments.

Mr. Shay answered yes and that he would submit his responses in the order that they are presented in the memo. Provide details and specifications (dimensions, materials, colors, etc.) for all doors throughout the structure as well as framing dimensions for all storefront windows. He explained that the storefront doors are the same system as the storefront windows. All the drawings they have presented are to scale. The doors are seven (7) feet tall. They will not get dimensions to the inch until the shop drawings are approved which will probably be one year from now. The vertical pilasters are done in accordance with the Board's recommendation. They all are on the same plane. They do not jump in and out, but they do have reveals. In other words, you will see the line. They were asked to make the buildings as flat as possible.

Dr. Williams stated that it looks like a channel.

Mr. Shay explained that it will not be a separate piece of metal, but a groove which is consistent. He said [pointing to an area] that these are the only places where there are projections. They are shown in the details. The area at the top has distinct projections that are around three and one-half (3.5) inches between the courses. Just underneath the area has a little projection because they are shedding water from the roof. But, all of the planes are flush one with another. The details for the materials shown beneath all of the windows are actually

included in their drawings as it is now. Mr. Shay explained that the places along the River Street side where they have a relatively high sill than the area beneath the window is brick is just a normal coursing. In some areas where the sills are closer to the ground, has a soldier course along the sill. If the sill is higher up from the ground, they will not use the soldier course. However, one way or another, it is all defined on the drawings provided to the Board.

Mr. Shay stated that the Cherokee Brick and Tile Company makes the bricks. They are not proposing tile on the outside of the building. He realizes that it might have been confusing to read that the manufacturer is Cherokee Brick and Tile Company.

Mr. Shay said the HSF's comment pertaining to the west elevation states: provide details were the top story is setback; provide details and specifications (dimensions, materials, colors, etc the garage doors; provide details and specifications(dimensions, materials, colors, etc.) for the two canopies/awnings indicted over entrances on either side of the garage doors; provide details and specifications (dimensions, materials, color, etc.) for the stairs/stairway at the entrance on the southwest corner. He explained that the details are on both pages A-16 and A-18. Regarding the garage doors is very generic. There are probably 50 companies that makes flushed garage doors, but if they need him to name someone, he will say the Overhead Door Company. The finish will be as spelled out on the color schedule for metal. The finish will be the dark bronze. On page A-16 the details are shown regarding the canopies/awnings. The stairway at the southwest corner is concrete. As indicated, the profile of the concrete stairs is approximately 6x12. This is shown on page A-22.

Mr. Shay said that the HSF's comments regarding the north elevation (River Street) states: provide details for setback sections of the top story; provide details and specifications (dimensions, materials, colors, etc.) for the canopies along the ground level; and provide details and specifications (dimensions, materials, color, etc.) for the ornamental brackets indicated beneath the balconies on Drawing A-24. He responded that he has already shown the Board the setback sections of the top story. They are on pages A-16 and A-18; the specifications are spelled out on the color schedule that they have submitted. Mr. Shay said that the balcony brackets that are shown on A-24 are custom-made. They will be steel in all likelihood and not wrought iron. The projection is about twenty (20) inches. This is a scaled drawing. Because they are metal and are painted, according to their schedule, they will be dark bronze.

Mr. Shay stated that in reference to the HSF's concern about the east elevation's elevator, they had a productive meeting on Tuesday morning with the leadership including the Assistant City Manager, City Engineer and others, from the City of Savannah's team that has been working on the Montgomery Street right-of-way, they made a significant amount of progress. A lot of people that were in the meeting were from Georgia Power. Some coordinating has to be done over the fact that there are some electrical ducts in this area. He said not surprisingly since it is an old power

plant, coordination needs to be done regarding the width of the stairs, etc. This information will come forward at some point. It is actually not their project, but they are keeping a place for it. They got great feedback from Ms. Ward during this meeting about her feelings about materiality and how it ought to be defined as something that is different in material from the body of the hotel so that it reads as something that is a public elevator rather than something limited to hotel guests. Mr. Shay explained that pertaining to the air conditioning unit ventilation issue, they are not far enough a long for him to commit to the Board exactly what type of air conditioning system will be used. They have designed it so that it could be with the wall cassettes that are located below the windows. It is his hope that they will have what is called a VRF system. This system is very energy efficient and allows the coolant to come from a central cooling tower rather than the "through-wall" variety that they refer to as pre-tex. This would have to be the system that would be used at the areas where they have all glass. This is why they created a big mechanical area on the roof of the building and screened it with the metal roofing panels.

Mr. Shay explained that the HSF's comment to provide details for awnings/canopies indicated over the entrances at the ground level - southern elevation (courtyard) are actually inside the courtyard, but they are shown on their drawings and are similar to the others that they have already shown to the Board. He said in regards to the HSF's comment regarding the details and specifications of the thin blade overhangs that are at the entrances, the details are shown on their drawings and has a wide thrasher and presently looks wide because it is blank. Mr. Shay stated he did not want to lead the Board to believe this means that automatically they want this to have messaging on it. But, signage, lighting, the details of things that have to do with the identification and branding elements for the hotel will have to come before the Board at a later date. They are presenting before the Board today the architecture that gives places for things such as this to happen. All the Board would be approving today is the metal canopy and the opportunity to come later and critique the signage, identity and exterior lighting.

Mr. Shay said with regards to using spandrels both above and below the windows has been inherent in their design that has been presented approximately four, five or six different times. There has always been spandrels above and below the windows. There is no change from what was previously approved.

Mr. Shay addressing the HSF's comment regarding the sand color precast concrete: said that if it is the Board's desire that these be made into brick it is something that they can do. He said they were hoping also that these could be structural elements. But, more importantly, he would like to keep the sand color coping that is around the monumental windows so that they can accent them. In the glazing plane, the Board will see in their details that instead of being a minimum three (3) inches or three and one-half (3.5) inches it is very deeply recessed in this area. The function of the coping is to give way to recess back into the building and have a nice reveal here. This detail is not copied from the adjacent power plant, but is similar to the power plant in that

there is a change in material there for the coping surrounds for the monumental windows.

Mr. Shay said he does not know how to address the HSF's comments about this being similar to the Country Inn and Suites Hotel. They have revised the sprandel detail to show that they are pushed back and recessed into the same plane in accordance with the staff's comments.

Mr. Shay said in summary that they feel this addresses the concerns of the Historic Savannah Foundation. They want to have the opportunity to do as the staff has recommended and come back with the fine details.

Mr. Bill Stuebe of the Downtown Neighborhood Association (DNA) came forward and stated that this is a major project and will have a major impact on downtown Savannah and the Historic District, which they all love. He said the next project that the Board will be reviewing on Wayne Street appropriately addresses how the capital on a single column on a porch addresses the architrave. This level of detail needs to be addressed also in this project. They do not need to hear we are going to do "this or that," but it needs to be put in writing so they will understand exactly what is happening here. As he has said, this is a major project.

Mr. Stuebe said the drawing that was referred to as the top level, they really cannot tell what the materials are on the surface. He said that their concern (pointing to an area is what the material is right here. It does not show up any place. They want to know. Mr. Stuebe said also the petitioner, in his cover letter, said the perforated metal for screens at the upper parking level, guardrails and sprandels, that the silver color aluminum relates to the newer third of the old power plant. He said, however, that the newer third of the old power plant is not silver, but more of a beige color. Mr. Stuebe said that there will be a lot of aluminum on the facade of this building. He believes that the Board needs to give real consideration as to whether this is what they want.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Shay if he wanted to respond to Mr. Stuebe's comments.

Mr. Shay stated briefly that the recessed planes are all brick. This building is not exactly a perfect rectangle; it is shown on other elevations, but they did not want them to be redundant. Nevertheless, the skin of the building is specified as being the materials that they see today. There are no secret materials.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said the question about the aluminum is a valid question. Would they prefer to see anodized aluminum with a color as opposed to not finished bare aluminum? He believes this is a critical issue as it will be a major element of this building. You will see six stories of aluminum and the Board needs to address this now because it will be too late two years from now to say that it is "a lot of aluminum."

Dr. Williams agreed and stated that the shifting between the two colors of brick needs to be discussed by the Board. He believes that color is a major issue. This is in an industrial context and he believes that they need to be careful not to try and impose a more traditional arrangement of windows. Dr. Williams said he believes that integrating the spandrels with the windows into the vertical columns is actually suitable for this kind of context. But, the question is how bright do they want the contrast between brick and window.

Dr. Williams said the third materiality question is about the cast stone. He agrees with staff on all the other recommendations.

Mr. Engle said he wanted to make a comment to Dr. Williams 's comment. He said if they look at the window and look at the brown brick, they are almost identical. Therefore, the sashes will blend with the brown brick.

Dr. Williams stated that this is not the color of the windows.

Mr. Engle said he knows this. If they are aluminum, they will not blend at all; but will stand out with the dark brown brick.

Dr. Williams asked staff to move the panel sample adjacent to the brick sample so the Board could see the aluminum against the bricks.

Mr. Engle said if the Board looks at the power plant, everything is pretty much the same tone or value.

Ms. McClain asked what is the explanation for two different types of bricks.

Ms. Simpson said she appreciates the fact that there are two different colors, but she does not believe that these two colors blend.

Dr. Henry mentioned the colors of a building on East Huntingdon Street having the same type colors and to him they blend well.

Dr. Williams stated that he was thinking since they have all the elements on the same plane as Mr. Shay has mentioned, it is almost that you can have what reads as pilasters, even though they are on the same plane separated by a groove, could be one brick color and a surrounding brick. He said, therefore, instead of being a block of red, block of brown, block of red; block of brown, he does not know if it would be better to go with the two colors, but have the brown actually be everywhere where there isn't pilaster. In other words, the pilaster could be red. However, he does not know how this would work. Dr. Williams said they are getting into aesthetics as opposed to compatibility, but he is not sure about sequence of brown and red. He understands the motive behind it, but does not know if it would be as successful as the power plant; across the street has a long wall facing River Street and is all consistent one color.

Ms. Simpson asked if in the past the Board asked the petitioner to provide a

more consistent wall of continuity?

Ms. Ward answered yes. They asked the petitioner to provide a more consistent wall of continuity and be consistent with the historical ranges along the street which are straight for the entire block.

Mr. Engle said when you look at the power plant, there is uniformity. The aluminum will increase the variability between the two primary colors.

Dr. Williams said on the power plant, the arched windows have light colored mullions inside their arches. They look as if they were painted white. There is a striking contrast on the power plant as inside the arches it is quite light.

Therefore, the contrast of light window areas with spandrels sort of picks up in a sense the framed arches of the power plant. But, the whole wall of the power plant, even with the recesses and pilaster reveals, etc. they are one color brick.

Dr. Henry said this picture makes him more comfortable with the proposal. However, he has some reservations about the aluminum as well.

Mr. Shay explained that historically the building was galvanized steel. It was only painted the beige color in relatively recent times. But, this does not change the discussion as to what is appropriate in the Board's minds.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Shay if he was speaking about the left-hand end of the power plant.

Mr. Shay [pointing to a section] said this end was not always light beige.

Ms. Ramsay asked Dr. Williams what was his third point.

Dr. Williams said the beige cast stone at least on the ground floor elevation on the corner tower [southeast corner] there is a brick arch as a lintel.

Ms. Ward asked Dr. Williams which page he was referring to.

Dr. Williams said if they look at the left-hand end, the lintel is brick and the right-hand lintel is cast stone. He personally likes the brick over the stone in this context. It actually accentuates the arch windows with the stone; this seems reasonable, but he is not sure about the stone and the aluminum as they don't have a place to see how they will match. He believes that the two main places where the stone will be are around the big arches along the bottom of the northwest corner and along various places along the Montgomery Street elevation. It does not appear that the stone appears anywhere else apart from the arches. He asked staff to show the western elevation. He believes they have it over the three arches on the left and flanking the openings to the parking garage. Dr. Williams asked Mr. Shay if he was correct in saying that it looks like there is cast stone in the middle of the building flanking the parking garage entrances.

Mr. Shay answered no. They are fully rendered canopies.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, it is just the three pieces over the arches.

Mr. Shay said all four of the elements in context if they are looking at them on the corner.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Shay if it is true that they appear nowhere else on the building, just on the corner.

Mr. Shay answered that's correct.

Dr. Williams said, however, there is an arch on the far corner that uses brick instead of this material.

Mr. Shay confirmed that it is and said because it is an arch, it is also in a round element. It is a compound arch. It is arching this way and this way [gesturing] at the same time.

Mr. Engle said in his mind if the mortar had some relationship with the cast stone, traditionally the cast stone would have been stone and would have tried to mimic the mortar. But now they are getting into two different colors, mortar, cast stone, and aluminum. If the aluminum was anodized to match the mortar of the cast stone, you would get some sense of continuity in materials. Personally, he would rather see anodized aluminum that matches the cast stone and the cast stone match the mortar. Mr. Engle said he has no problem with the two different colors of brick. However, he does not know if they would be his choice of the two colors.

Mr. Shay said this is something they need to study. He hesitates to commit to a color scheme that has not been drawn or rendered. He said that they have many dozens of these before they come forward. But, if they are down to the point where what they are talking about are the final colors, then they will be happy to come back to the Board for colors and the details that staff needs with another color scheme, if this is what the Board would like.

Dr. Williams said because it is such as issue with the vertical alignments, spandrels and windows, they are trying to imagine given the two colors of brick and the suggestions of changing the mortar color, how would all of this hang together. Therefore, if what Mr. Shay is proposing to come back with something that the Board could look at and evaluate would be fine. Personally, he would love to see options. Dr. Williams said he does not know how the options work, but presently it is hypothetical.

Mr. Shay said the scheme that Dr. Williams proposed is one of the ones that they studied and rejected. It begins to take the facade and make it look overly fussy and articulated compared to just what the big slab of buildings are in the range.

Dr. Williams said he was talking about the trim around the windows, not on the

brick work.

Mr. Engle said he was not saying colors specifically, but he was saying that he does not like the unfinished aluminum. What the exact color would be, he does not think that much aluminum would be compatible, historically. He thinks this should be a color and not aluminum. Staff deals with color, not the Board.

Ms. Ward, for clarification, asked the Board if they were saying they don't like aluminum or they don't believe that aluminum as a material is compatible or they don't feel that the anodized color is compatible.

Mr. Engle said the color is the issue and bare aluminum is a color.

Mr. Shay stated that because this all is on the record and is a real technical point, this is also an anodized aluminum window. It is the silvery looking that is clear anodized. You can also have color anodized and he believes this is what they are talking about the difference from.

Dr. Henry asked staff if when the Board makes its decision along with the staff's recommendations, do they exclude from their consideration the comments of the Historic Savannah Foundation and the Downtown Neighborhood Association? Does the Board block themselves off if they do this?

Ms. Ward answered that if there are specific concerns that the Board feels need to be addressed, they need to let the petitioner know what the concerns are. She believes that Mr. Shay was able to address most of the comments that were made, but if the Board still believes there are some that need to be addressed, they should let him know.

Dr. Henry stated that he believes Mr. Shay did address most of the comments, but regarding the air conditioning units on the east elevation and elevator, he said it is unknown at this time. Mr. Shay also said that he would submit the ornamentation later.

Mr. Shay said he could provide the document today or bring it back to staff as this is a part of the staff's recommendation. He said as far as the HVAC systems, he wanted the Board to understand that this not an element of visual compatibility. They want to use a 21st century air conditioning system as much as the Board wants to.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Shay about the elevator.

Mr. Shay answered that the elevator is City of Savannah. They are working with the City to ensure that it will be integrated, but he cannot, of his own, bring forward what it will look like, but he can tell them in all likelihood and this is what their drawings indicate.

Ms. Ward confirmed that this is a separate project. It happens to be adjacent

to this building, but it is a separate project, on a separate schedule and it may or may not happen, but this project will happen regardless of this. When it is ready to come forward, the Board will consider it at that time.

Ms. Ward said staff is recommending approval with the conditions that are listed in the staff report. She believes if the Board has specific concerns, it needs to be made as a part of the motion or indicate this to the petitioner. The Board delegates the color review to staff. However, the petitioner has said that he can bring this back to the Board for review; therefore, the Board does not have to close themselves out of the review even if it involved going to the site to look at the sample panel that is constructed. This is something that the Board can be involved in.

Mr. Engle said it appears that the Board is not completely happy with the aluminum. Therefore, he believes that the Board should give the petitioner information on this now.

Ms. Ramsay said she believes that what Dr. Williams suggested was different options and bring them back to the Board.

Dr. Williams said as an option instead of just anodized unpainted is it fair to call it unpainted aluminum?

Mr. Judson interjected "uncolored."

Dr. Williams said yes, uncolored aluminum. Therefore, it is basically natural aluminum. It is really hard under the circumstances right now to visualize how that much window and spandrel area vertical elements will work with the two different colors of brick. Wood and other colors may be a little more subdued, but not necessarily as dark as the window that is on display in the bronze color. He believes the Board has a concern about the contrast on one hand and the perception of it as just unpainted aluminum. Is it the Board's concern that it would seem unfinished or is the brightness of it?

Mr. Engle answered no. He believes it will end up being a dominant material. He does not believe that aluminum historically is a dominant material on River Street. Mr. Engle does not believe that the aluminum is compatible and he also believes that it is too much. As Dr. Williams has said, the windows on the power plant were recently painted.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Engle, therefore, is he not opposed to a lighter color? But that it could be something that is almost in the same family, but painted?

Mr. Engle said he believes it should blend in with the apparent sand stone arches and the mortar. There needs to be similarity of tone.

Dr. Williams said the mortar was suggested by staff to actually not look like portland.

Mr. Engle said this could be whitish. Every color in the world and mortar mixes.

Dr. Williams stated another issue would be whether it is lighter or darker, more red or more brown mortar.

Ms. Simpson said as long as it ties-in, it is not a factor.

Dr. Williams said there are a lot of options. Is the Board suggesting that the mortar be lighter or darker than the sample panel?

Ms. Ramsay stated that she believes the question at this point is whether the Board feels comfortable in letting the staff review this or do they want it to come back to them?

Ms. Simpson said she believes it should come back to the Board.

Dr. Williams said given the scale of this project and the significance of these decisions, can they give guidance for example "yea" or "nay" on the two colors of brick where Mr. Shay has proposed them?

Dr. Henry said he believes that Mr. Engle had the right phrase, "similarity of tone."

Dr. Williams stated that he believes, therefore, the Board was saying one color of brick.

Mr. Engle said he was not saying that it should be similar to the brick. He was saying that the cast stone, the mortar and the finish on the aluminum should be similar. They should stand out and should not be the same thing.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Engle how he felt about the two-tone brick.

Mr. Engle replied that he is perfectly happy with it. They are not his two favorite colors, but this is not the Board's choice.

Dr. Williams said Mr. Engle said the colors are not the choice of this Board. However, he believes this is a choice of the Board. They can say "yes" or "no" to these two colors.

Ms. Simpson said she is leaning towards saying "no" to the two colors, but she does not know how to give the petitioner direction in terms of which color to use.

Ms. Ramsay told Mr. Shay that he has heard all the Board comments.

Mr. Shay said he believes he has direction.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Shay if he wanted to ask for a continuance.

Mr. Shay answered that he does not want to ask for a continuance for the entire petition. But, he wanted to ask for the opportunity to come back and have larger samples that actually have the materials touching, along with what the Board needs.

Ms. Ramsay added that Historic Savannah Foundation made some comments about the dimensions. She said that she would like to see the dimensions of the groove.

Ms. Simpson stated regarding the colors that Mr. Engle stated that he likes two different reds. However, she did not want to give the petitioner colors.

Mr. Engle said the Board no longer gets full size drawings. They get the drawings at home on their computers and, therefore, they cannot scale. When the dimensions are not provided, there is no way for the Board to review them in advance. They have nothing to review unless they come to the office and review the staff's copies.

Mr. Shay said the drawings are a part of the permanent record, but if the Board needs to see the actual dimensions, they will have them.

Board Action:

Approval for Part II, Design Details, of the proposed hotel at 412 Williamson Street with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final approval:

1. Construct a sample panel on-site to be reviewed and approved by staff prior to construction and installation in accordance with the HDBR Sample Panel Guidelines (attached). Revise the mortar colors to have less contrast with the associated brick and eliminate the gray color indicative of a cement composition.
2. Remove the screen track from the Peerless, Model 9350 window, to provide greater visibility for the variation in sash depth.
3. Recess the ventilation panels a minimum of three inches from the face of the brick to reinforce the shape of the opening and to provide greater depth within the façade. - PASS
4. Submit awning/canopy details to staff for final review.
5. Within the wall along Williamson Street, the cast stone coping overhang the brick and more ornament within the metal grills. Vertical piers, introduced between bays (three window groupings)

are recommended to provide a rhythm more consistent with the bays established in the building exterior.

6. Provide greater similarity in the color of cast stone, mortar and aluminum finish. Reconsider the two-tone brick to provide less contrast or a single brick.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

12. [Petition of Gary Sanders, Architect | 12-000351-COA | 114 West Wayne Street | Amended petition for addition/alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

NOTE: Mr. Howington arrived at 4:15 p.m.

Mr. Gary Sanders was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The Board reviewed this petition at last month's meeting. The petitioner is requesting approval for the amended application for exterior alterations to the rear addition of the property facing 114 West Wayne Street. The garage addition has been eliminated from the proposal.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the exterior alterations and additions to the rear portion of the property facing 114 West Wayne Street, with the following conditions, to be resubmitted to staff for final approval with the construction drawings:

1. Provide specifications for the accent window, doors, transoms and sidelights in the new construction. The window in the historic structure must match the original design, material, composition (i.e. wood, single-glazed, true-divided-

light, double hung sash), and placement within the stucco wall or meet the three inch minimum recess standard.

2. Provide a true column capital that extends forward of the architrave.
3. Provide details on the dimensions, spacing and materials for the pickets and specifications for the standing seam metal roof.

NOTE: Lot coverage is verified by the Zoning Administrator during permit review. The proposed drawings illustrate proposed modifications to the existing addition. If it is determined that a variance from the 75% maximum lot coverage standard is needed; further review and a recommendation from the HDBR may be needed for the petition to be heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Sanders said they agree with the staff's condition to provide a window specification. They will restudy the column capital detail and provide the specifications on the standing seam metal roof.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. John Doughtry came forward and stated that he lives at 107 West Taylor Street. His residence runs from 107 West Taylor Street right through the block to West Wayne Street. Mr. Doughtry said his concerns are as follows: they like what they have heard and learned from this session of the Board with the elimination of the three-story carriage, windows, railings and walkways. However, his understanding is that no structure was there prior to the metal shed that was put in place in the 1950s. The single story shed is constructed of aluminum panels and has no historic significance. It is the eyesore on West Wayne Street. Presently, both garage doors are up and he realizes it is under construction, but it has been left opened since he has moved in the area. His other concern is where the air conditioning units are going to be placed. They are now going from two apartments to three apartments. The air conditioning units will be in sight lines of several other neighboring properties. The noise from the units will adversely affect the quality of life for the neighboring residences. Parking in this area is already stressed especially on street cleaning days.

Mr. Doughtry said their main concerns are the parking and the positioning of the air conditioning units. Where are they going to be placed?

Mr. Doughtry said he was speaking also for Ms. Robin Allen who shares the same concerns as he about the air conditioning units. Will the three units be on the roof? Ms. Allen suggested that maybe the units could be tucked behind the addition. They do not believe that someone will put money in a nice building and leave the eyesore shed there.

Ms. Ramsay told Mr. Doughtry that the Board appreciates his concerns; however, the only concern that the Board can work with is the placement of the air conditioning units. She asked Mr. Sanders to come forward and address the

issue of the placement of the air conditioning units.

Mr. Sanders said the units will be placed inside the courtyard next to the unit that is already there. The units will not be seen.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle stated that he believes the petitioner addressed all of the Board's concerns at the last meeting.

Mr. Judson thanked all the neighbors for their concerns.

Board Action:

Approval of the exterior alterations and additions to the rear portion of the property facing 114 West Wayne Street with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final approval with the construction drawings:

1. Provide specifications for the accent window, doors, transoms and sidelights in the new construction. The window in the historic structure must match the original design, material, composition (i.e. wood, single-glazed, true-divided-light, double hung sash), and placement within the stucco wall or meet the three inch minimum recess standard.

2. Provide a true column capital that extends forward of the architrave.

- PASS

3. Provide details on the dimensions, spacing and materials for the pickets and specifications for the standing seam metal roof.

NOTE: Lot coverage is verified by the Zoning Administrator during permit review. The proposed drawings illustrate proposed modifications to the existing addition. If it is determined that a variance from the 75% maximum lot coverage standard is needed; further review and a recommendation from the HDBR may be needed for the petition to be heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Robin Williams	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

13. [Petition of Monica D. Mastrianni for Greenline Architecture | 12-000816-COA | 219 East Gaston Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

NOTE: Mr. Gay left the meeting approximately 5:30 p.m.

NOTE: Mr. Howington recused himself from participation in this petition. He is an employee of Greenline Architecture.

Mr. John Deering of Greenline Architecture was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for in-kind repairs on the front façade, non-historic window replacement on the rear façade to the property at 219 East Gaston Street.

Ms. Michalak reported that the staff recommends approval of the replacement windows, new door opening, and porch addition with the following conditions because they are visually compatible and meet the standards:

1. Submit specifications and color selections for the light fixtures shown on the rear elevation drawing to staff for review and approval.
2. Submit all paint color selections to staff for review and approval.

Mr. Engle asked if the Board requires that new air conditioning units to be screened. This unit is in clear sight.

Ms. Michalak answered yes and she asked the petitioner about this who told her that the units are not visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Merriman believes, too, that the units are visible.

Mr. Engle said according to the photo, the units are visible from the public right-of-way.

Ms. Michalak said the petitioner will be able to address this question.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Michalak if she said that the door on page five (5) will occupy an existing window opening.

Ms. Michalak, pointing to an area, answered yes this door right here.

Dr. Williams stated that as drawn, the opening does not align with the existing window opening.

Ms. Michalak explained that it is an existing masonry opening.

Dr. Williams said the existing masonry opening is a window that is directly below the one above it that is in line, but the door is not drawn in line with the window above it.

Ms. Michalak stated that it could be a drawing error, but the petitioner could answer this question.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Deering explained that they have decided to place the air conditioning units on the ground as they can be seen from Lincoln Street. With the roofing material, they discovered that there is metal underneath some existing asphalt shingles and they want to restore the metal roof. He cannot say why the door does not align with the window. However, it is intended to be aligned. The inset will be the same as the existing brick mold on this window.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Deering if they were changing the historical opening of the window apart from dropping it down to function as a door? The opening will not be shifted.

Mr. Deering answered no.

Dr. Williams stated, therefore, it is a drawing error.

Mr. Deering replied yes and apologized.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval of the replacement windows, new door opening, and porch addition with the following conditions because they are visually compatible and meet the standards:

1. Submit specifications and color selections for the light fixtures shown on the rear elevation drawing to staff for review and approval. - PASS
2. Submit all paint color selections to staff for review and approval.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

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

14. [Petition of Gretchen Ogg for Greenline Architecture | 12-000821-COA | 466 MLK Jr. Blvd./420 West Gaston St. | New Construction, Part II](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Sample Panel Guidelines.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Howington recused himself from participation in this petition. He is an employee of Greenline Architecture.

Mr. John Deering was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. Part I was given at last month's meeting. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction Part II, Design Details, of a three-story mixed-use building at 466 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard (MLK)/420 West Gaston Street.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for Part II, Design Details, of the proposed building at 466 Martin Luther King Boulevard/420 West Gaston Street with the following conditions to be submitted with the construction documents to staff for final review and approval:

1. Construct a sample panel on-site to be reviewed and approved by staff prior to construction and installation in accordance with the HDBR Sample Panel Guidelines (attached).
2. Provide specifications and color selections for the light fixtures, mailboxes, scuppers, downspouts, and louvers shown on the elevation drawings.
3. Replace fiber cement siding with a material that is permitted on commercial exterior walls.

4. Replace the cementitious panels with metal spandrel panels or precast concrete panels; provide details.
5. Replace the cementitious panels on the east elevation located under the cornice with brick.
6. Replace the one by six (1x6) vertical tongue & groove siding on the rear (east) elevation be replaced with a wood trim detail similar to that indicated between the second and third floors on the rear elevation.
7. Ensure that the storefront is set back a minimum of four inches (4") from the face of the building.
8. Provide information for screening the condensing units located on the ground near the southeast corner of the building.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Deering said they will comply with the staff's recommendations. They will construct the sample panel on site for the Board's review before the construction begins; they will provide specifications of the light fixtures, mailboxes, scuppers, downspouts, and louvers. They will provide a screening detail for the HVAC unit located on the ground near Gaston Street. The standards for the storefront glazing are in contrast with the standards for windows, which says that four inches to the glazing. Their drawing shows from the face of the brick to the glass is six inches. But to the frame, it is three inches which matches the standards for windows which is the same situation on the upper stories. Mr. Deering said, therefore, he hopes this is acceptable by the Board.

Mr. Deering the said the one by six (1x6) vertical trim has been found to be an historic detail that has been seen on buildings of early 20th century when there were really deep porch beams. He said that unfortunately, with bad contract renovations in certain areas, this detail is not found very often now in Savannah. They thought this would be one of those things that they bring back. The wood siding on the back of the building is in response to the wooden townhouses that are behind it that are contributing structures and to the Ralph Martin Gilbert Civil Rights Museum to the north of the project, which has siding on most of its north wall. Consequently, this is one of the reasons why they decided to use the wood siding on the back. This is a mixed-use building and two-thirds (2/3) is residential. Therefore, they thought they could use cementitious siding on the rear.

Mr. Deering explained that on the principal façade along MLK, they have used the cementitious panels here to give some details and definition so that it would not be just a boring brick building; it has some vertical and horizontal movement. They believe this to be in the spirit of the street and simpler, inspired early 20th century buildings that used to be along these blocks. However, since the last time the Board reviewed this they have added

more brick to the building and reduced the amount of panel area. So, they are not using panels on the entire building, but they are using the panels as an accent below and above the windows. He said many of the storefronts along MLK have these sort of painted panels above the storefronts as well. Therefore, they thought this blended well with the rest of the street.

Ms. Ramsay said Mr. Deering has mentioned many precedence in the past. She asked him if he had any photographs showing this.

Mr. Deering showed a photograph of a residential building within the block. It is a combination of stucco and cementitious panel. The brick on the Ralph Martin Gilbert Civil Rights Museum shows that the brick returns maybe twelve (12) or fourteen (14) feet and the remainder of it now is vinyl siding, but at one time it was wood siding before the renovations were done.

Ms. Ramsay explained to Mr. Deering that she was referring to the horizontal siding that staff recommended for the vertical siding on the rear.

Mr. Deering said if this is a subject for approval, he is happy to change this.

Ms. Ramsay told Mr. Deering that she thought maybe he had some pictures to demonstrate this.

Mr. Deering said he has seen this for years and it seems that all the deep porch beams that used to be detailed this way have all been changed by bad renovations. Most of them happened in the Victorian District and Thomas Streetcar Neighborhood. Therefore, he is not able to find them any longer.

Mr. Deering pointed out another mixed-use building at Huntingdon Street and MLK. It is a residential building with wood siding above and brick piers below. The storefront has the panels. He is not sure how altered the storefront has been over the years, but he believes that the upper floor is pretty true to the way it was initially built. He stated further north on MLK there are more examples of wood panels between windows. The Cementitious panels were used as an accent on the building.

Mr. Engle informed Mr. Deering that at the last Board meeting, they brought it up that cementitious panels are not allowed. This Board does not have the authority to grant a variance. There are a lot of options; it can be precast concrete or metal panels. He believes that they should not be saying cementitious just as they said at the last Board meeting as it would open the door for every commercial building to be put up as big stucco and this was passed in order to prevent this. There is metal paneling, precast concrete paneling and wood paneling. There are lots of other options if they want the design detail. But, to ask the Board to go against the ordinance, which is what Mr. Deering is doing, the Board does not have the authority to do so.

Mr. Deering stated that he believes it is a matter of interpretation. He believes these are more detailed and not the entire building will be cementitious panels. He told Mr. Engle that if he walked down the street if the building was to be built and he looked at it, it would look like a brick building and you might notice that there are some other details on it.

Mr. Engle said this would only open up the door for the next person who might not be that detailed and that sensitive.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Deering what are his feelings for this particular material over some of the others that were suggested.

Mr. Deering replied that precast and cast stone are expensive. The former bank building, now the Civil Rights Museum, to the north was built as a bank. The building that was on this site and the other buildings in the neighborhood that have been razed were all very simple commercial buildings, very simply detailed with very little ornamentation. Ms. Michalak took photographs last month of the buildings that were at one time on this street. They were simple brick or brick and wood buildings.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Deering had he thought about using wood panels?

Mr. Deering said this is something they can consider also.

Dr. Henry asked him if he thought the wood panels were too expensive.

Mr. Deering answered no and explained that the wood panels from an owner's perspective will be a maintenance issue within five (5) years. He has been using cementitious panels and siding for ten (10) or twelve (12) years; they hold up very well and look painted almost exactly like wood with the exception that when the wood begins to rot, you notice it more quickly.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with the staff's recommendations for approval for new construction with all of the outlined conditions, but specifically they feel that the cementitious panels be replaced with metal spandrel panels, precast concrete panels or as the Board has said wood panels. HSF also feels that the fiber cement siding at the rear should be replaced [it was said with a different material that is acceptable] but, they would say specifically with brick so that it matches the rest of the structure and thereby creates a uniform facade.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Deering if he wanted to respond to the issues brought up by the HSF.

Mr. Deering stated that he believes the issues brought up by the are the same

issues that they have already discussed .

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said the Board has an ordinance that they follow. The public can lobby to get the ordinance changed, but the Board does not have the right to pick and choose which part of the law they will abide by and which part they will not. There are a lot of panel options that the petitioner can use. He said his belief is the petitioner should ask for a continuance and come back and bring something that meets the ordinance.

Dr. Henry stated that the ordinance is subject to review, but the staff has their interpretation and the petitioner has another.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ramsay to help him clarify the final point that Ms. Meunier made about replacing a particular element with brick. It this included in the staff's recommendations?

Ms. Ramsay answered yes, she believes the staff included this in their recommendation.

Ms. Michalak explained that it is included in staff's recommendation. They are recommending that all the fiber cement siding, basically the lap siding on the back side of the building be replaced with an allowable material. The ordinance only allows wood siding on row houses.

Board Action:

Approval for Part II, Design Details, of the proposed building at 466 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. / 420 West Gaston Street with the following conditions to be with the construction documents submitted to staff for final review and approval with the construction documents:

1. Construct a sample panel on-site to be reviewed and approved by staff prior to construction and installation in accordance with the HDBR Sample Panel Guidelines (attached).
2. Provide specifications and color selections for the light fixtures, mailboxes, scuppers, downspouts, and louvers shown on the elevation drawings.
3. Replace fiber cement siding with a material that is permitted on commercial exterior walls. - PASS
4. Replace the cementitious panels with metal spandrel panels or precast concrete panels; provide

details.

5. Replace the cementitious panels on the east elevation located under the cornice with brick.
6. Replace the one by six (1x6) vertical tongue & groove siding on the rear (east) elevation be replaced with a wood trim detail similar to that indicated between the second and third floors on the rear elevation.
7. Provide information for screening the condensing units located on the ground near the southeast corner of the building.

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Ebony Simpson

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

[15. Petition of Paul Miller and Shea A. Slemmer | 12-001360-COA | 224 Houston Street | Trellis](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Merriman recused himself from participation in this petition.

Mr. Paul Miller was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval to construct a trellis in the courtyard of the property at 224 Houston Street. The trellis is nine (9) feet tall, eight (8) feet wide and eighteen (18) feet long. It is constructed of wood beams and boards salvaged from the interior of the principal structure and painted Sherwin Williams Thunder Gray (SW7645). Over the last couple of years, several Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends after-the-fact approval for the nine foot (9') wood trellis in the courtyard of the property at 224 Houston Street

because it meets the preservation standards, design standards, and is visually compatible.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Miller thanked the Board for hearing their petition. He is the owner of the property.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Simpson asked if the painting and the trellis were a combination of two after-the-fact requests.

Ms. Ward explained that there have been a number of prior Certificates of Appropriateness approvals.

Board Action:

After-the-fact approval for the nine foot (9') tall wood trellis in the courtyard of the property at 224 Houston Street because it meets the preservation standards, design standards, and is visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Brian Judson

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

Agenda B (Items 13-18 will be heard no earlier than 4:00pm)

16. Petition of Tim Luther for Denyse Signs | 12-001392-COA | 27 Bull Street | Signs and Awnings

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Awning Rendering and Samples.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Preservation Brief 44.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Howington recused himself from participation in this petition. He is an employee of Greenline Architecture who represented the initial application.

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petition is requesting approval for two (2) awnings over the existing windows on the front (east) façade and a sign package for the new business, "United Community Bank," located at 27 Bull Street.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval of the awnings and signage package with the following conditions because they are visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Submit a sample of the limestone panels for the principal use fascia sign to staff for review prior to installation.
2. Reduce the size of both traffic signs to a total of two square feet (2 sf) each, which is the maximum allowed by the ordinance (Section 8-3116).

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Luther stated that he was representing the Denyse Signs and they are the signage vendor for the United Community Company. Mr. Luther said he found samples, but did not have them at the time of their submission. They believed the building was actually polished when it was built. But, obviously a century later, it is not. This really is an awesome building. He stated that a part of the reason they went with the plaques on the corners is because there are a lot of damage on the corners. They have tried to come up with a way to cover up the damage.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Luther if the awnings will appear as shown in the photo that is shown on the monitor or in the photo that is being passed to the Board which shows that the bottom of the front edge of the awning is scalloped or will they be straight, which is more historic.

Mr. Luther answered that they prefer that they be straight because over time the weather tends to make the scallops curl.

Dr. Williams said he does not know if the Board should be so specific, but the product the Board has received in the petitioner's packet shows scalloped.

Mr. Luther explained that he believes this was actually from the manufacturer's catalog and is showing this as an application of how their material looks in a given application.

Ms. Ramsay said whoever makes the motion that this can be added as a stipulation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with the staff's recommendations for approval of the signs and awnings. However, they are a little concerned about the attachment of the principal use limestone fascia sign. They are interested to know from the petitioner whether the epoxy adhesive that will be used on the panels is reversible and whether the panels can be removed at a later date without damaging the building. They also wanted to ask the petitioner to keep the mechanical mounting for the identification signs at the corner of the building to a minimum. They understand that the petitioner is trying to cover up the damage that is there now, but they want the petitioner to ensure that this does not extend outside of the current area that is already damaged so that they do not continue to contribute to this damage.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Luther if he wanted to respond to the concerns of the HSF.

Mr. Luther said actually on the adhesive, their plan is to only run it vertically so that there is actually a small air space behind here. They are doing this for two reasons; they do not want to encapsulate some that could possibly catch water and easily push one of them off the wall. They were trying to avoid putting any further mechanical fasteners and penetrations, especially that high where it would be difficult to get to them and work on it. As far as where the plaques are going in the corners, the manufacturer started out recommending eight (8) attachment points on the back of the plaques. But, they sort of engineered this back down to a little thinner. Probably, what they will use here is a minimum amount of adhesive, but only put it into the stud holes so that when it does come off there will not be anything else to try to get off. Mr. Luther explained that they actually tried finding something and went by there a couple of times to see if they could patch any of the holes, but it would become too soft over time.

Dr. Henry commended the petitioner for having such great respect for such a gorgeous building.

Board Action:

Approval of the awnings and signage package at 27 Bull Street because they are visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

Vote Results

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

17. [Petition of J. Leander, LLC | 12-001400-COA | 502-508 East McDonough Street | New Construction Part I, Height and Mass, for two-story townhomes](#)

- Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Application, Description and Photos.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Aerial - Looking North.pdf](#)

Mr. Matthew Allan was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Part I, Height and Mass, of a two-story residential row from 502-508 East McDonough Street. They are also requesting a variance to allow a zero setback for structured parking within the ground floor to allow for a one-story, two-car garage at the corner of Hull and Price Street.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass, with the following condition to be resubmitted with Part II, Design Details:

- a. Provide a parapet on the side elevations of the garage or a side gable roof to meet the design standard [Sec. 8-3030(n)(13)f.].
- b. Where intersected by a new driveway, the sidewalk shall serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

Ms. Ward reported also that staff recommends that the Board recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) of the 30 foot structured

setback parking variance required under Sec. 8-3030(n)(14)b. to show a zero setback in the Trust Lot condition.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Ward to go to page 1 and tell him where the trees are located.

Ms. Ward stated that the petitioner will need to address this with their specific development plan.

Dr. Williams said he believes that Ms. Ward said that houses without stoops are typical for this area. He asked Ms. Ward to clarify this as this is not what he is seeing in the aerial photo view, except for some new construction.

Ms. Ward explained that the historic row houses along this entire two block area to the south within Crawford Ward all have the low stoop which may go up two steps to go into the front entry door.

Dr. Williams said what he is seeing is that they all have covered stoops. They are low, but they are covered stoops with steps.

Ms. Ward asked if there is a roof over the top.

Dr. Williams [pointing to an area] said west of Price this is the norm and east of Price this is the norm. Price is the major dividing line, historically; but when there are stoops and non-stoops, you go along Price Street and you will see lots of stoop-less entrances, but the further west you go, the higher they get towards Bull Street.

Ms. Ward asked Dr. Williams [pointing to an area] if he was saying this block?

Dr. Williams said he was looking at the one that is facing north at the bottom of the photo. Every house has a covered stoop.

Ms. Ward said there are canopies on them.

Dr. Williams said it is hard to tell from the photo, but it looks that there are three or four steps. Therefore, the current proposal is not in fact compatible with the character. He asked if the unit at the bottom on the left of the trees is historic?

Ms. Ward pointed out the units that are not historic.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, all the Board has to work with is the block that is to the south.

Ms. Ward pointed out the images that are immediately across the street. A single unit is here, but it has the canopy over the entrance that Dr. Williams was talking about. She said she was comparing it to these because an example does exist. She believes there is a lot of variety in this ward.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward if the units she just mentioned are historic?

Ms. Ward pointed out the units that are historic.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Allan said he was representing J. Leander, LLC; the owners of the property. He has worked very closely with Ms. Ward and Ms. Michalak on this project. They have already attempted to do all of the staff's recommendations.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Allan how he felt about the stoop.

Mr. Allan said he is not theoretically opposed. The model they used for this project is somewhat a hybrid between the units on Perry Street that has the little stoop and the one on Price Street that has no stoop at all. The unit between Perry and Liberty Street on Price Street [the unit with the coke cola advertisement on either side]. This is the one they were modeling their project with.

Mr. Engle said on page 4 he thinks something is wrong with the cornice. The top view shows the cornice stopping before it hits the masonry and on the front elevation, the cornice is extended beyond the masonry edge on the dutch gable. He believes this is incorrect as it should stop short of the masonry.

Mr. Allan said this is not problem. They will correct it.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Allan that with regards to the recommendation for the carriage house or the garage roof, what are his feelings regarding a side gable or a parapet?

Mr. Allan stated that within the last couple of days they have sent Ms. Ward and Ms. Michalak a rendering showing a hip with a parapet to match the front house.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation said they agree with the staff's recommendations for approval. They just wanted to add one additional point. On the Price Street facade, they believe the window should be vertically aligned because it is facing a principal street. It would only take shifting that lower left north window over a little.

Mr. Allan said they will take a look at the window. He knows the ordinance calls for aligning windows on the primary facade. The Price Street side is not the principal, but if they can shift it and it does not impede on the interior, he does not see why it would be a problem.

Dr. Williams said he believes it would be considered a primary facade since it is facing Price. Therefore, the petitioner has two primary facades.

Mr. Howington said even if it is not a primary facade, he would appreciate it if the petitioner looks at the line elevation bumpout on the next sheet. The windows are shifted about six inches or maybe a foot. The three windows on the bottom do not align with the three on the top.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Allan if he said that the garage will have parapets matching the house, a stepped side gable profile? Is this what you said?

Mr. Allan answered yes.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, the roof historically would not have that screening hip roof, but it would be a side gable roof with the brick walls. Is there a rationale for hip roof?

Mr. Allan said he is not opposed to it. He said he has been on pain killers for the last several days and he is not sure if what their designer drew was not a side gable.

Ms. Michalak said it is to be like the main house.

Board Action:

1. Approval for Part I, Height and Mass, with the following conditions to be resubmitted with Part II, Design Details:
 - a. Provide a parapet on the side elevations of the garage or a side gable roof to meet the design standard [Sec. 8-3030(n)(13)f.].
 - b. Where intersected by a new driveway, the sidewalk shall serve as a continuous uninterrupted - PASS pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.
 - c. Vertically align the windows on Price and Hull Streets.
 - d. Correct roof overhang detail at parapet roof.

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye

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

Board Action:

Recommend the Zoning Board of Appeals approve of the 30 foot structured setback parking variance required under Sec. 8-3030(n)(14)b. to allow a zero setback in this Trust Lot condition. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.
Second: Keith Howington

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

18. [Petition of William A. Halford, III | 12-001402-COA | 3 West Liberty Street | Replace front stair](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Preservation Brief 16 - The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Description, Materials, and Drawings.pdf](#)

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

NOTE: Mr. Merriman recused himself from participation in this petition.

Mr. William A. Halford was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to replace the front entry stair treads to the building at 3 West liberty Street occupied by the Knights of Columbus.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval to replace the brownstone, concrete, and metal front entry stair treads with cast stone to match the design, color, and texture of the original brownstone treads and to restore the iron railings and light fixtures because it meets the preservation and design standards and is visually compatible.

Dr. Henry said he believes the petitioner has done a fine job of matching brownstone, but why are they not getting it from China?

Ms. Ward said she believes it would be extreme to ask the petitioner to do so.

Dr. Henry said he was of the opinion that it could be ordered via the internet.

Ms. Ward said she believes it would be expensive. She is not sure if the brownstone could be ordered by internet. However, the petitioner would want to know if the brownstone that is being mined in China is actually a good match for what is here.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Michael Ford came forward and stated that he was representing the Knights of Columbus and Mr. Bud Halford was accompanying him. He said it was a pleasure working with the staff. They are very professional. Mr. Ford said he appreciates the work that the Board does.

Mr. Engle said the color looks good as a match. The question he has is that the original has mica-like properties and the sample does not. Can powdered mica be added to this mix?

Mr. Ford said he was not sure, but would find out.

Mr. Engle said he was sure the manufacturer has a different sand mix that could be used.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said he agrees with Mr. Engle's comment. Obviously, the Board cannot require it, but what obligations would the petitioner have to embrace this if they say to just look into this?

Mr. Engle said he has worked with cast stone companies before and they are usually willing to modify the mix.

Ms. Ramsay said in their motion, the Board can stipulate that the petitioner works closely with the staff to ensure that an appropriate portion of mica is

inserted into the tread mix.

Board Action:

Approval to replace the brownstone, concrete, and metal front entry stair treads with cast stone to match the design, color, and texture of the original brownstone treads and to restore the iron railings and light fixtures because it meets the preservation and design standards and is visually compatible, provided that powdered mica be added to the cast stone composition to replicate the reflective quality of the historic stone and a sample be reviewed and approved by staff prior to installation. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Brian Judson

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

19. [Petition of Harold Yellin | 12-001406-COA | 420 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Enlarge garage door at lane](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Application and Garage Door Examples.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Door Specs, Historic and Current Photos.pdf](#)

Attorney Harold Yellin was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting to install one 16 foot wide garage door opening on the rear wall of the property at 420 East Oglethorpe Avenue. This new opening will replace the existing seven foot-10 in (7'-10") wide garage door and pedestrian door opening on the rear. The petitioner is also requesting a variance from Section 8-3030(n)(13)(d) to allow for the 16 foot wide garage door opening. The standard states that *garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.*

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends denial of the request to install one 16 foot wide garage door opening on the rear wall of the unit at 420 East Oglethorpe Avenue, replacing the existing seven foot-10 inch (7'-10") garage door and pedestrian door opening, because the preservation standards and design standards [Sec. 8-3030(n)(13)a. and d.] are not met.

Ms. Ward reported further that staff recommends that the Board recommends to the Zoning Board of Appeals to deny the variance request for standard Section 8-3030(n)(13)(d) to allow for the 16 foot wide garage door opening because the proposed alteration is not consistent with the intent of this ordinance to preserve the historic character, size, and scale of openings along the lane. The standard states that, garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.

Ms. Ramsay asked when was the maximum 12 foot wide garage door opening standard adopted?

Ms. Ward speculated that the standard was adopted in 1997. It was recommended in their old design manual which is when the more specific design standards came out. However, she will have to do further research to confirm this date.

Mr. Engle said if the garage door did go across the entire span, is there any mention of where all the electrical will be placed?

Ms. Ward stated that the electrical can be moved, but they would need to know what it would look like. It is not shown in the rendering that was provided.

Dr. Henry said he recalls that there is a rule that stated if you were building on a structure such as a carriage house, you could not put in a double car garage door. Is this correct?

Ms. Ward explained that the rule states that garage openings can not exceed twelve (12) feet in width. This is the standard and the petitioner is requesting a variance from this standard.

Dr. Henry said he was of the opinion that you had to put in carriage type doors and could not put in one latch as you had to have two.

Ms. Ward explained that the ordinance states that the garage door width cannot exceed 12 feet in width.

Dr. Henry said, therefore, they all are saying the same thing.

Ms. Ward answered yes. They can not require that someone do two doors as they can do one door.

Mr. Merriman said maybe he missed something, but instead of a sixteen (16) foot door, why can't the petitioner do twelve (12) feet.

Ms. Ward said the petitioner wishes to accommodate two cars within the space. But, the petitioner can answer this question.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Attorney Harold Yellin came forward and stated that he along with his wife, Peggy, are the owners of 420 East Oglethorpe Avenue. They are requesting a variance so that they can have one sixteen (16) foot garage door instead of the one garage door and one rear entry door. The garage door that they are requesting will look exactly like his neighbor's two garage doors. Attorney Yellin explained that they are one of eight units in Oglethorpe Row. It is a part of the building that is commonly known as the Derst Bakery Building. Ms. Ward has shown the Board a photograph and she gave him a copy also that she got from the Georgia Historical Society. He showed the Board a photo that he gave to Ms. Ward that he obtained from Jack Lee's collection. Prior to the building be used as a bakery, it was originally built as an automobile dealership. After Derst Bakery left, it was used as a furniture store; it was used for a general warehouse and general retail. In 1998, eight (8) residential units were created at this location. The building is 200 feet along the lane [and he showed the photograph that Ms. Ward provided]. It is unusual to have a building this large in Savannah and it runs approximately 200 feet from Habersham in an easterly direction, if they count the structure it is literally a wall of about 270 feet running from Habersham Street to Price Street.

Attorney Yellin said he brings this to the Board's attention because this is not a carriage house. A lot of issues do arise when there is a carriage house. An answer to the question that he thinks Ms. Ramsay brought up [maybe it was Dr. Henry], the ordinance was changed in 1997 as the result of the Chadborne guidelines. If they look carefully at the Chadborne guidelines, they refer to a 12 foot limitation for new construction of carriages. He wanted to make this really important sanction that this is not a carriage house, this is an adaptive reuse of a commercial building, one that they are very proud of and one that they look forward to being a part of. There are two garage doors which are identical to what they are looking to do. Attorney Yellin pointed out his neighbor's garage door which is literally two doors down from them. It is located at 410 East Oglethorpe Avenue. He said this garage door is located next door to their unit and you can see the siding and the electrical meters from our pump room. Pointing to an area, Attorney Yellin said these two are located right here and the other is located right here; and this is our unit right here and the other is located right here and this is our unit right here. Therefore, literally they have two doors down, one door down, the

exact garage they are looking to put for this particular unit. He said incidentally both of these units had garages installed after 1997; after the ordinance was changed to be twelve (12) feet both of these sixteen foot garages were installed because the units were not created until 1998.

Attorney Yellin said they included a "before" and "after" photograph of their portion of the rear facade. Currently, there is an existing garage door. Ms. Ward came out and met with him in the alley. The existing garage door is substandard; it is 7'-10" wide; it is too small for a single car. They looked at all kinds of ways to try to create an appropriate garage back here. It is very difficult. He has met with an architect, two builders, his electrician, and with Georgia Power. It is a very difficult wall to work with. But, ultimately, it was decided that it would make the most sense to install a sixteen (16) foot garage door because it happens to be that the distance from the framing of this garage to the framing of the door is exactly sixteen (16) feet; not 15'-10 inches; not 16 '-10', but exactly 16 feet which would allow for a garage door exactly like his neighbor's garage door. Attorney Yellin said they would also remove the wood siding. They personally do not think it is visually compatible. They don't believe this makes sense. Why it is here they do not know. They have not seen any photographs of the alley. He has had numerous conversations with Ms. Ward and she has looked; he has looked and they can not find what the alley used to look like. All they know is what the alley looks like right now; and the alley includes two sixteen (16) foot garage doors right next to him.

Attorney Yellin said, therefore, it is their intention to remove the wood siding. He said, pointing to an area, that they will lose brick here, but they will be picking up brick here, almost the same square footage and they will paint it to match the building. He showed the Board an artist rendition of what theirs would look like. Their electrician has told them that even though the meter can not be moved and particularly this meter can not be moved [he is sorry the rendering does not show it], the meters that were formerly here can be moved here; this will have to be raised up and they can put another meter can be put down here, but this wall can accommodate the meter boxes. This is the rendering of what they are proposing. He showed the Board a view from the alley looking in a westerly direction from Price Street to Habersham Street. Attorney Yellin told the Board that he shows this to them because they believe it will be an improvement to remove the siding; then the entire row will be brick with the exception of the last unit [he has no control over the last unit], but he believes the wood siding stands out. As he has said, he believes it will be an improvement to remove the wood siding and have a consistent finish here.

Attorney Yellin said there is a reason they have less façade to work with and they are the only one of the eight units that houses a pump room for the entire facility. He showed the Board the front of their property and he shows this to the Board because every unit at the building has a door with three windows. Their unit, 420 East Oglethorpe Avenue, has two windows. He showed the Board the door to the pump room. He is not sure why it is 418 East Oglethorpe Avenue and they are 420 East Oglethorpe Avenue. Attorney Yellin believes the

numbers should be reversed, but the Board can see that there is an alarm system and there is approximately forty (40) square feet beyond the store which has the pump room for the entire facility. As a result, there is a large pipe that runs through their first floor and it is controlled by the meter box on the back. He said that he has been told by all parties concerned that the meter cannot be moved. It is a part of the wall that cannot be moved. He said, pointing to an area, the meter sits right here. Attorney Yellin said, pointing to another area, their neighbor has located her meter box here. He believes it is probably a matter of first to arrive or last to arrive. But, the neighbor's entire expansive façade has garage door and doors. Under the condominium declaration she has the right to use common area for her meters. As a result, even though their building probably comes to about right here, this meter box belongs to their neighbor and cannot be moved.

Attorney Yellin said, therefore, they come to the table with limited space to work with. The only meter that can be moved, as he has said, is the one in the middle which they can move to the side. He said he has met with his electrician, architect, and Georgia Power. They have looked for all kinds of ways. He said that Mr. Merriman asked if there is something else that they can do. Attorney Yellin said they have looked and have tried to come up with some other alternatives. The one alternative that they kept coming back to is to create a sixteen (16) foot door which matches their two neighbors' door.

Attorney Yellin asked the Board that in its review of their petition that they consider the variance criteria in the ordinance. The ordinance does allow for variances for a reason. In Section K-6A [Ms. Ward touched on this], but the Board is allowed to consider special conditions and circumstances which exist which are peculiar to the building and in their case, peculiar to their unit, that is not applicable to other buildings. He said that they certainly have a unit that is different than any other unit. They love their place, they love their unit, but it is different make no mistake about it.

Attorney Yellin said they also ask that the Board consider Section K-6B [Ms. Ward did touch on this], but it talks about the literal interpretation of your ordinance. Would it deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties within the same or immediately adjacent ward? He wanted to tell the Board that filing a petition before the Board is an humbling experience; one that he has never done before. Before coming to the meeting, he and his wife actually drove down alleys and lanes looking at garage doors. He cannot imagine what people thought of them as they got out of their car and went door-to-door literally photographing garages. They expected to find no garage doors greater than twelve (12) feet, much to their surprise every lane they went down had garage doors. In fact in just the three lanes that they went down [the three alleys of Gordon Lane, Jones Lane and Charlton Lane] there were twenty-nine (29) garage doors of sixteen (16) feet or greater. The smallest being sixteen (16) feet and the largest being twenty-four (24) feet. They fully expected in a residential neighborhood [this area is far more residential than where they are] to find no garage doors, but as he said much to their surprise, they found numerous garages which are enjoyed by residents of their downtown district. Consequently, they would like to enjoy the rights that are commonly enjoyed

by others. Particularly, coming even closer to home, they would like to enjoy the rights as the people next door.

Attorney Yellin said again that this is an adaptive use, it is not a carriage house. He has to tell the Board that before coming here, you read a lot and he read Chadborne. He thinks that when you are talking about new construction for a carriage house, maybe it does make sense to have less than twelve (12) feet because you have a clean slate, a clean canvas, and you can do whatever you want to do; but when you come across a building like this one which is commercial, you have to take what you find and what they find right now is something that says it is difficult to work with and they are trying their very best to come up with something that works.

Attorney Yellin said aside from the historical element, the safety of his family is very important; being able to have two cars in a garage is very important. This is the only way they know how to do that. He knows that the Board has had petitions where the neighbors come to the meeting to speak for and against, he wanted to let the Board know that they have talked with their neighbors. He does not know whether the Board has received the letter from the Oglethorpe Row Homeowners Association. He read that the Association states "the members of the Association wish to go on record as approving the variance for the property located at 420 to allow the garage door opening to exceed twelve (12) feet. 420 East Oglethorpe Avenue is a part of the Oglethorpe Row Condominium." There are eight (8) properties in the condominium, two of which already have existing garage doors like the one he has asked for. They feel that the wider doors are superior to the narrow doors because of the wider turning radius. They are safer and they offer greater visibility for backing in and out of a very narrow lane. Attorney Yellin said lastly, the Association states "visually there is no problem with the wider door there are already two garage doors in the building that are identical to the one that is requested. Furthermore, the lane is not to be used as a through way. There is virtually no foot traffic; the visual impact of the door is not a factor." They feel, in fact, that it will improve the exterior appearance of the building. The historical significance of the building and the nature of the building is industrial and commercial being the old Derst Bakery Company. He said the letter is signed by the President of the Association, Lawrence Tomhave. Attorney Yellin said he realizes that it is only their opinion; but since he knows, that there are times when neighbors speak against, he wants the Board to know that his neighbors are in favor.

Attorney Yellin said they respectfully request approval of the petition. He entertained questions from the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said Attorney Yellin always presents terrible arguments. Some time they hope to hire him to make a case for them. It is perhaps compelling given the circumstances and so on, but the HSF supports the staff's recommendation for denial. He believes the standard is important and he believes they have an obligation to uphold the standard. Mr. Carey said he could not speak to

previous cases why things are the way they are. What a great debate a preservation class ought to have about this? He was saying this in all sincerity that this is the kind of debate and discussion that could be done in an academic setting. He would love to know the results of this. Mr. Carey said, however, this is not what is before them today. There is a standard that the petitioner wants to deviate from. The HSF supports the staff's recommendation.

Mr. Ramsay Khalidi said there were three brief points he wanted to add to the discussion. He said he believes they all made a good point on the adaptive reuse. He believes they all are finding out in careers as they move on that historic preservation, adaptive reuse, and sustainability are actually one in the same. They are not mutually exclusive, but are actually a boost to each other. Mr. Khalidi said from an adaptive reuse perspective, he has worked on many buildings in the district. He wanted to say that this building has been punctuated many times to be useful.

Mr. Khalidi wanted to go back to the initial image showing the aerial. He said if the Board notes, the entire City block was removed in 1984. The new portion of this row was a parking lot. He and his wife lived in the corner four blocks. The three Victorians that were on Oglethorpe Avenue and Habersham Street were moved to Price Street. Therefore, they completed this block. As the area began to redensify with residences, they found out quickly that parking is at a premium. So in 1984 parking was a big issue. They created two parking spaces for each structure in the rear, the lane that faces Walls BBQ. He had these properties for almost twenty (20) years. Now, he is watching this as it develops; he is not the owner. Mark and his mother purchased the corner buildings at Oglethorpe and East Broad Street. She could not be here today, but they did discuss this. Historically speaking, Mr. Khalidi believes the building supports congenial investments throughout the century. He believes it endangers preservation and significance structures if you are not able to use it and if people were not able to find a way to live in these buildings. If parking is such a premium, he applauds the petitioner for trying to create another parking space.

Mr. Khalidi said he agrees with Mr. Carey. If this is worthy of a debate and if it is that close to call, he asks that the Board grant the petitioner some sort of relief in the case of this particular issue.

Ms. Ramsay asked Attorney Yellin if he wanted to respond to the HSF's comments.

Attorney Yellin said yes, some day he would like to work with the Historic Savannah Foundation. He wanted to remind everyone that they are talking about the alley. Great care has been taken on all portions of this building. There are twenty-one (21) garages between Habersham and Price Streets. If they start walking down the street, they will see on both sides of the lane these twenty-one (21) garages. Whether the door is sixteen (16) feet, twelve (12) feet or whatever it maybe, he does not believe it will change anything about this block. In fact, what is interesting is that their unit is exactly in the middle. It is approximately 125 feet to Habersham Street and 125 feet to Price Street. You will not see the garage door from either Habersham Street or Price Street. All

he can tell the Board is that this is very important to them. They very much want to make this their home. They have been looking for six (6) years and they believe that they have found the home of their dreams. With the help of the Board they would like to have a sixteen (16) foot garage door.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he does not believe that they have ever approved a sixteen (16) feet garage door on a historic building since he has been on this Board. A lot of pictures were shown, but they were never reviewed by this Board. Also, he believes a false sense of history is being created. If this is approved, only one will be left that shows any variation at all. The Secretary Standard's state that they will not create a false sense of history. Mr. Engle said creating a whole row of sixteen (16) feet wide double car garage doors is not history.

Dr. Henry said he was sympathetic to Attorney Yellin's transportation problem because he has a carriage house and would like a sixteen (16) foot door himself. But, when they look at the pictures, he does not believe they compliment the historic district.

Dr. Williams said the easternmost unit is intact. In fact, they have not been altered with any wood. Therefore, if anything is intact it is the last two units. But, currently there are four out of eight that are in what they might call "original condition." Or at least "original apertures." It appears that the one just beyond these two, one has a divider that looks like two. Therefore, they have two that are like what Attorney Yellin is requesting. One is double-sided. They have had the debate about original fabric. What comes to his mind is the townhouse on the corner of Oglethorpe Avenue and Drayton Street built around 1820 and they voted to allow original fabric to be torn off the back of that building for adaptive reuse. It is under construction now.

Mr. Merriman asked Dr. Williams if he was talking about is an old building and an addition was added to it on in the late 1800s?

Mr. Howington said the wall on Drayton Street was historic fabric the rest was gone.

Mr. Merriman said that a part of the kitchen was gone and they allowed the petitioner to tear that down.

Dr. Williams stated that it is not a clean cut decision.

Ms. Ramsay asked Attorney Yellin if he wanted to clarify something.

Attorney Yellin said yes, he wanted to clarify one thing. All of the doors are eight (8) feet or greater on that building with the exception of his. You would not get even two eight feet doors because you need to have at least an eight (8) inch minimum for the rails. Therefore, within the sixteen (16) feet that he is afforded, the only way to have two cars is to have one large garage door. He wanted to make this clear. They actually looked at having two single doors, but could not put it together. Their neighbors who have a larger space to work with do have the ability to have two single doors, but they do not.

Dr. Williams asked Attorney Yellin if it is because of the one piece of electrical equipment.

Attorney Yellin said it is two pieces. They have the electrical meter for the pump room which is on the east side. On the west side, basically is neighbor has a utility easement to be on the back of their side. Therefore, they have to bring it in about eight (8) feet. This is why they only have sixteen feet. If he was not clear, they would love to have two single doors if it could fit, but they would have had the existing seven foot ten (7'-10") and the other would have been seven foot six inches (7'-6"). He said in short of using two golf carts, you might see these at the Landings. The whole reason behind this is that it is the only way to get two cars for this buildings.

Mr. Merriman said when he arrived to the meeting today and he looked over this earlier this morning he was set to vote against it as it did not meet the standards, but after listening to these arguments and thinking back, he spent a lot of time in this alley last year. working on one of these places. It is a mess back here as far as how things look. Attorney Yellin makes a good argument that his neighbors have the sixteen feet doors. He was wondering maybe if he could apply for a variance. It is not like this Board would be setting a precedent where everybody in the historic district would get a sixteen foot door.

Ms. Simpson said she does not believe that the Board should add to the mess that is back there.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Yellin if he would be against one twelve (12) foot door?

Attorney Yellin answered that they would be.

Mr. Howington said he has a conflict as well because they do not know if these are the original openings. Were they bigger? They do not know this without investigating it.

Mr. Yellin said he does not believe anybody knows this. Both Ms. Ward and he tried to ascertain this. He pointed out that they can see where it looks like the brick was cut on each side of the garage. If they go back to the original photograph, there were garage doors on the front of this building for the Derst Bakery bread trucks. The answer is they would be opposed to one twelve (foot) door. On the inside of this building is a garage that holds two cars and the only way to get two cars in is to have one double door. His wife and he both would like to park under the house. It is not a carriage house. The answer is one twelve (12) foot door allows for one car and he would think there would be a strong argument for encouraging cars to be off the street. This is the way to be able to get that extra car off the street.

Dr. Williams asked Attorney Yellin if he has talked with his neighbor, who is encroaching on his wall, with her meters, even though she did it legally? Have you approached that person to see if there is room to move her meters so that you have the option of two eight (8) foot doors? Granted, however, this would be altering fabric too. However, he does not know if this would be less of an issue for the ones worrying about fabric removal.

Attorney Yellin told Dr. Williams that he did ask. Primary, if you look at the back of her unit, she pretty much takes up the entire twenty-four (24) feet with garage and door. Everybody comes to the table with a different menu. She has two garages and an entry door. As a result because she was one of the first persons here, she took her meters and put them on the unit next to her which she had the right to do because the building was common area. So she did what her contractor did, it was permitted and approved and this is where her meter boxes are. The answer is yes he asked, his electrician asked and the answer was no; nothing can be done.

Board Action:

1. Denial of the request to install one 16 foot wide garage door opening on the rear wall of the unit at 420 East Oglethorpe Avenue, replacing the existing seven foot-10 inch (7'-10") garage door and pedestrian door opening, because the preservation standards and design standards [Sec. 8-3030(n)(13) a. and d.] are not met and is not visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ebony Simpson

Second: Reed Engle

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

Board Action:

Recommend that the Zoning Board of Appeals deny the variance request for standard Section 8-3030(n)(13)(d) to allow for the 16 foot wide garage door opening because the proposed alteration is not consistent with the intent of this ordinance to preserve the historic character, size, - PASS

and scale of openings along the lane. The standard states that, garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Nicholas Henry

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

20. [Petition of Wubbena Architects | 12-001412-COA | 601 East Broad Street | New Construction, Part I](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

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

NOTE: Ms. Simpson left the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Ms. Terri Cornelius was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction Part I, Height and Mass, of two (2) two-story residential apartment buildings at 601 East Broad Street. The buildings will consist of 10 apartment units. A variance to allow for the zero setback from East Broad Street for structured parking within the ground floor for both buildings is requested.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass, with the following conditions to be resubmitted with Part II, Design Details:

- a. Northernmost Building, East Broad Street Elevation: Step the building back at the southernmost bay and add one more bay of windows. Add another bay of window openings at the northernmost unit of the front facade.
- b. Southernmost Building, Nicoll Street Elevation: Center the two end unit

window bays between the door and the corner. Center the single window bays on each side of the center unit's door.

East Broad Street Elevation: Align the centers of the southernmost bay of windows.

- c. Change the secondary engaged hipped roofs on the southernmost building to another shape, such as a gable.
- d. Provide a curb cut with a maximum width of 20 feet,
- e. Where intersected by a new driveway, the sidewalk shall serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

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

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Michalak to explain the rationale for the bump out.

Ms. Michalak explained that early in the design process, the walls were very long and flat. They were too long for the Beach Institute area. The petitioner's response was to add one foot step backs on the two end walls of the southernmost building and added those engaged secondary roof hips in response to an earlier discussions, prior to the writing of the staff's report.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Michalak to show the East Broad Street elevation. He said procedurally, he has a concern with how the staff's recommendation is worded on the step back as coming back as Part II Design. The footprint of the building needs to be resolved one way or the other in Part I, Height and Mass. Maybe his disagreement is looking at the north building as Ms. Michalak described it, first of all to do a step-back as was described as they are seeing on the left, the part facing the courtyard, if they look at the site plan; it is going to pinch the parking. If the goal is some symmetry, he might agree and support stepping back the northernmost corner of the building. But, if they look at it carefully, it is not a symmetric building. There is a greater space to the left of the first entrance than you have to the right of the last entrance. Mr. Judson said he cannot remember what the standards are for percentage of window space to walls, but his initial reaction to the staff's suggestion is to enter four more windows in that façade will look a little beyond cluttered. He realizes that this is not a question, but he wanted to clarify at least from his perspective, the decision about step-back and the windows have to be resolved as part of today's decision Part I, Height and Mass. They cannot just defer these sorts of structural things to come back with the design details.

Ms. Michalak explained that they would be conditions on the Part I that they would have to return.

Mr. Judson said he agrees that the vertical alignment of southernmost two windows should be a like.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Cornelius said she is a part of the design team at Wubbena Architects. They agree with the staff's recommendations except for the setback where the parking is located. This would pinch the parking to the point where they would have to remove one of the spaces.

Dr. Williams said currently the east elevation of what has been called the north building has four individual little stoops. He said the characteristic of the area is to have paired entrances. He asked Ms. Cornelius if they considered the idea of flipping two of the houses.

Ms. Cornelius said they originally submitted two paired entranceways, but the staff declined this and asked them to revise it. Consequently, they came up with the individual entries.

Dr. Williams guessed this would be a question for the staff because this is less typical than paired entrances in the area.

Ms. Michalak explained that the way the building design was heading, it did not work visually. She said she does not know how to describe it other than it was not visually compatible. It had a very long shed roof.

Dr. Williams said this serves as a mute point. He asked if it was a fair statement to say that other changes have been made to the design with a hip roof.

Ms. Michalak said a lot of changes have been made.

Dr. Williams said a statement was made "a cluttered east façade," especially if more windows are added. He said pairing the entrances under combined stoop roofs might actually simplify the elevation. Dr. Williams said in looking at all the photos that were submitted, the tendency is for the pairs to come together in the middle. He asked if there is a reason why the northernmost units have two bays rather than three bays of windows? Is it for the sake of symmetry where the garage is located?

Ms. Cornelius explained that she believes it was just to create symmetry. However, she is not sure how to answer this accurately. She is a part of the design team and is not always a part of every decision.

Dr. Williams said his concern is one of the houses will be north on East Broad Street. It is three stories and has the entrances pushed to the outer edges and a single entrance stoop. Virtually, every other picture has them come together under a hip roof.

Mr. Engle said no stoop is shown on the right-hand building.

Ms. Cornelius said this is a drawing error.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Cornelius if the property line is the heavy line going right to left.

Ms. Cornelius answered yes.

Mr. Engle asked if eighteen inches are between the stoop and property line.

If someone put up a fence on the property line, people will have to climb over each stoop to walk along the back, aren't they? They don't have a scale on this.

Ms. Michalak said these are not stoops, but just concrete pads by the back doors.

Mr. Engle asked, therefore, why are there two levels.

Ms. Michalak said she was not sure, but these are just concrete pads going out the back door.

Mr. Engle said they read as steps.

Ms. Michalak said it is not a stoop; there is no railing or anything else. She said, pointing to an area, the steps are here, just to clarify.

Mr. Engle said to clarify, they read as two steps.

Dr. Williams said two of them read as steps.

Mr. Engle said one is missing. But, they are reading as two steps.

Ms. Cornelius said the intent is for them to be pads. She apologized for the confusion.

Mr. Engle asked if the "CUs" are compressors.

Ms. Cornelius answered yes.

Mr. Engle said it looks like it is about eighteen (18) inches between the property lines and these units. Will you have to walk sideways? To him, it seems awfully tight. What is the distance?

Ms. Cornelius said if they want to reference this door, it will be three (3) feet.

Mr. Engle said it looks like it is about eighteen inches between the fence and the air conditioning unit, which would make it impossible to get a bike by or anything else. He said he would suggest that they are too tight to the property line to be functional.

Mr. Joe Duckworth came forward and stated he is representing the company that is doing this construction. The pads are for the CUs, but the compressor units are not that big. They have about six feet between the building and the fence. Therefore, there should be close to two and one-half feet or maybe three feet. Now, it is pretty tight, but there is space back there.

Dr. Henry asked if the pads are flush to the ground.

Mr. Duckworth answered yes.

Mr. Engle asked are the steps drawn here?

Mr. Duckworth answered that he does not know. He would have to ask the architect.

Mr. Engle said it is like a six inch step up into the house at the back.

Ms. Cornelius explained that the inner line will not be there. If they erase that line, then this would be the pad.

Mr. Engle said, therefore, you would be stepping from the pad one step up into the house. It is like seven inches above grade.

Dr. Henry asked if that pad is also flush to the ground.

Mr. Duckworth said this would be one step up.

Mr. Engle said they are back to his original point. To walk along the back, you will have to step up over a pad, step down, step up and a sidewalk is not even showing along the back. If you live in that end unit you are going on and step over a pad, down the grade, over a pad.

Ms. Ramsay said this would make it difficult for recycling and trash cans.

Mr. Engle asked where are they supposed to take their trash? How do they get to the dumpster if a fence is along the entire elevation? How would they get to all the dumpsters over there when they all are in the courtyard? There is no trash area in the back at all.

Dr. Williams asked if these are secondary entrances into one unit or is each floor divided into two units.

Ms. Cornelius, pointing to an area, said these are two level units and these are the secondary entrances.

Dr. Williams said on this floor you enter mainly from East Broad Street. The purpose of the rear entrances is just?

Ms. Cornelius said life safety.

Dr. Williams asked if the plans need to show where the garbage cans are to be placed.

Mr. Engle said they do, the plans show that they all are in the courtyard. He said all the "Ds" are for dumpsters, but you cannot get to the courtyard.

Ms. Michalak said to answer Dr. Williams question, the dumpsters will come under Part II.

Mr. Engle said the site plan shows boxes with "Ds" on them. He assumes this means dumpsters. However, you cannot get to the dumpsters. None of the units on the right are connected to the dumpster area.

Dr. Williams said there is no walkway.

Mr. Engle said, therefore, where will they put the dumpsters? He said on the street.

Dr. Williams asked if a fence is here?

Ms. Cornelius answered that a fence is here.

Dr. Williams said the question is how the people in those four units take their garbage to those dumpsters?

Ms. Cornelius said she could not answer this question.

Ms. Michalak said a gate is here.

Mr. Engle said you are not allowed to keep your dumpster on the street.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said he had a property line question. He said the stair appears to cross the property line. At one point, he thought he was following Dr. Williams thinking maybe you would have two units that face East Broad Street as opposed to one facing Nicoll Street. Could there just be two buildings, not two units, all facing East Broad Street? Then maybe the parking could come in off of Nicoll Street and still be able to get the ten (10) units. Is this your goal?

Ms. Cornelius said yes.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Carey if he was saying actually instead of one four unit building, break into five.

Mr. Carey said yes, break into two fives. Then maybe put the other items behind it on the Nicoll Street side. However, he is careful not to try to redesign things. But, as is, it seems problematic. He wonders if maybe it needs to go back to the drawing board?

Mr. Engle said if they go to drawing four of four, the drawing shows the stat. Therefore, this makes it worse.

Ms. Ramsay said there appears to be many issues with this petition. She told Ms. Cornelius that the Board cannot ask for a continuance. Only the petitioner can ask for the continuance. The Board has a lot of questions that are unresolved.

Dr. Williams asked the petitioner if there is a unit over the parking?

Ms. Cornelius answered yes. It is a one bedroom unit on the second level.

Dr. Williams said potentially there is a staircase encroaching on the neighboring property. He said he is a little concerned with the staff's suggestion to emulate this solution on the other building because having hip roofs with side gables introduced into them, he does not see evidence of this as being character of the area. He said on the model, a shift is shown in the hip, but staff requested that the petitioner look for another solution including this. However, he would say that this is not typical. In this special circumstance in the center of the block, it will not be visible from anywhere around is one thing, but putting it on the elements with gables facing east and west if he understood the staff's recommendation, would not be compatible with the area.

Dr. Williams asked if the logic to cure the idea of the shift in the wall plane

on the end walls of this unit was simply to break up the massing? Was this in response to the staff's recommendation?

Ms. Cornelius said it was in response to the staff's recommendation. They had one plane and shifted the wall back one foot and added the secondary roof.

Dr. Williams said this is the short elevation of the building. He asked staff if it is necessary to have the one-foot shift? This seems to be introducing complications to the building.

Ms. Michalak said it may not be any longer. This was the second edit. Therefore, if they imagine it without that, the massive expanse that was there before that.

Dr. Williams said it would be more typical of the area if there were just simple hip over the entire mass. They are also talking about the short elevation of this block. He does not know of any other building with a roof that has parallel hips as this.

Dr. Williams said among the things that need to be considered is a simple rectangular mass under one big hip. On the rear elevation on the left, there seems to be one strange alignment issue with the unit left of the staircase; the second window.

Ms. Cornelius said this it is supposed to be aligned.

Dr. Williams asked, therefore, it should be spaced as the other units?

Ms. Cornelius answered yes.

Mr. Engle said the second window is the same.

Dr. Williams said actually all of the windows are aligned differently. In fact, it looks like the second unit from the left is sliding a little beyond the alignment on the second floor.

Mr. Howington said the rhythm of the windows need to be restudied. Every window has a different space; especially on the primary facade, East Board Street and keep the Nicoll Street facade the same as well.

Mr. Engle said he cannot understand why they are encroaching on somebody else's property and there are other accesses to the back. The sidewalk gives clear access to the back.

Ms. Ramsay informed Ms. Cornelius that she has heard the Board's comments and their confusion with the project. The Board cannot ask for a continuance. They can go ahead and consider it today or she may ask for a continuance.

Mr. Howington [pointing to an area] believes that Dr. Williams's comment was that the gable on the hip would not be favorable as well on this unit .

Dr. Williams stated that this unit is hidden from the street is a sort of particular circumstance over the garages and will not be noticeable. He has less concerns about this, but the suggestion that the solution over the first bay

of the end, the east and west elevations, of the south building would seem completely eccentric to him. There is no structural rationale for it. There is nothing happening inside that would justify a one-bay gable over the ends. Whereas, here there is a change of use inside with a change in orientation with the unit over the garage which suggests the wall plane is different; although it is creating new issues with the property lines. If it turns out that the wall plane is pulled back because of the property line where the stair is. Let's say that ends up being in line with the rest of the west elevation.

Ms. Cornelius wanted clarification on Dr. Williams's comment.

Dr. Williams said to the petitioner see: where the stair is? The west wall that is attached, if she ends up having to move that wall eastward because of the property line, and if it ends up aligning with the other wall, try to get rid of the gable and just have it underneath the body of the hip, if it aligns. He told her that looking at the site plan she could solve a lot of problems by moving the wall.

Dr. Henry said the Board needs to give directions, but they do not want to design the project.

Dr. Williams said he understood that, but if the petitioner is going in a certain direction, they need to give them guidance in what to do with the features.

Mr. Engle said adequate access needs to be provided.

Ms. Cornelius asked for a continuance in order for them to resolve the issues.

Board Action:

Continue at the request of the petitioner - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

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

Alterations

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

NOTE: Dr. Williams left at 8:00 p.m.

Ms. Gretchen Ernst was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting alterations and additions to the property at 107 West Liberty Street. Ms. Michalak informed the Board that the petitioner's request was for the installation of three iron balconies on the east facade. But, as of this morning, the petitioner requested to continue this portion of the petition. Therefore, anything that was addressed in the staff's report regarding the three iron balconies will not be covered in her report.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval of light fixtures, gate, stair ironwork, and doors as requested because they are visually compatible and meet the standards.

Mr. Engle stated that the doors never existed without the porch. They are not putting a porch back.

Ms. Michalak said right.

Mr. Engle said, therefore, they are creating something that never existed.

Ms. Michalak explained that the openings existed and still exist.

Mr. Engle said the door openings did not exist until the porch was added.

Ms. Michalak said the balconies were removed from the petition at this time, but the petitioner will return at a later date.

Mr. Engle said may be they need to wait until the balconies come back. He does not believe they should approve doors when they have not approved something that they will lead to.

Mr. Howington said the openings are here now.

Ms. Michalak said they have plywood over them.

Mr. Merriman asked if the transom and frame are still here.

Ms. Michalak said yes.

Mr. Engle said on the back is a window that the petitioner wants to open up as a door.

Ms. Michalak, pointing to an area, said this one is filled back in as a window. But these two currently exist as openings with plywood over them.

Mr. Engle said if the Board said that they were just going along with the gate since the staff recommended it, then it would be fine to put doors in, but it is being assumed that the Board will approve the balconies. He said he disagrees with the staff's recommendation as they will be creating something that never existed. It is not a secondary elevation; it is wide out there, you cannot miss it.

Ms. Michalak explained that by definition, it is not; this is not the front elevation which means it is the secondary elevation.

Mr. Engle said earlier today they talked about a side elevation being a primary elevation.

Mr. Judson said, however, it also faced the street.

Mr. Engle said he believes that ought to be withdrawn until the Board makes a decision on the balconies.

Ms. Michalak asked Mr. Engle if he was saying just the doors.

Mr. Engle said at least the door that is not presently opened.

Mr. Judson said they can deal with this in their motion.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Ernst said she was representing the owners.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Earnest if she saw any procedural problems with the Board only approving everything else, but not approving the doors at this point. Will this hold up any of the other work?

Ms. Ernst answered no. But she would like to request that the doors that have the existing opening be approved today. They can wait on the other door.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval of light fixtures, gate, stair ironwork, and replacement door in the existing opening because they are visually compatible and meet the standards.

The new door opening at the south end of the second level of the east facade was deferred to be reviewed concurrently with the balcony proposal, which was continued at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

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

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

22. [Amended Petition of John L. Deering for Greenline Architecture | H-11-4521-2 | 205 Papy St. | Staff Review - Louvers](#)

Attachment: [COA - 205 Papy Street H-11-4521-2 Amended 10-30-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Amended Petition of Todd Huntington for GPD Group | H-12-4578-2 | 504 E. River St. | Staff Review - Brick and Mortar](#)

Attachment: [COA - 504 E. River St. H-120119-4578-2 Amended 10-5-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Amended Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-12-4698\(S\)-2 | 318 E. Liberty St. | Staff Review - Replace Entry Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 318 E. Liberty St. - H-120621-4698\(S\)-2 10-5-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 318 E. Liberty St. H-120621-4698\(S\)-2 10-5-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Amended Petition of Lois Gruberger | H-12-4714\(S\)-2 | 309 W. Hall St. | Staff Review - Exterior Painting](#)

Attachment: [COA - 309 W. Hall St. H-120628-4714\(S\)-2 Amended 10-5-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 309 W. Hall St. Amended.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Amended Petition of Patrick Phelps | 12-000482-COA | 2 East Broughton St. | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 2 East Broughton St. - 12-000482-COA Amended 10-12-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 2 East Broughton Street - 12-000482-COA Amended 10-12-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Lou Thomann | 12-000952-COA | 120 E. Jones St. | Staff Review - Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 120 E. Jones Street - 12-000952-COA 10-5-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 120 E. Jones St. - 12-000952-COA 10-05-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Doug Patten for City of Savannah | 12-001104-COA | 601 E. Bay St. | Staff Review - Repair/Replace Damaged Stone](#)

Attachment: [COA - 601 East Bay St. - East Broad Street Ramp 12-001104-COA 10-12-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 601 East Bay St. - East Broad Street Ramp - 12-001104-COA 10-12-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Doug Patten for City of Savannah | 12-001107-COA | 201 W. Bay St. | Staff Review - Repair/Replace Damaged Brick, Stone, Stair and Railing](#)

Attachment: [COA - 201 West Bay Street - Barnard St. Ramp - 12-001107-COA 10-12-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 West Bay Street - Barnard Street Ramp 12-001107 - COA 10-12-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Michelle Roberts | 12-001114-COA | 118 W. St. Julian St. | Staff Review - Two Illuminated Signs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 118 W. St. Julian Street - 12-001114-COA 10-10-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 118 W. St. Julian St. - 12-001114-COA 10-10-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of James Kery | 12-001147-COA | 41 Drayton St. | Staff Review - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 41 Drayton Street - 12-001147-COA 10-10-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 41 Drayton Street - 12-001147-COA 10-10-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Amended Petition of James Kery | 12-001147-COA | 41 Drayton St. | Staff Review - Flower Box Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 41 Drayton Street - 12-001147-COA Amended 10-30-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 41 Drayton St. 12-001147-COA Amended 10-30-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Brad and Gail Beaman | 12-001216-COA | 317 E. Huntingdon St. | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 317 East Huntingdon St. - 12-001216-COA 10-15-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 317 Huntingdon St. - 12-001216-COA - 10-15-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Laura Potts-Wirht | 12-001233-COA | 107 West Liberty St. | Staff Review - Exterior Work](#)

Attachment: [COA - 107 West Liberty Street - 12-001233-COA 10-17-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 107 West Liberty Street - 12-001233-COA 10-17-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Sam Carroll | 12-001256-COA | 223 W. Broughton St. - Units 1 - 6 | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 223 W. Broughton St. - Units 1-6 12-001256-COA 10-19-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 223 W Broughton St. - 12-001256-COA 10-19-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of J. Leander, LLC | 12-001301-COA | 409 E. Perry St. | Staff Review - Front Entry Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 409 East Perry Street - 12-001301-COA 10-19-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 409 E. Perry St. - 12-001301-COA 10-19-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Chris Kroha | 12-001328-COA | 405 East Liberty St. | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 405 East Liberty Street - 12-001328-COA 10-23-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 405 East Liberty Street - 12-001328-COA 10-23-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Linda and Ronald Mosca | 12-001339-COA | 140 Lincoln St. | Staff Review - Roof Replacement](#)

Attachment: [COA - 140 Lincoln Street - 12-001339-COA 10-23-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 140 Lincoln Street - 12-001339-COA 10-23-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of Paul Miller and Shea A. Slemmer | 12-001362-COA | 224 Houston St. | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 224 Houston St. 12-001362-COA 10-26-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 224 Houston St. 12-001362 COA 10-26-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Petition of Tim Gilstrap | 12-001372-COA | 601 Indian St. | Staff Review - Logo](#)

Attachment: [COA - 601 Indian Street - 12-001372-COA 10-26-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 601 Indian Street 12-001372-COA 10-26-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. [Petition of Becky Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects, PC | 12-001384-COA | 401 Whitaker St. | Staff Review - Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 401 Whitaker St. 12-001384-COA - 10-26-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 401 Whitaker St. 12-001384-COA 10-26-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. [Petition of Doug Bean for Doug Bean Signs, Inc. | 12-001390-COA | 516 Drayton St. | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 516 Drayton Street 12-001390-COA 10-31-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 516 Drayton Street 12-001390-COA 10-31-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. [Petition of Richard Moscatiello | 12-001401-COA | 302 E. President St. | Staff Review - Replace Balusters](#)

Attachment: [COA - 302 East President St. 12-001401-COA 10-31-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 302 East President St. 12-001401-COA 10-31-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. [Petition of Pete Elenbaas | 12-001407-COA | 22 West Bryan St. | Staff Review - Repairs and Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 22 West Bryan Street 12-001407-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 22 W. Bryan St. - 12-001407-COA 10-25-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

45. [Petition of Doug Patten for City of Savannah | 12-001514-COA | 2 East Bay St. | Staff Review - Stucco Repair/Repainting](#)

Attachment: [COA - 2 East Bay Street 12-001514-COA 11-1-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 2 East Bay Street 12-001514-COA 11-1-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

49. [Petition of John Deering for Greenline Architecture | 12-001661-COA | 102-106 W. Congress St. | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

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

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

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

50. [Next Meeting - Wednesday December 12, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)
51. [HSF Historic Tax Credit Training | December 6-7, 2012 | Kennedy Pharmacy, Savannah](#)

Attachment: [Historic Tax Credit Training Flyer.pdf](#)

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

52. [Nominating Committee Report for 2013 Officers](#)

Ms. Ward explained that the Nominating Committee forwarded their recommendations to staff. They nominated that Ms. Linda Ramsay serve as chair and Ms. Ebony Simpson as vice-chair. If the Board members want to nominate others, they may do so at this time. They will vote on the nominations at the December 12, 2012 meeting.

Mr. Howington asked staff if they know what is happening with the parking lot on Charlton Street and Drayton Street?

Mr. Engle said the tree lawn is being reestablished. They are planting 16 trees.

Mr. Howington said he had an issue with the way he voted on the petition for East Oglethorpe Avenue. He asked if it is too late.

Ms. Ward said the Board has already voted. She explained that the only way the Board can reconsider a petition is to recommend that it be put back on a future agenda.

Ms. Ramsay explained that to go to Zoning Board of Appeals, "visual compatibility shall not be the basis for appeals." Therefore, if the Board makes a motion that something should go to the Zoning Board of Appeals, you need to include visibility compatibility language.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

53. Adjourn

There being no further business to come before the Board, Ms. Ramsay adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah P. Ward
Historic Preservation Director

SPW:mem

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