



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
October 10, 2012 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

OCTOBER 10, 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.
Ebony Simpson
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Member Not Present: Stephen Merriman, Jr.

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

City of Savannah Staff Present: Tom Bolton, Zoning Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Order and Welcome](#)

Ms. Ramsay called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. She announced that a class from the Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD) was visiting with us today. These students are learning about Emerging Issues. Ms. Connie Pinkerton is the professor. Ms. Ramsay welcomed the students and the public to the meeting.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. [Approve Minutes of September 12, 2012](#)

Attachment: [09-12-2012 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve September 12, 2012 Meeting Minutes - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Not Present

III. SIGN POSTING

IV. CONTINUED AGENDA

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

Board Action:

Continue (no date certain) at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Not Present

V. CONSENT AGENDA

4. [Petition of J. Leander LLC | H-11-4526-2 | 409 East Perry Street | Amended Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Site Plan.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawing Details.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the amendment to the 409 East Perry Street rear fence as submitted because it is visually compatible and meets the standards, with the condition that the fence be painted or stained and submit a sample to Staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

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

5. [Petition of Cruz Salinas III | 12-000819-COA | 15 East Bay Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Paint Colors.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photograph and Renderings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Sign Design.pdf](#)

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

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

6. [Petition of Coastal Heritage Society Preservation Team | 12-000830-COA | 315 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Ned Gay

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

7. [Petition of Robert Portman for Barnard Architects | 12-000835-COA | 133 Montgomery Street | Canopy additions](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

Approval to install canopies over the entrances and exits to the Chatham County Parking Garage at 133

Montgomery Street as submitted because they meet the design standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Not Present

8. [Petition of Patrick Phelps for Hansen Architects | 12-000837-COA | 217 & 219-221 West Broughton Street | Storefront Replacement](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Existing Lane Window Inset.pdf](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval of the alterations to the storefront, doors, and lane window as requested because the changes meet the standards and are visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Not Present

9. [Petition of Dawson Architects | 12-000840-COA | 229 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard | Rehabilitation/Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

Approval for alterations to the main entrance stair and porch, and the addition of a crosswalk (with a ramp, stair, planters, and benches) to the building at 229 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. because the work - PASS is visually compatible, meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and is minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Not Present

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

10. [Petition of Dawson Architects | 12-000838-COA | 411 East River Street | Rehabilitation/Alteration](#)

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

Agenda A (Items will be heard at 2:00pm in sequential order)

11. [Petition of Jeff Cramer for Diversified Designs | H-12-4730-2 | 601, 603, 605, and 605A Tattnell Street | Amended New Construction, Parts I and II](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Mr. Jeff Cramer 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 four attached two-story townhomes at 601-605 Tattnall Street. The vacant property is at the southwest corner of Tattnall and Huntingdon Streets and the property will be subdivided into four parcels. She reported that the petitioner submitted his General Development Plan on September 6, 2012. The MPC, Fire, and Police Departments approved the plan with some conditions. Part I, Height and Mass, was approved at the meeting of August 8, 2012. At the September 12 meeting the petitioner came back for Part II and requested a continuance to address specific comments. Ms. Ward said staff has gone through the report and identified all the comments that were made during the meeting and the changes that were made to the plan.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval for new construction Part II, Design Details, of the four attached two-story townhomes at 601-605 Tattnall Street upon construction of a stucco sample panel of the finish and scoring pattern on-site to be reviewed and approved by staff. Additionally, a detailed drawing and materials of the front door surround is still needed. Staff has asked for information on the Miratec. Wood fencing is allowed and can be used for the mechanical screens which do not directly front a public street. She said she was pleased with the sample that the Board is reviewing at this time; it is wood. The sidewalk adjacent to Jefferson Street must serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway where intersected by the new driveways.

Ms. Ward asked the Board to allow the staff to continue to work on the plan with the applicant to develop something that best meets the ordinance while still consistent with other infrastructure departments.

Mr. Engle said that sheet five (5) shows the columns being HB&G. But, the elevation shows them as stucco. Does staff know if the petitioner has not changed the elevation?

Ms. Ward asked if the elevation sheet still shows stucco.

Mr. Engle answered that the elevation sheet says pilaster and stucco columns.

Ms. Ward said she was stating what was shown on the details. She asked the petitioner that when he makes his comments to please clarify this and ensure that it is noted on the final plan.

Mr. Johnson said he was concerned about the sidewalks on Jefferson Street. Will the garbage cans interfere with the traffic and residents?

Ms. Ward explained that the recycle bins that are shown are really the neighbors' bins. There are no buildings on this site. There is a fence area in the back and the neighbors should be putting their bins there. The petitioner is proposing masonry walls with iron gates. There are actually refuse screens within the site that will handle the trash and recycling bins.

Mr. Johnson asked if this will be enclosed.

Ms. Ward showed the proposed plan which shows that for each townhome, there is a place in the lot for the trash and recycling bins to be located.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cramer thanked the Board for considering their petition. He said regarding the columns, he has the HB&G square columns on the front. In the rear, the entire facade is stucco (the front is stucco, too), but they are free-standing columns that looks like walls. Mr. Cramer said he was of the opinion that these are a little simpler than the ones on the front [they look exactly like the ones on the front] but they are made out of stucco because a wall is here between the two columns on the left side. He explained that if the Board looks at all the porches, the two columns on the left are walls where you enter from the back door. Therefore, these are basically pilasters engaged into these two walls.

Mr. Cramer explained that columns are on the right of every unit, except the one on the far right which is 6-0-5-A Tattnell Street, is the only free-standing column on the back. Because they all are engaged and the rest of the materials are engaged, he did a judgment call and made all the columns in the back stucco with the same details as the columns in the front. They could be made precast columns to match the ones in the front, but what he found out in his experience about trying to waterproof buildings and a lot of times you change materials, especially on a wall that gets a lot of rain on it, increases more chances for you to have a leakage. Therefore, he thought making it all stucco would be a better construction detail, plus it would be similar, if not exactly like the ones in the front. Consequently, he made them stucco. There is only one free-standing column and he was going to put in a steel plated column and then put stucco around it as it has to hold up the corner of the building. The rest are pilasters and engaged pilasters.

Mr. Howington asked that on the front porch stoop, to clarify the records, on the elevation the petitioner has a black metal standing seam roof. On the details which shows a different cornice detail, maybe this could be resubmitted to staff as the upper cornice shows a little soffite around it. It also shows an architectural shingle.

Mr. Cramer asked Mr. Howington if he was saying on the roof of the porch.

Mr. Howington answered yes. The porch detail does not match.

Mr. Cramer said standing seam metal is on the front entrance porches.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said

they believe that the detailing has been greatly improved since the last submittal. The only additional point they would make is that the portions of the front portico and door should be improved by making it a little taller and maybe slimmer. Otherwise, they agree with staff's recommendation for approval.

Ms. Meunier realized that they are talking about visual compatibility; however, she wanted to point out to the applicant that the curb cut that are similar to this in the district tends to create an opportunity for parking. They just want to ensure that this does not happen because they are currently obstructing the public sidewalk.

Mr. Bill Stuebe of the Downtown Neighborhood Association (DNA) said regarding the comment just made about parking on the sidewalk, he want to suggest that the Board make its approval subject to the fact that homeowners will not be permitted to park on the sidewalk. This will provide a reason for the police to ticket and/or tow cars if they are parked on the sidewalk. On McDonough Street between Habersham and Price Streets you cannot walk on the sidewalk because cars park along here. What could happen here is that the a car could pull halfway in the courtyard and the rear end could be out to the curb line. This will prohibit someone from walking on the sidewalk.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Thomson, MPC Director, if there is something that this Board can say regarding the no parking on the sidewalk.

Ms. Ward said this Board cannot give permission for the homeowners to park there.

Mr. Thomson believed what the Board could do is ask staff to send their comments to the appropriate City department.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry agreed with the parking situation.

Mr. Engle said he was not sure of the Board getting into the parking situation as it is not within their purview. It is the law that there should not be parking on the sidewalks.

Mr. Howington said he had somewhat of a concern with the last portico being a little too wide. Some of the porticoes were a little narrow especially on the south side. If these were a little smaller they would not have the cornice and eve of the portico hanging over the side of the building.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Cramer how he felt about the two recommendation that have been made.

Mr. Cramer said they can make the porticoes a little narrower so that they will not project with the corner of the building. They all will be made the same size. They will make the door entrance as tall as they can. A ten (10) foot ceiling is here. He believes they will be able to raise the door up to at

least nine (9) feet.

Board Action:

Approval for new construction Part II, Design Details, of four attached two-story townhomes at 601-605 Tattall Street upon construction of a stucco sample panel of the finish and scoring pattern on-site to be reviewed and approved by staff prior to application/installation and with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final approval:

- PASS

1. Reduce the width of the porticos.
2. Elongate the front entrance.
3. Provide detail drawings and materials for the front door surround.
4. The sidewalk adjacent to Jefferson Street must serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway where intersected by the new driveways.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Brian Judson

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

12. [Petition of Patrick Phelps for Hansen Architects | H-12-4733-2 | 2 East Broughton Street | Amended Signs and Storefront](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs and Sign Specifications.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Application, Drawings and Materials.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of two principal use fascia signs and amended aluminum frame storefront system at 2 East Broughton Street.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval of the principal use fascia signs and amended aluminum frame storefront system at 2 East Broughton Street because they are visually compatible and meet the preservation and design standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Phelps entertained questions from the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use fascia signs and amended aluminum frame storefront system at 2 East Broughton Street because they are visually compatible and meet the preservation and design standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

13. [Petition of Gary Sanders, Architect | 12-000351-COA | 114 West Wayne Street | Addition/alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Mr. Gary Sanders of Sanders & Trowell Architecture, Inc. was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations and additions to the rear portion of the property.

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. Incorporate multiple panes within the single light doors and associate transom to be compatible with proposed and existing multi-paned windows;
2. Windsor Legend Windows have been approved for new construction in a one-over-one light pattern. Verify that the muntins simulate a putty glaze, that the glass panes are true-divided, and that the windows are double-hung as required by the ordinance;
3. Garage doors must resemble carriage house doors and submit specifications for review;
4. Provide details on the dimensions, spacing and material for the pickets and standing seam metal roof.
5. The column capital must extend forward of the architrave.

Ms. Ward said it was brought to staff's attention earlier today that hardi-panels are not allowed on exterior building walls in the district. Therefore, the petitioner needs to change the material on the upper floor.

Ms. Ward stated that lot coverage is verified by the Zoning Administrator during permit review. If a variance from the 75% maximum lot coverage standard is needed; further review and a recommendation from the HDBR will be needed for the petition to be heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).

Dr. Williams said during staff report, Ms. Ward mentioned that three windows face east. He asked if these windows were contiguous.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Sanders thanked the Board for hearing their petition and thanked the staff

for working with him. He said regarding the conditions that staff has made, he spoke with his client and they are in agreement with all of the conditions and will meet all of them.

Ms. Ramsay explained that staff has a questions about the exterior of the original building.

Mr. Sanders said it should be shown in stucco and they will make this modification on the exterior. He said that the clapboard on the left-hand side will be stucco.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the window is existing.

Mr. Sanders answered no.

Mr. Gay asked if the window is new.

Mr. Sanders answered yes.

Mr. Engle asked if the window would be a six-over-six and not a nine-over-nine.

Mr. Sanders answered yes. It should be shown as a six-over-six as the rest of the project shows. This will be corrected also.

Dr. Williams asked if the windows will be true-divided light or simulated.

Mr. Sanders said the windows will be true-divided light and this will be submitted to staff.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Barry Gayle stated that he resides at 108 West Gordon Street. He wanted to thank the owners as he lives across the street and looks at the eyesore of a parking structure every day. He is glad they are going to do something about it, but he is worried about two items regarding the proposed modifications and additions to the present garage. Firstly, the portions that extend up to the parapet appears to be windows on three sides. He is worried about the amount of light that will shine in the window at night when he is trying to sleep. This extends over the parapets and appears to be higher than he prefers. Secondly, he was wondering where the proposed mounting of the air conditioning units will be. They are not indicated on the plan. Are the units going to be visible from the houses across the street where he lives and even from Taylor Street? Are the units going to be on the ground?

Mr. Gayle said he heard a discussion about the garage doors being redone. Hopefully, the garage doors will be consistent with the other garage doors in the area. If they are painted Charleston Green, this will be great. There is no indication of the downspouts or downpipes for the runoff of the rain. He asked that these be consistent with the area which is basically copper or cast iron.

Ms. Robin Allen came forward and said she and her husband, Stephen Allen, live at 424 Barnard Street which is the property directly connected to and adjacent to 426 Barnard Street, 114 West Wayne Street. Ms. Allen said they are gravely concerned about the magnitude of the proposed structure, how it will effect their property value and their privacy. She asked the Board to remember that the proposed complex of four units is an investment property, which probability is based on density and magnitude. Ms. Allen said that 424 Barnard Street is their home. They have four concerns which are: 1. the mass of the structure as it relates to the lot; 2. the percentage of lot coverage; 3. the deck which over looks their garden and is very visible from Taylor Street and Wayne Street; and 4. parking. The guidelines require no more than 75% lot coverage. The proposed project claims lot coverage of 88% which they believe is questionable. Grandfathering is being considered for an existing shed which is comprised of a garden wall and corrugated aluminum siding.

Ms. Allen said she wanted to assure the Board that there is an enormous difference between this one-story shed and the proposed two-story masonry structure and how it will affect the overall mass of the buildings on the property and the adjacent historic residences. The 25% open space requirement is intended to encourage green space. What is left of open space on this project and on this lot will be consumed by staircases and decks. She said the mass of the carriage house and type of density is exactly what the guidelines were meant to prevent. The deck is their second issue. It is visually incompatible with the historic surroundings. They currently view the Mercer House out of their kitchen and bedroom windows. As proposed, they will be looking directly into a deck of an apartment building. The deck will be highly visible not just from their garden and every window in the back of their house, but from Wayne and Taylor Streets. They have a concern with parking. They have an inn on their square and it occupies five (5) buildings. Parking is an issue. The potential occupancy of this complex is ten (10) or more people. It allows for only two parking spaces. It is their opinion that the proposed carriage house replaces an existing shed. The density will place further burden on parking on the square.

Ms. Allen asked the Board not to recommend a variance for lot coverage on this project.

Ms. Ramsay thanked Ms. Allen for the completeness of her presentation, but reminded her that the Board does not control parking and lot coverage.

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said he is a resident of this area. He lives off of Chatham Square. He wanted to make comments representing both interests, HSF and his residence.

Mr. Carey said this is a good project in terms of the reclamation of an 1868 building that could use some work. There are certain improvements proposed here that are welcome. He knows the property owner and knows of his award winning work because the Historic Savannah Foundation has recognized his

work. However, he believes this proposal has a few problems and he wanted to bring attention to them, many of which were brought up by Ms. Allen. The HSF supports Ms. Allen's position. Mr. Carey said staff has already pointed out the hardi-plank issue on the proposed addition to the rear. As a general statement, perhaps density and parking issues are not the purview of this Board, but he believes it is this Board's purview on visual compatibility. He stated that visual compatibility can be compromised by elements that touch on these two items. In this Board's opinion, commentary and what gets forwarded to anyone that goes on the record should be a part of that because he believes that any body who looks at this will look at this Board's opinion. Consequently, he believes that some of this should be included as it will perhaps give guidance to them in making their decision.

Mr. Carey said the HSF believes the proposed deck along the north wall should be lowered or removed as it is not fully screened and is visible from the right-of-way on Wayne Street. The height of the garage addition is also troubling. They believe it should be physically lower than the main building. It should be subordinate in height and maybe it is, but it should be plainly obvious that it is. They believe the building is too large, too high and certainly with the additional roof that has been added; all seems excessive, not necessary and only adds to the height and mass of the building. This building does not fit this area and they don't believe it is visually compatible.

Mr. Carey said good work is being done here, but the additions, decks and so forth should be restudied and brought back in a more compatible way with this area.

Mr. Bill Stuebe of the Downtown Neighborhood Association (DNA) said he realizes that parking is not the purview of this Board, but the design of the project is this Board's purview. There are clearly four units in this project. Mr. Stuebe believes that the ground floor unit will be used for office space as a bathroom is here, but no tub or shower. The second floor shows three kitchen units. There is supposed to be one parking place per unit. The plans show only a two car garage, which is only fourteen (14) feet deep as there appears to be storage units. Fourteen (14) feet are not deep enough to accommodate all the automobiles. He said the petitioner is clearly violating the open space requirements of 75%. Mr. Stuebe suggested that this be restudied so that the amount of open space could be increased. He does not believe that this Board would recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) that a variance be given.

Mr. William Hadwin, property owner of 103, 105, and 107 West Taylor Street, said he had a number of concerns. One of this concerns is just as Mr. Gayle stated, the air conditioning units. Where will the air condition units be placed? If the units are placed on the roof, they will encroach on the people living at 107 West Taylor on their back balcony. A safety factor will be present here, too. The garden areas in each of these houses are very small. He is proud of the way the gardens are planted. As they see, presently, there is flashing on the side of the building. This was here when he bought the building. Will there be a watershed here? If so, this could cause damage to his property. Mr.

Hadwin said he does not believe this will be compatible from the Taylor Street view or from the Wayne Street view.

Mr. Hadwin asked the Board to give consideration to the fact that he has an option on 107 West Taylor Street at the expiration of the existing lease. He asked the Board to give consideration to all of the factors. He thanked the Board for their attention.

Mr. John Doughtry said he is currently living at the property that Mr. Hadwin mentioned, 107 West Taylor Street. He has been leasing the property for a couple of years with the option of purchasing it after having just sold his house at 11 West Gordon Street. He agrees with everything that Ms. Allen said. He invited the Board to check out the calls he had made to 9-1-1 over the period of two years for boisterous parties going on in the cement courtyard. His balcony will be adjacent to the large wall. Mr. Doughtry said he was told by the owners that they were going to build a new garage and put a carriage house here. The staff person who made the report about the various specifics about the siding and windows said she was pleased, but he is not pleased at all.

Mr. Doughtry said he was told that the carriage house was going to be two stories, but now he hears that it will be two and one-half (2 1/2) stories with a parapet, windows and something else on the top that will be slanted. He was told that the building will be built at 114 Wayne Street. However, it is not 114 Wayne Street, this building will be across the street from 114 Wayne Street. This will be mostly an entirely new three-story building. The wall is going to cut all the light from his apartment. As Mr. Hadwin has said it will affect the lighting of all the small enclosed gardens. All these plants are going to die. He was unaware there was going to be a one and one-half story building over the garage. He has lived next door to 426 Barnard Street for two years and it is a charming building; it is a mess and is a slum. It has been rented to SCAD students who have had many parties and it is dilapidated. He has called 3-1-1 and it has been inspected; which they have said that it is structurally sound, but it is unsightly. As has been discussed, what is the purpose of this new carriage house? Obviously, the purpose is to make money; it is rental. The second floor of the front of the house is now currently one apartment and one down and it is going to be made into two apartments on the second floor, the first floor will be commercial. Parking is a problem. Presently, work is being done on the inside. Trucks have been ticketed and enforced removal of them has taken place. The balcony will become a place for partying. The slope roof and the addition of the fifth (5th) window are highly unsightly and do not blend with anything in the area.

Mr. Doughtry said his main objection is because of the high wall, [he has found out today that it is much higher than he thought] he will lose the entire view out of his kitchen and the only window on the back of his house on this level. He will also lose the entire view from his back porch and kitchen window of Chatham Square. No greenery will be here at all. He asked the Board to please reject the request.

Mr. Sanders said his response about the air conditioning units, they are going

to use mini-split in the carriage house and roof top units on the front building which is adjacent to the neighboring property. The units will not be visible. Additionally, the windows are not all the way around. The upper portion of the stairs is only three small windows for light that will illuminate the upstairs loft. They will not be visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Sanders said it appears to him that a great majority of the comments concerns the deck. He just spoke with his client and they are happy to eliminate the deck. There is no question about the coverage as it will remain the same. He cannot speak to view because anyone losing view because they feel that they do have a right to build something here. Somebody will lose view, but they are building on his client's property. The watershed has been taken care of. The structure is independent of the carriage house. Therefore, every neighbor keeps their historic garden wall. He said he cannot speak about the parking.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Sanders to pull up sheet five (5) and show them what will not be visible by eliminating the deck.

Mr. Sanders [pointing to a section] said this in his opinion this will not be visible from the public right-of-way on Wayne Street. On the back, they will see a small bump-up which they have recessed in order to mitigate it less visible. The neighbor on the rear and the gentleman who is leasing it, his building is four-story and is higher than anything that they are doing. The mass of the building is greatly mitigated by the parapet and is essentially a background structure. He realizes that the elevations do not always read easily when something goes into the background, but this is actually the reason they designed it this way.

Mr. Engle asked what will be eliminated if the deck is no longer here.

Mr. Sanders said the deck only would serve the carriage house. Now, they think it would be nice, but it is not so pertinent to the design that it could not be removed. Pointing to a section, Mr. Sanders said their neighbor, Ms. Allen, is here and it would impact on her and he understands this. Therefore, his client and he have agreed to eliminate the deck as it seems to be drawing a lot of unwanted attention. However, with the mass of the building, in his opinion and according to the neighbors, it is for less, massive than anything else. He understands that nobody wants to lose a view, but a view over somebody else's property is not guaranteed anywhere. Nevertheless, they do agree to remove the deck and he will be glad to address anything he has not addressed already.

Mr. Howington asked if a smaller studio apartment could be considered.

Mr. Sanders said they were trying to put in a small loft. If they look at the interior, the ceiling is seven (7) feet over the kitchen. It is just a small sleeping loft here of one bedroom.

Dr. Williams directed their attention to sheet eight (8).

Mr. Sanders said they tried to mitigate the height. The shed roof was only to mitigate the height. They do not believe this is intrusive at all and they see the detail where they pushed it back. Mr. Sanders pointed out the neighbor's existing garden wall which has similar details on the other side where they are

doing all of their work on the interior. They are hopeful of being good neighbors. The building has been rented to SCAD students for quite a while and it is his client's intention to renovate the property.

Mr. Howington said on sheet 3-0, he agrees with some of the comments as the windows seem to be larger than the main house. Some of this or maybe the whole thing could be lowered.

Mr. Sanders said with their configuration, he was not sure if much more could be taken out of the building with regards to height. If they did, he does not know if it would look that much more favorable. They believe it is much lower than everything else in the neighborhood. Their main house is much lower than anything in the neighborhood. Pointing to a section, Mr. Sanders said four-story buildings are over here and three-story townhouses are over here. Therefore, definitely they are not over-building the neighborhood by any means. The view from the back of Taylor Street is over on Ms. Allen courtyard. They have done an attractive wall, like they see, all over the historic district. There are zero buildings lot lines here, this is definitely the character of the city. This is something that happens all the time. He personally has a four-story church building behind his house and he has learned that living here, you have to expect these things. He enjoyed the light when it was torn down, but they rebuild it the way it was.

Dr. Henry asked that when the deck is removed, will there be an empty space on the ground?

Mr. Sanders answered that it will be an opening of the courtyard below. He explained that this was really the only net change in density that they had.

Dr. Henry asked if this would increase the percentage.

Mr. Sanders said they did not need a density increase for the deck. But, if they take the deck off, there is no net density increase. The staircases are currently here and they will be replaced.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Sanders if they had seventy-five percent (75%) lot coverage.

Mr. Sanders said they have more than seventy five percent (75%). But, it is grandfathered and he forgot what the exact amount is.

Mr. Engle said the long exterior hallway is connecting the new garage apartment with the main building, but there is also a stairway from the garage apartment to the courtyard.

Mr. Sanders explained that it is integrated to the stairway. A stair is here that allows entrance into the carriage house. You have to go a few more stairs in order to enter into the unit.

Mr. Engle said his concern is it is very visible. One of the standards says that decks "shall be screened when visible from the street." This is going to end up being a deck and it is above the height of the wall. Since the deck has been eliminated, this is going to be party central here. Mr. Engle said he does not

think that it is necessary.

Mr. Sanders said stair rises were made much more quickly and much narrower in the old days. This is no longer a code staircase.

Mr. Engle said the fifteen (15) feet long side level balcony is centrally to go to the other unit is not required by code.

Mr. Sanders said this just allows them to enter both the carriage house and the apartment.

Mr. Engle explained that his point is, it is not screened from view and basically the ordinance requires this for decks. This is essentially a deck.

Mr. Sanders said he disagrees as it is an egress stair; this is what it is designed to be and this is what it is designed as with the dimensions as such.

Mr. Engle said it is highly visible; he does not know what they are calling it; it is level. Therefore, he does not believe they can call it a stairway when it is level.

Mr. Gay asked Mr. Sanders what exactly he was saying they will eliminate.

Mr. Sanders [pointing to an area] said they are willing to eliminate this deck. The deck extends over to Ms. Allen's property and they can easily raise the garden wall, but he does not believe that this is what the neighbors want. Therefore, his client and he have agreed to eliminate this deck.

Mr. Judson asked that picture five (5) be shown again. He asked if the bridge between the two buildings is at the street.

Mr. Sanders said it is on the Wayne Street side. The previous plan that the just showed the Board, the stairs come all the way up and enters into the carriage house; you go across; up a couple of steps and then you enter the main section of the house. It is truly designed to be an egress stair and not anything to fool anybody. They matched the pickets with it as it is an egress stair.

Mr. Judson said he was misreading it.

Dr. Henry questioned the drain pipes.

Mr. Sanders said they agree with the materials for the drain pipes. If it needs to be cast iron or copper, he knows his client will agree. This is not a problem.

Dr. Henry told Mr. Sanders that he applauds the improvement of the site, but obviously there are some more concerns.

Mr. Sanders said he was hopeful that something would come from this meeting where they will have some kind of guidance that when they come back. When they come back they will still be asking for a carriage house and there is no way that it will not impact the neighbors. They want to do right by the neighbors and welcome their comments.

Ms. Ramsay said in other cases where this kind of thing as been an issue, the

Board has asked for a site line showing the visibility of a roof top addition. She believes this would help.

Dr. Williams stated that Mr. Sanders mentioned that it would not be visible from Wayne Street. He said when you move west ten (10) feet, you will see the profile of this and see what is called the bump up. But frankly lofts are not a conventional part of carriage house. He said he was involved in the writing of the codes that they are using for guidelines and remembers they had a discussion about mezzanines inside of buildings and how they impact stories. He said essentially the loft is a mezzanine. There is specific language in the code about prohibition of mezzanines. In terms of compatibility, regardless of whether or not there is a prohibition of mezzanines, he will tell them that the lot with the eccentric bump up is not typical of a carriage house.

Dr. Williams said his question dovetails with Mr. Howington statement which is given the resistance that the neighborhood has to the height and visual impact of the carriage house, would this project be viable without the loft?

Mr. Sanders said he would have to discuss this with his client.

Dr. Williams said this would lower the height and compatibility. If he recalls correctly in the zoning throughout the district, this applies to tithing lots and not trust lots that are typically zoned at two-stories. Therefore, comparing its height to the adjacent taller main house is not a relatively comparison.

Mr. Sanders said they try not to call it a carriage house for this reason. It is a trust lot and is not a tithing lot. Carriage houses are on lanes and this is not on a lane. He believes the project that Mr. Stuebe brought up when they were talking about Mr. Cramer's project is all sort of a cut up odd trust lot. He said he understands the parking across the sidewalks and it does not really work that well; it but another uniqueness in Savannah that is not absolutely typical.

Ms. Ramsay said with the hearing of all the comments, the Board cannot continue a petition. The petitioner has to ask for the continuance.

Mr. Sanders said they would like to ask for a continuance. He was hopeful that the Board would give him some comments or direction. If the monitor is the biggest hang up, he can talk with his client about this. He believes they can agree to eliminate the deck. He saw that the deck was generally what was being opposed. He does not know what he can do about the egress stair as it is an egress stair. As they all know that when a fire escape is removed, a new egress stair is quite larger, but it is safer. It gets people out of buildings. Mr. Sanders said if there is another treatment that the Board would like to see on it, maybe they could do this, but truthfully as he has said, they are not trying to fool anybody; it is a staircase, an egress deck.

Mr. Judson told Mr. Sanders that he is inclined to move for approval of his request for a continuance, but he wanted to inject a couple of other things. He wanted to remind him of Ms. Ramsay's comment about supplying the Board with some site lines. If in fact the height of the carriage house with or without monitor in this drawing misrepresents its relation to the house, he encouraged him to redraw this so the Board will have an accurate perspective of this.

Board Action:

Approved to continue the petition at the petitioner's request to address comments from the meeting discussion. - PASS

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

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

14. [Petition of Jose Gonzalez for Gonzalez Architects | 12-000356-COA | 304 East Bryan Street | Amended New Construction, Part I Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Simpson arrived at 3:30 p.m.

Mr. Jose Gonzalez was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. Part 1 Height and Mass was reviewed at the meeting of September 12, 21012. The applicant is requesting approval for new construction of a four-story 40-unit hotel on the property at 304 East Bryan Street. The existing one-story historic structure on the property will remain and is part of the hotel. Combined, the proposed development will have a footprint less than 8,500 square feet and is not considered Large-Scale Development under the historic district ordinance. The site is zoned R-B-C and adjoins a Residential-Institutional-Professional-Amended (RIP-A) zone in Warren Ward.

Ms. Ward stated that at the meeting of September 12, 2012 following the staff report, public comment, and Board discussion, the applicant requested a continuance of Part I, Height and Mass to revise the submittal and address comments. Ms. Ward gave the overview of the petitioner's revised submittal based on the comments received at the last meeting.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of new construction, Part I Height and Mass as revise, of a four-story 40-unit hotel on the property at 304 East Bryan Street.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Gonzalez said they have worked with staff to incorporate the Board's comments they received at the last meeting. He entertained questions from the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Paul Hansen said he lives 410 East Bryan Street, the next block over from this proposed development. As they may recall, this project came up approximately two years ago. They had a lot of discussion about this and then it was put aside for awhile. The owner then came back and said they would demolish some unsightly buildings [which they were] and build a parking lot, build a fence; maintain the property; and be good neighbors.

Mr. Hansen said they ended up with an area that has not been maintained. They have talked with the persons who operate the hotel and their answer is they never see it; they never go over here. Therefore, as this project evolves, he is a little concerned now as to what they will be faced with. Upon reviewing the floor plans, the entrances that are coming off of Bryan Street really go into corridors that link to the rooms that really looks out over the pool. The existing building that is located on the corner assumed will be the new lobby. Maybe the staff or Mr. Gonzalez can answer his question whether the entrances on Bryan Street will ever be used for anything with tenants coming in. If the entrances are not going to be used and are there only as a window dressing, will they be maintained? Mr. Hansen said Mr. Gonzalez is a good architect, but he believes this project needs some tender loving care (TLC). He believes that some detailing is needed on the exterior. The ward that he lives in is basically early federal buildings and wood siding. The first story is typically a few feet above grade; therefore, the relationship of the ground level up to the first level is totally different than what Mr. Gonzalez is asking for. He is asking for a full three-stories above grade. But, when you look at the stairwells going up to the second level, it is out of scale and some of the materials, wrought iron hand-rails, precast concrete and stairs are not compatible with the neighborhood.

Mr. Hansen said as an architect and as a neighbor, he would like to see that instead of trying to mimic some architecture that is in the neighborhood, why not just build a hotel building that is attractive; has main entrances off of Bryan Street into the hotel and not put up just a storybook facade. His concern is will this ever be maintained and used by the people that are coming to the hotel. He would like to see the petitioner go back and restudy the entire exterior imagery before this is approved by the Board.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said that in terms of Height and Mass, she wanted to talk about some of the building's

forms. She understood that they have different facades and they are trying to make them look different, but they also need to be somewhat united because of what will be behind them on the interior. Ms. Meunier said she understood that the petitioner is trying to align the windows with the other facades going across, but in this one particular structure, they are very low. They should be closer to the cornice line and roof line. She was not sure how this could be adjusted. If the roof is lowered, then they would lose all the space with the gable in the corridor. But, it seems inappropriate for this building structure and shape. Also, the partial gable is visible where it cuts off from this building because it sets back. From the right-of-way, you can actually see where the partial gable cuts off and just goes into nothing. You can see the sort of false facade.

Ms. Meunier said with the full-story structure of the front porch, especially in the renderings, it still seems to read as a three-story porch. The renderings appear to have more rounded columns, not piers like a foundation and a very low wall. Now, this might just be a fault of the renderings. But, it is still reading as an inappropriate feature on this building. She said, pointing to an area, it says a wood cornice. She was not sure why a wood cornice would be on a stucco building. Ms. Meunier said this could be an error, but she wanted to point this out. She realizes this is material, but it is inappropriate to have a wood cornice on a stucco building.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that there is no wood cornice. This is just an error from the previous layer. With regards to the issue of the window, they can make an adjustment, but if they notice the windows are shorter simply for the changing in the massing as they go up with windows that there is a sense of a hierarchy. Therefore, with the question of whether the windows could be taller, they thought it would be more appropriate to do it this way, create a band and scale, but it is probably an issue of someone likes right and someone likes left. The break in the roof line will not be seen in the back. The only way it would be seen is from an aerial, but it would not be seen from the street. They do not mind exploring the detail issue to the satisfaction of the Board. This is like anything else, you can do things square or round. But, from his point of view as an architect, it is what is the appropriate proportion scaled to the property and not so much what is scaled stylistically.

Mr. Gonzalez said that Mr. Hansen may recall that they went through about eight hearings on this project years ago. He believes it was pointed out in an earlier meeting that the project did not go forward because of the recession. Nevertheless, they went through a variety of hearings and as an architect, he can tell them that he designs in fifteen (15) states and in a lot of historic districts. He would probably agree with Mr. Hansen one hundred percent (100%) that they should have designed a hotel as a hotel, but there was such an outcry with regards to the neighborhood and scale from the persons present at the time [they had numerous meetings not just at MPC, but throughout the neighborhood] the desire was to try to make this not look like a hotel as much as possible and make it appear as an extension of the residential; even though it is zoned commercial, and is across the street from a parking garage that it

would have more of that quality. Mr. Gonzalez said to this end, they worked with the neighborhood to achieve this. He said he would not get into a philosophical discussion about whether this is the appropriate response, but it is the response they felt at that time and still do that it is more sensitive to some of the wishes of the neighborhood. It is not necessarily his personal philosophical idea of an architectural design in different places and he was sure that it is not Mr. Hansen's philosophy as well, but sometimes they do what is best and what would be more acceptable to a community. This is what was more acceptable to the community at the time. Mr. Gonzalez said at this point, he stands behind it.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Gonzalez to please respond to Mr. Hansen's question about whether the doors will actually be used.

Mr. Gonzalez explained that all of the doors are exits. These are the appropriate exits to be used by the guests so they can walk out into the neighborhood. If they so wish, they will have card access and for security from a security standpoint, the people could not just walk up, but they are accessible. He said he could not agree more with Mr. Hansen regarding the maintenance. They do a lot of hospitality projects and there is no excuse for the photograph that was shown. He said he does not operate the hotel, but knows that the hotel will be operated by a new management company. However, Mr. Hansen is absolutely correct that the property should be maintained, just as any property should be maintained. Mr. Gonzalez said to this end, he will certainly have a few words with the ownership and let them know that it should be an embarrassment to have someone within the community bring a picture that shows that the property is not being maintained. But, this is beyond his purview as an architect.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Gonzalez if he has considered beefing up the dormers slightly in the sixth bay building. He knows that they are not in the detail design yet, but the dormers look like they are two inch thick.

Mr. Gonzalez asked Mr. Engle if he was saying make them larger.

Mr. Engle answered not larger, but he thinks they should look like they are pilasters in the gable. They look awfully thin, structurally.

Mr. Gonzalez asked Mr. Engle if he was speaking of the dormers in the top of the middle section.

Mr. Engle answered yes.

Mr. Gonzalez said he had no objection to this.

Mr. Engle said this maybe getting into the detail, but the petitioner might want to consider shutters on other buildings. The sixth building is bare and maybe shutters would provide some richness that it lacks. Maybe they might just want to do half of the sixth bay building. The illusion is that these are two townhouses. Therefore, they do not have to be treated exactly the same on each

half.

Mr. Gay asked Mr. Gonzalez if he has given any thought or considered with the owners a different material than bricks since bricks are not very prevalent until you get further south. Maybe this could be wood or hardi-plank. He believed that hardi-plank could be used here because this is new construction.

Mr. Gonzalez answered yes. Actually, they discussed this several years ago. The rationale at the time was that this area, because it serves the limbo land of zoning that with an 1850 warehouse on the corner and certainly across the street with the tower behind, that a use of materials that would help to transition would be appropriate. They did discuss and he believes that one of their iterations years ago was that the inn house for example was clabbered and then would transition to brick. This came about as a result as he has said from all those meetings. He said, therefore, they are not in anyway hesitant. Mr. Gonzalez said it is difficult for him as an architect to stand before the Board [they design buildings all over the place] and design the building as such because in his mind the design is everything that Mr. Hansen indicated. But, he has no problem creating an illusion that makes people feel comfortable with it as long as they all are doing so in a conscious manner. Therefore, to the extent that they can tweak the detailing if they want to modify some of the finishes, they are totally in agreement with it.

Mr. Howington said he wanted to curtail on what Mr. Engle said about the dormers. To him, they don't need anymore detail, but seem a little large.

Mr. Engle said Mr. Howington was talking about the dormer cheeks, but he was talking about the pilasters being thicker not the windows.

Mr. Howington said maybe the size could be reduced. He asked Mr. Gonzalez what were his thoughts on the comment Mr. Hansen had about the concrete steps and the railings.

Mr. Gonzalez said he did not understand Mr. Hansen's comment.

Ms. Simpson said she thought they were answering materials questions.

Ms. Ramsay said they are now answering design details, but should be only in Part I, Height and Mass.

Mr. Gonzalez said, however, to answer the question; obviously, the traditional railing and step is a wood material. Therefore, they have no issue with it. But, he does not know where the concrete issue came from.

Dr. Williams said there is no one material that prevails in the district. Therefore, wood steps, iron, stone, brick and every conceivable combinations have been used in the district. He said a question came up about lining the windows of the central part of the building higher than the others. He asked if the reason was simply to vary the roof lines and cornices height to evoke the

idea of different buildings that its cornices are higher than the one on the end.

Mr. Gonzalez answered that is correct. This is the rationale that was requested when they had all of the discussions before. In essence, it is to create the affect that these are all different buildings built by different owners. But, obviously, it is all one building. Therefore, it is clearly an illusion.

Dr. Williams said he believes idea of varying materials is good and should be considered as the petitioner moves forward with the next stage.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he understood what Mr. Hansen was saying and he guessed if he had his preference, they would not be doing many historic looking buildings, but a lot of contemporary buildings. However, this is what the neighborhood wanted and he thinks it is a good response. He believes it works and he does not think that anybody will think that it is real. They are comfortable and are what the neighborhood wants.

Board Action:

Approval of new construction, Part I Height and Mass, of a four-story 40-unit hotel on the property - PASS at 304 East Bryan Street.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Nay

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

15. Petition of Becky Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects, PC | 12-000381-COA | 104 West Gaston Street | Rehabilitation and Addition

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Rebecca Lynch was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting

approval for new construction of a second floor addition to the northwest corner of the north and rear facades, exterior alterations on the rear (north) facade, an ADA lift at the northeast corner, and a covered porch addition with a dual staircase to the rear (north elevation) of the building.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for new construction of a second floor addition to the northwest corner of the north and rear façades, exterior alterations on the rear (north) façade, an ADA lift at the northeast corner, and a covered porch addition with a dual staircase to the rear (north elevation) of the building at 104 West Gaston Street, with the following conditions:

1. The balustrade on the covered porch addition must be removed and the re-design submitted to Staff for final approval prior to construction.
2. The roof material for the covered porch must be submitted to Staff for final approval prior to construction.
3. All finish and color samples must be submitted to Staff for final approval prior to construction.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the staff's recommendation does not state that "wood" should be instead of polyurethane.

Ms. Michalak said the staff recommends that "wood" and not "polyurethane" be used on all porch addition members.

Mr. Engle asked if the plans are showing a fountain in the rear courtyard. This is significant garden and has been published. The Board does not deal with landscape.

Ms. Ramsay said the public cannot see the fountain.

Ms. Michalak confirmed that the public cannot see the fountain.

Ms. Ramsay said this is not within the Board's purview.

Dr. Henry said on page eight (8), he was trying to distinguish between the 1995 and the Victorian section.

Ms. Michalak, pointing to a section, stated that this is the existing and all of this is 1995. The entire section with the wood siding is Victorian. She said it is hard to explain, but when half of the Victorian structure was removed, this was built which exposed the principal structure.

Dr. Henry asked if this was cut into two parts.

Ms. Michalak answered yes.

Dr. Henry wanted to know how they were able to do this.

Ms. Michalak said half of the Victorian was removed in the 1970s and the 1995 portion was built later.

Dr. Henry said this makes him feel better about the entire thing.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Lynch thanked the Board for their consideration of their proposal today. The first portion of the project, the second addition was previously approved and is only intended to provide some more office space for the Georgia Historical Society. The rear porch has been proposed to provide a covered ADA access in lieu of having to do an elevator to the parlor level. Ms. Lynch said she saw that there have been concerns about the upper balustrade, the style and design. She said they have no issue at all with reconsideration of the picket design. What they have proposed came out of a desire to compromise between something that would be so simple as would appear as a contemporary deck railing; certainly something more contemporary such as a cable railing did not seem appropriate. But, not something as formal as the wrought iron or larger turned wood balustrade that they see all over the Italianate homes within the area. Ms. Lynch said, therefore, they were looking for something that was somewhat a compromise. They have no issue with the wood. Since this would be new construction, they looked at possibly some sort of polished polyurethane or composite railing just for maintenance issues, but if it becomes an issue, they have no problem at all with going to wood.

Ms. Lynch said with regards to the upper balustrade, while they do agree that especially in the rendering, it does appear to increase the formality of the rear facade. She thinks it definitely has to do with the picket design that they have proposed. They would like to iterate their opinion that it actually is subordinate in scale to the porch even with the upper balustrade. She said they would like to argue that it is in fact subordinate in mass. Ms. Lynch said she believes the porch was described as being 15 feet x 25 feet. She said they wanted to clarify that covered porch portion is 10 feet x 20 feet, which is used all over the Historic District on front, side and rear porches. The larger footprint comes from the stair down to the courtyard, which had to be a certain width because it is considered an egress stair. The height of railings [they usually see them a little lower] because it is a commercial use and has to be forty-two (42) inches.

Ms. Lynch said the Georgia Historical Society would like the option, even though they don't have doors shown here now, to use at a later date the upper balcony so this is one of the reasons they proposed this. While typically in this neighborhood they may see the upper balustrade more on the fronts of front porches or side porches, they are also seen on rear porches. There are many examples in the area where upper balustrades are on rear porches as well. She said they would be happy to reconsider, but they also would like for the Board to consider it and not just take it off. She showed a picture of a house on East Gaston Lane behind the Oglethorpe Club and a unit next to it also has a parlor

level porch with an upper balustrade. It extends the full width of the building. She said next to this is another house which has the same thing. Therefore, they do feel that there are examples in the area of covered porches with upper balustrades. Ms. Lynch said porches are actually quite prevalent in the neighborhood. She showed another house in the area with a more formal front porch with an upper balustrade that has the turned wood railings that they referred to, but they did not want to duplicate since they were trying not to have a false sense of history. Ms. Lynch showed the Board another picture of a house with a side porch that has an upper balustrade. Consequently, they believe that there are many examples, front, side, and rear porches with Italianate stucco homes that use this type of railing and massing. She showed a house in the area that has a combination of different types of railings.

Ms. Lynch reported that the HSF holds an easement on this property and they have expressed their opinion as a concern about the formality of the design of the porch. They are happy to work with both the staff and with HSF in finding a solution that makes everyone happy. But, they also want to hear the Board's feedback.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Lynch if she was saying that basically six (6) months from today she would come back and ask to put doors where the windows are on the second floor.

Ms. Lynch answered that she was not saying that at all. However, presently the space is being used completely for cubical offices and the upper floor is planned this way. But, the director did express an opinion that they would like the option of being able to access this, even if they go out through the windows. She knows that it is a vegetation issue and not a building issue, but actually it is going to be quite difficult to see any of this from the right-of-way. Currently, there is a line of trees along the side of Whitaker Street that nearly completely obscures the view of the back of the building. She knows that a tree can be cut down in the future, but in reality she does not see that any of this will be visible from the public right-of-way.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Daniel Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said that as Ms. Lynch stated, the HSF will work with them on the balustrade on the top and find a suitable arrangement for the balustrade.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he agrees with staff. He does not believe that a second floor porch should be here. It is visible from Whitaker Street; this is a very important house. They are adding a window and there is the potentiality of adding doors later. The first floor porch is acceptable, but not the second floor porch.

Dr. Henry said seeing the people climbing in and out of the windows do not compute well for him.

Dr. Williams stated that if the Georgia Historical Society has the intention of using this as a terrace for which they would need a railing, it would accompany a request for a door. When the time comes that they can demonstrate the need for a door and request it, would seem to be the appropriate time to request the railing. The two seems to be tied together. Therefore, having a railing and the possible future use of it as a terrace and there is no door plan, does not appear to be the logical way to approach this; not to mention the concerns of staff and Board members regarding the visual impact.

Mr. Judson said with the present tense that there is no door access it becomes just a facade.

Mr. Engle stated that what he hears the Board saying is don't come back with a modification of the railing design as they don't want the railing on the second floor at all.

Dr. Williams said the Board said no railing.

Mr. Gay said the staff did not say no railing.

Ms. Simpson said staff is asking for a redesign.

Mr. Engle said the Board does not want a railing at all.

Dr. Williams said the staff's recommendation says the balustrade on the covered porch must be removed and the redesign resubmitted. He said if the railing is redesigned, you have to redesign the top of the bay.

Mr. Engle said the Historic Savannah Foundation said they will work with them on another design for a balustrade. But, the Board does not want a balustrade.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for for new construction of a second floor addition to the northwest corner of the north and rear façades, exterior alterations on the rear (north) façade, an ADA lift at the northeast corner, and a covered porch addition with a dual staircase to the rear (north elevation) of the building at 104 West Gaston Street, with the following conditions:

1. The balustrade on the covered porch addition must be removed and the re-design submitted to Staff for final approval prior to construction. - PASS
2. The roof material for the covered porch must

be submitted to Staff for final approval prior to construction.

3. All finish and color samples must be submitted to Staff for final approval prior to construction.
4. All porch addition members must be “wood” and not the “polyurethane” option shown in the drawings.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

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

16. [Petition of Greenline Architecture | 12-000821-COA | 466 MLK Jr. Blvd. / 420 West Gaston Street | New Construction - Part 1](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

NOTE: MR. HOWINGTON RECUSED FROM PARTICIPATION IN THIS HEARING. HE IS AN EMPLOYEE OF GREENLINE.

Mr. John L. Deering 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 a three-story mixed use building. The building will consist of office space on the first floor and apartments on the second and third floors. The vacant property is bounded by Alice Street, MLK, and Gaston Street. The new building is oriented to front MLK with secondary entrances on Alice and Gaston Streets.

Ms. Michalak stated that the General Development Plan (GDP) was submitted to the City on September 25, 2012. At the regular Site Plan Review (SPR) meeting on September 27, 2012, comments focused on stormwater requirements, grade access at entry doors along MLK, street lighting along

MLK, tree trimming, and adding lighting along at the rear off the building (east) by the parking area. The petitioner is aware of these concerns and will be addressing them through the review process.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass with the following conditions to be resubmitted and reviewed at the Historic District Board of Review meeting for the Part II, Design Details application:

1. Strengthen the vertical elements of the building's front façade and extend the parapet above the cornice to increase the visual compatibility with the contributing structures to which this structure is visually related.
2. Add window openings on the east elevation at the south corner of the building.
3. Restudy the three-story (3) recessed porch to add continuous and evenly spaced vertical elements (such as brick columns) to strengthen the visual compatibility to the contributing structures to which this structure is visually related. (See Figures 6-8 at the end of this document for local historic examples.)
4. Redesign the structured parking area to meet the "Parking Area" Design Standards or seek a variance for the proposed design.

Dr. Henry asked how did the building get razed in 2001.

Ms. Michalak said she did not know, but the petitioner can answer this question when he makes his comments.

Mr. Engle asked if the windows met the ratio.

Ms. Michalak answered yes.

Dr. Williams asked staff that when they say strengthen the vertical elements of the building's front facade and extend the parapet, he wanted to know if extending the parapet means the vertical elements will be strengthened or are they asking that the petitioner do two different things.

Ms. Michalak said staff is asking two different things.

Dr. Williams said to him the piers between the bays are strong already. They are very robust vertical elements. What does staff mean by "strengthen?"

Ms. Michalak said she was thinking of something where they will actually potentially penetrate the banding. It may have something to do with how it appears shortened; maybe it is because a parapet is missing, but it seems to be very horizontal.

Dr. Williams said to him despite the fact that the cornice or the band at the top

of the first floor cuts through the verticals; but then the vertical rise two stories. If the piers were made thinner, it actually might make them seem more vertical. Strengthening is a picky word.

Ms. Michalak said she guessed that this the thing as she does not necessarily want to recommend what the petitioner should do design wise.

Dr. Williams said staff is setting up a recommendation that is presumably putting up a target. This is not clearly defined; so how will the petitioner hit the target is his question. The idea of adding a parapet is clear; but the first half of the staff's recommendation is not clear. Therefore, he does not know how to respond to it.

Mr. Gay said it is not their responsibility to design the project for them.

Dr. Williams said it is their responsibility to either accept or deny staff's recommendation. He does not know whether to accept this or deny it if he does not know what the recommendation is asking.

Ms. Michalak said she guessed it was a matter of opinion. It appears that Dr. Williams does not think the verticality needs to be strengthened.

Ms. Ramsay said she believes this is getting into the Design Details which is Part II, but today they are looking at Part I, Height and Mass.

Mr. Judson said for six (6) years there has been a debate of the gray area of what is height and mass and what is design detail. When they are talking about adding windows to that one section, he has always presumed that to be a height I part and mass. But, staff is now recommending that it come back as a part of the design detail and he is concerned. Mr. Judson said to him, this is still a part of their consideration of height and mass as would any change to the cornice or any profile of the building. He said he was not saying that the Board could not take the staff's recommendation under consideration, but he believes they need to be a part of today's discussion and not deferred for design detail discussion.

Ms. Michalak explained that staff was not saying that it should not be considered until then, but that they did not need to suspend the approval.

Mr. Judson said the Board has to resolve the issue as a part of height and mass.

Mr. Engle said the Board does not talk about color or anything else, but he wanted the Board to bear in mind that there are cementitious [he was assuming that they are talking cast stone] belt courses that are breaking all of the pilasters. They are being broken at the first floor levels; there are capitals on top of the columns on the first floor level. The cementitious belt courses go all the way across horizontally. Therefore, the verticals are being broken twice.

Dr. Williams asked if the verticality was a question for Part II Design Details.

Mr. Engle explained that this is where it overlaps as there is no total verticality because they all are cut by horizontals and you are not going to realize that until it comes back next month. But, there are belt courses that go all the way across there and they are breaking the verticality. Therefore, they have to be aware of this even though the materials are another issue all together.

Dr. Williams said the Board could discuss this after all the various stages and comments. They will revisit this issue then.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Deering said he wanted to thank Dr. Evans, owner of this property, for rehabilitating this entire block and building new structures where they are missing.

Mr. Deering explained that the building was razed in 1999; it burned. They followed many of the early 20th century building examples along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard to develop the design of the building. He said he would go through the staff's recommendation and keep it brief. Mr. Deering said they believe that the brick pilasters make the building very vertical. If they look at any early 20th century building design in Savannah or in any other city, you have multi-directional elements [horizontal and verticals] they all play and will come together at some harmonious example of both horizontal and vertical. The ordinance requires that they have the first floor and cornices expressed, but it does not require a parapet. He believes that Ms. Michalak's comment is subjective; it does not require that they actually have an extension of a parapet above the cornice. He thinks this cornice works. They do not want every building within three blocks along this street to have the same parapet and cornice example. He believes they should be different. They should have some variety.

Mr. Deering said they amended the drawings, but did not submit them before the packets were forwarded to the Board members. He said, pointing to a section, that they are willing on the rear elevation to add window openings within this brick section here, but much of this will not be seen from Gaston Street. A five foot alley is here and you cannot see anything; and they also get into the International Building Code issue where they are so close to the property line that they are only allowed a certain percentage of openings. He said, therefore, they would rather use them where they are more advantageous to the dwelling units over here. They restudied the three story porch projection and this elevation. He is aware of the Charity Hospital, the John Morris house at Liberty and Bull Streets, and also the Mercer House. Mr. Deering said they have actually done an addition to the Allen's house and followed that particular example.

Mr. Deering explained to the Board [pointing to a section] that they reduced the spacing in here and used the three-story brick columns along the back. He said they were submitting this to the Board for their consideration today. He said as far as the structured parking comment, in redesigning this they only had four parking spaces under the porch in the back of the building. Even though no

parking is required, they thought it would be nice if the counselors that work at the facility could park there because they work late and go in and out. Mr. Deering said in redesigning this, they lost one parking space. This leaves them three parking spaces. He does not know if the structured parking section of the ordinance applies to this. This is three parking spaces under a porch. It is not like the old Commerce Building at Oglethorpe Avenue and Jefferson Street where the entire ground floor was parking. It had openings to the public streets that looked into the parking area. This is why the ordinance was changed. They have been trying to avoid the openings. Mr. Deering, speaking about the openings, said it happened more recently a few years ago with a condominium building at Price and McDonough Streets. He said again that this is what they are trying to avoid and the rewriting of the ordinance. He pointed out several places where there are openings that look into the parking and service area. This is not really what they are doing. Mr. Deering said, pointing to a section, that they have in this corner on MLK and Alice Street interaction with the street where the offices are; and of course, they will have a utility service area and a stair. When someone walks down the street, they will not see parking. There will only be three cars parked here. The condominium building has twelve (12); he believes that the other condominium building has sixteen (16) spaces; the Commerce Building on Oglethorpe Avenue and Jefferson Street has many spaces. What they are doing is not quite the same. Therefore, he does not believe that they should be made to ask for a variance for this particular issue.

Mr. Deering said they wanted the Board to consider their revised rear elevation and accept their explanations for the other conditions.

Dr. Williams said while Mr. Deering talked about the rear galleried elevation, there is another building locally that he might want to throw into the bag of precedence. He said as a model, would be the former convent on 37th Street. It has a much finer and delicate second and third floor gallery with something closer to the petitioner's first version. It has a brick arcade on the ground floor which is closer to this version.

Mr. Deering said he actually would like to do a combination of the brick arcade on the ground floor and go back to the lighter column elements on the upper floor.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Deering if he considered chamfering at least the north corner. He said that this building originally had chamfered corners. He guessed that this building predated [what is now] the Civil Rights museum. But, there are some playful echoes across the street. He does not know how it would be tied in, but it is not a common feature and the fact that the preceding building had it and that the existing Civil Rights museum is here, it might be an interesting way to be in dialogue with the neighboring structure.

Mr. Deering answered yes; it really has to do with more space in trying to achieve the amount of square footage required for the program within the building.

Mr. Engle said his question would be considered in Part II, but to satisfy his

interest, it is being said cementitious panels. Are they all labeled? He thought cement fiber panels could not be anywhere in the district. If this is the case, they might need heads up on this now.

Mr. Deering asked if it is written in the ordinance where cementitious materials are allowable.

Ms. Ward said she wanted to address this issue as it has come up in several petitions today. She explained that it is in the exterior wall section where it talks about what siding and how fiber cement board can be used on new construction, but the last sentence says “that fiber cement panels shall be prohibited in any case in the Historic District.” She pointed out that the Board has approved hardi-plank or hardi-cement board for the use of storefront on Broughton Street. She wanted the Board to keep in mind that there are cementitious panels and hardi-trim; the way that it is applied makes the difference.

Mr. Deering said there is one method to get that achieved; large panel was used in early 20th century architecture with the material that is modern will actually hold up.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Deering to show the Board the other rendering of the rear porch façade as it would help in trying to visualize this. He said with regards to variance pertaining to the parking, as it was read, they are not talking about either street or lane.

Mr. Deering said it is a private driveway.

Mr. Judson said he believes this puts it in somewhat a different category as far as requiring a variance.

Mr. Engle asked why are they talking about parking.

Dr. Henry, too, wanted to know why they are talking about parking. Would this not be left to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA)?

Ms. Ramsay explained that she believes Mr. Deering is asking the Board to say that this rule does not apply.

Mr. Deering said he believes the way the ordinance is written is actually trying to prevent something like redesigning the Liberty Street parking garage where the entire first floor you look into cars. He does not want to see this anymore either; he believes it hurt street blocks and interaction with the public and whomever is within these buildings.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation said they agree with staff's recommendations. They believe that the overall vertical expression could be improved. They were not saying how it necessarily needs to be done. Obviously, there are strong vertical elements. It maybe just the way the materials are reading, how they are presented now, and they are only looking at height and mass. Now that the rear porch has been restudied, she

believes this clears up the issues that they had for the most part. Ms. Meunier said they suggest that possibly not having an open porch concept on the rear and just have a continuous brick wall with windows. She realizes they are very close to the property line and this maybe an issue for windows, but it is a suggestion to consider the way it is proposed now sort of references tenants. But, in the way they are restudying it, maybe if they look to an example the way that Dr. Williams has pointed out; potentially the building on 37th Street, then maybe there is a way to make it look much more compatible.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said he wanted to make an observation. He was looking at the three-story commercial block that overlooks Ellis Square at the corner of Barnard and Congress Streets. It is the green and white one; it has glazed bricks and has the green glazed piers. The top of the first floor has projecting cornice that is unbroken; goes straight across that is projecting and below it is an awning; then from there rise the glazed green brick piers which are actually skinner than the proposed one and reads as more vertical. They rise up and basically at the top, there are panels that rise and then at the top the cornice crosses them.

Dr. Williams said he believes the solution that the petitioner has proposed is not out of character with the typical early 20th century commercial block where the first floor is top by a cornice and then piers rise up and are topped by another cornice without any parapet above. Therefore, there is a precedent very prominent from the same era that would be compatible with the development of West Board Street (Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard) in the early 20th century.

Dr. Williams said he was not saying how the petitioner should address issues of verticality, but frankly he believes they are getting, as the chair as said, fairly close to designing the building. He did not want to say the petitioner should do one or the other, but he was only letting the Board know that the way it has been presented is not incompatible with other buildings in the district.

Mr. Judson said he does not see the need to change the long MLK side in terms of its balance of vertical and horizontal elements. He does not see the need to add a parapet and frankly he does not see the need to add the window openings to the east elevation along the private driveway; especially given that they might open a can of worms since they are on the property line. Mr. Judson said he applauds the redesign of the three-story recess porch as it brings a lot more balance and is a better design. Mr. Judson said he would be inclined to approve the petition as is with the changed rear porch.

Mr. Engle stated the building that Dr. Williams mentioned, the green and trim color are what make this building. He believes what is going to determine vertical or horizontal on this building is the color of the brick and color of the cast stone. Therefore, it is hard to judge what the final appearance will be.

Mr. Judson said he believes that the petitioner has heard the comment and will allow this to guide the judgment with regards to the design elements and

color.

Mr. Engle asked if there was no requirements for parking for residential.

Ms. Ramsay answered not in this district.

Mr. Engle asked then why is a variance needed if they do not need parking.

Ms. Ramsay explained that parking is not the issue; it has to be thirty (30) feet. But, the Board is saying that it is not a public street, but a private driveway.

Dr. Henry said he was looking at page six (6) of thirteen (13) and he does not understand how it is being said that it is a driveway.

Mr. Engle said the entire thing is a driveway. He is not sure whether the variance is an issue for this Board and he is willing to accept the other things as they are with the redesign of the porch.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for Part I, Height and Mass with the revised porch with 3-story brick columns - PASS as presented by the petitioner at the meeting.

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Robin Williams

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

Agenda B (Items 15-20 will be heard no earlier than 4:00pm in sequential order)

[17. Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects | 12-000823-COA | 2 Whitaker Street | Fence and Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Application, Description, Photos and Renderings II.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal - Rendering NE.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal - Rendering NW.pdf](#)

Mr. Johnson left the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Mr. Jerry Lominack was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to construct a dining and beer garden at 2 Whitaker Street as an extension of the adjacent Moon River Brewing Company. She said the renderings give a good idea of what is being proposed. The principal visible structure of the project is the nine foot-four inch (9'-4") tall privacy wall with an 11 foot tall segment at the corner of Bay and Whitaker Streets. A one-story extension from the Moon River facility is proposed at the rear of the site. A 13 foot tall wood cypress trellis is proposed interior to the property. Ms. Ward stated that the petitioner is willing to reduce the 13 foot tall wood trellis to 11 feet to meet the ordinance, but they are requesting that the Board consider whether or not the 13 foot height is visually compatible and make a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the dining and beer garden with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final approval and illustrated in the construction drawings:

1. Reduce the height of the trellis not to exceed the maximum height permitted of 11 feet or seek a variance for the proposed design standards.
2. Increase the size of the paired storefront windows on the west elevation fronting Whitaker Street.
3. Mortar sample and profile with the proposed brick.
4. Awning fabric color sample.
5. Verify storefront recess within the upper and lower brick exterior walls.
6. Sign dimensions and details.

Mr. Engle asked what will happen to the brick wall.

Ms. Ward said the staff asked the petitioner about the brick wall and they were told that it is under a separate scope of work and is not a part of this project. She said the petitioner could answer this question. However, the owner is planning to fix the wall.

Mr. Judson asked about the above ground tunnels coming from Screamin Mimi's. He realizes it does not relate to this project.

Ms. Ward said it is not a part of this project. It is attached to Screamin Mimi's building that is owned by a separate property owner.

Mr. Judson asked, therefore, they are not looking to attach this to an accessory building.

Ms. Ward answered no.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lominack said they agree mostly with the staff's recommendations. He believes that they submitted to staff electronically the revised drawings of the 11 foot high trellis.

Ms. Ward confirmed that staff received the revised drawings, but it was after the submittal packets were forwarded to the Board. She asked that hard copies be presented at this meeting.

Mr. Lominack explained that the 13 feet actually aligns with the floor level of the existing adjacent building. It also aligns with the visual division between the lower and upper levels of the building. This was one of the main reasons that they felt it was important to relate it to this building since it is a commercial structure as opposed to relating it to a residential scale. He believes it was primarily envisioned when the ordinance was written that it would deal with residential. They believe the scale of the trellis is much better at the 13 foot height because of the size and since it will be located in the middle of the space. It relates much better to the adjacent structure.

Mr. Lominack said he is aware that the ordinance says 11 feet. When he was a part of the task force for the revisions, the height of walls came up and he was opposed to them being 11 feet. But, as he has said, he believes they were looking at them as being residential. If the Board can approve it at 13 feet, they would prefer this, but, if not, they would like to get it approved at 11 feet and then go to the ZBA with a positive recommendation from this Board. As far as the windows, the ordinance allows for group windows as long as they are separated by a mold. They slightly lengthened the windows on the elevation and subdivided them into three parts which complies with the 3:5 window proportion requirements. Mr. Lominack said in looking around downtown at the first level of existing buildings, that particular proportion rarely exists. He believes this was geared more towards residential proportion as opposed to commercial proportion.

Mr. Lominack said the signs have not been designed yet. They would like to submit the signs to staff at a later date. They have colors for the awnings. He thought they had already submitted this to staff. The mortar color will be the same color as the stucco, which is approximately the same color as the brick.

Mr. Lominack said they have some additional renderings that show the relationship of the awning at 13 feet. He showed several pictures of how the trellis would be seen from several directions.

Mr. Engle said he had a problem with some of the renderings. He was looking

at picture 18 of 27 and there is no way that this is a 13 foot trellis or the female in the picture is only four (4) feet tall. He believes the trellis would be twice as tall as anybody who would be here.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he believes this is a nice project, but he has a problem with recommending a variance. If they do it here, then they will have to do so everywhere.

Dr. Williams said he believes this has two main reasons. The main thing that he would say is that it would help mitigate it as a precedent would be that it is a rare commercial traveled area. He believes that the height lining up with the floor joist marks on adjacent building and that the point is to be the height of the same floor of Moon River. Dr. Williams said he does not believe they need to worry about a precedence because it is so particular to this site as a variance. It is not just a blanket variance.

Mr. Engle asked Dr. Williams if he noticed that they are not shown on any of the renderings as some how they intend to cover that wall. If you look at the renderings you do not see any of the floor joists pockets.

Dr. Williams said he would not infer the fact that the petitioner has rendered it this way means that they are going to align all visual evidence of what was on this wall. Even if the wall was covered, the height of the first floor of Moon River as a reference point would still be legible. There is a canopy and then the part that is over the fence on Bay Street. This, too, aligns with the neighboring building.

Mr. Judson said his inclination for supporting the 13 feet [they are doing this absent of the site line drawing] as it would certainly mitigate any consideration of what the auxiliary building looks like; behind the 13 feet, it will not be visible.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Judson if he was saying that the Board does not need the site line drawings.

Mr. Judson answered no. He was only saying that the Board does not have the site line drawings.

Board Action:

Approved the petition for the dining and beer garden at 2 Whitaker Street with the following

conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final approval and illustrated in the construction drawings:

1. Increase the size of the paired storefront windows on the west elevation fronting Whitaker Street.
2. Mortar sample and profile with the proposed brick. - PASS
3. Awning fabric color sample.
4. Sign dimensions and details.

The Board recommends the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals approve the 13 foot trellis because the height is compatible with the commercial context.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Keith Howington

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

18. [Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects | 12-000827-COA | 660 East Broughton Street | Rehabilitation, alterations, and additions](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Kehoe Machine Shop Aerial.pdf](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Repointing Submittal Criteria.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Preservation Brief 2 - Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings.pdf](#)

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

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

Mr. Jerry Lominack was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for stabilization, rehabilitation, additions and exterior alterations to the Kehoe Shop building at 660 East Broughton Street.

Ms. Ward said the Board has seen this building come before them for stabilization, but this petition is proposing to do the full rehabilitation and additions. This is the metal machine shop building that was accessory to the main Kehoe building and is a historic structure within the district. She showed the Board some photos of the building. Ms. Ward said a portion of the existing addition in back; but the petitioner is proposing a new addition between the back of the main Kehoe building and this addition that will not be visible from the right-of-way.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of stabilization, rehabilitation, additions and exterior alterations to the Kehoe Machine Shop building at 660 East Broughton Street because the preservation and design standards are met, provided that the brick wall repair and repointing be performed in accordance with the Board's submittal requirements for masonry repointing and Preservation Brief 2: Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings. Specific location of areas to be repointed, mortar specifications and a four square foot (4x4) text patch must be reviewed and approved by staff prior to execution of work

Dr. Henry commented that he was looking at page 10 of 23 which shows that most of the corners of this building are gone. This restores their faith in their role as a Board in reviewing this and seeing how to fix it.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lominack said they are in agreement with the staff's recommendation. They will do a test sample and submit the data to staff. They will comply with the Secretary's of Interior Standards Preservation Brief #2. The extent of the work as far the restoration of the brick foundation wall probably will grow each time that they do a little bit of work, but they will submit the necessary information. The building is in pretty bad shape; therefore, they are not quite sure where they will have to stop. But, their intent is to do all of it that needs to be done.

Mr. Engle said one and one-half (1 ½) years the Board was told that the steel structure was ready to crumble. Has further evaluation shown that this will not happen?

Mr. Lominack answered no. It is really in bad shape. He explained that they were not a part of that submittal. They have a structural engineer that has already done an analysis on it. They will be proceeding with the work .

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

Board Action:

Approval of stabilization, rehabilitation, additions and exterior alterations to the Kehoe Machine Shop building at 660 East Broughton Street - PASS

because the preservation and design standards are met.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

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

19. [Petition of Blick Art Materials | 12-000828-COA | 318 East Broughton Street | Mural](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Dr. Williams left the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Ms. Robyn Reeder was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting to paint a mural on the building at 318 East Broughton Street. The painting will be painted by artist James "Dr.Z" Zdaniewski. It is approximately 10 feet long by 18 feet tall, will be located on the west stucco facade facing Lincoln Street, and visible from east-bound traffic on Broughton Street.

Ms. Ward explained that this is a commercial building and is not rated within the historic district. However, it was constructed in 1947 and may be eligible for historic designation. The design of the mural has been from its original concept; has been restudied and in working with the Zoning Administrator they have reviewed the design and determined that it does not meet the definition of a sign and can be reviewed as public art or a mural. Ms. Ward said in addition to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness, the mural must be reviewed and approved by the Savannah-Chatham County Historic Site and Monument Commission as well as public art because this Commission reviews all public art in historic districts.

Ms. Ward said that the Secretary of Interior's Standards do not apply because the building is not listed as historic. The main standard that staff found applicable was the visual compatibility standard for relationship of materials, texture and colors.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the proposed mural on the west facade of the building at 318 East Broughton Street because, as

presented in its location on a secondary facade with the reduced imagery, it is visually compatible with the commercial building to which it is associated, the broader commercial context in which it is located, painted wall signs in the vicinity, and the colors and style are reflective of the mid-century architecture character present on the eastern end of Broughton Street with the condition that the freestanding sign for Blick's at the northeast corner of the property, which has not received a Certificate of Appropriateness and exceeds the allowable signage for the business, be removed. Any changes to the color or imagery in the painting would require another Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ms. Ramsay asked if this Board has ever approved a mural.

Ms. Ward answered no.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the Board had a request for a mural come before them during the Olympic and they did not approve it. But, eventually it was painted on President Street.

Ms. Ward explained that some murals are on Price Street. They are generally accepted. She does not know if the murals formally came before the Board or whether they were approved by staff as a paint color change. Staff was very specific in their recommendation for approval that this is not a blanket approval for murals in anywhere in the historic district, but in this case on this building as it is designed within this commercial context staff feels that it is compatible and, therefore, recommends approval.

Ms. Ward reminded the Board that if they remembered during their retreat last year, Ms. Ellen Harris made a presentation on behalf of the Historic Site and Monument Commission who has developed standards and a policy that their Commission adheres to. This project will have to go through this process and meet all of their standards.

Mr. Engle said by rationale, the message is a medium. If someone proposes [which he was going back to the big wall they just talked about for Moon River] to put up a mural, which would be appropriate to the architectural of the buildings on this block, by this rationale there would absolutely be no reason that they could not put up a three-story mural, sixty feet long.

Mr. Gay said that is a historic building, but this is not a historic building.

Mr. Engle said this Board has not judged this building, but when they dealt with Kehoe Iron Works, they demanded that an evaluation of the significance of that building be done before anything happened. But, they are ignoring that on this building. Staff has said the building could be eligible. If it is judged eligible, they would be taking action on a building that is historic. Mr. Engle said he believes that this rationale could be used up and down Bay Street and River Street. He believes they have already had problems with unauthorized paintings on Bay and River Streets; people painting murals without approval.

Ms. Ward answered not since she has been on the MPC staff.

Mr. Engle said the Board got something to this effect in their packets.

Ms. Ward explained that there was graffiti on top of the Banana Republic building on West Broughton and Barnard Streets, but it was removed.

Mr. Engle said a mural was painted on River Street.

Ms. Ward apologized and said a painting was done on the Cobblestone Cafe. But, it was determined that it was a sign; it did not receive approval and it was on an unpainted brick surface on a historic building. She believes that every case has its own situation. The only way that staff is supporting recommending approval on this mural is because they believe that there are certain conditions and contextual things that apply to this specific painting, the building and the context that warrant its approval. However, the Board has to make the decision.

Ms. McClain asked if this is painted on Blick Art Materials or is it another sign.

Ms. Ward said this is the sign that this Board approved. It is attached to the building.

Ms. McClain said she is concern because it looks like a sign to her. It is a part of the logo. Is it their logo?

Ms. Ward answered no. It is designed by the artist.

Mr. Gay said the real problem would be anywhere there is a wall someone will say let's try this. Since it would be done once, then all of a sudden it becomes fair game everywhere. Every one will be different, but all of sudden they will have 600 applications.

Mr. Howington asked if this is not why they have mural standards in place.

Mr. Judson said written in the standards, is it mandated that the mural request comes to this Board first for approval and then goes to the Historic Site and Monument Commission.

Ms. Ward explained that the policy identifies the goals that are within the Savannah Historic District also requires the Review Board approval on this. They use flexibility on which board the request goes to first. However, they felt in this case that it was important that this came to the Review Board first and that this Board consider whether or not it was compatible before the petitioner spent time going to the Historic Site and Monument Commission. The petitioner has revised the mural to not be considered a sign by the Zoning Department.

Mr. Engle said when this came up one and one-half (1 1/2) years ago when the first mural ordinance was being developed, he thought if the wall was not painted, then there is no issue. But, technology is of such today that nobody paints a billboard. They all are on polyurethane fabric that you can stretch on the building. Therefore, the Secretary of Interior's standards can be followed and you can still have a 60 foot tall mural because they are not painting on the masonry, but hanging fabric in front of it.

Mr. Engle said he has gone back and forth on this mural because he really likes

it; but it is not just this one. They will see a lot more and you can go to Philadelphia [which has had a mural program for about 40 or 50 years] in the historic district and you will see murals three blocks away. They can say the block that is around it is 1950 or 1960, but you can see the mural three blocks down Broughton Street. This is not a secondary facade. There is nothing between it and the corner. This will impact every historic building between it and the mural. Mr. Engle said he believes this is a problem.

Ms. Simpson asked if the base or foundation of the wall was painted.

Ms. Ward answered that it was concrete block and it was stuccoed recently.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Reeder said she is a property and business owner on Broughton Street. She is also a consultant for Blick's Materials. She said she does not have many points to make as this is something new to the Historic District and Broughton Street.

Ms. Reeder said that Blick has thirty-eight (38) stores across the country. They are doing this on all of their stores and has been positive in the community promoting a local artist.

Mr. Judson said to clarify a point Ms. Reeder just made and to help him in determining a sign versus a mural, he asked if the thirty-eight (38) locations each with a local artist doing the renderings or thirty-eight (38) versions of this going nationwide.

Ms. Reeder said it was different local artists and it is not on every thirty-eight (38) stores, but this is something that they are doing one-by-one.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Reeder if she knew whether some of the murals were in historic districts.

Ms. Reeder said one is in Philadelphia. A mural is in San Francisco, but she is not sure what their rules are. She has been told that this would be difficult to get approved, but they felt it was worth trying to do. The artist is also a part of the See-Saw project. They just completed a mural on East 34th Street. Ms. Reeder said the artist is very experienced. He is an alumni of SCAD. This is a stencil process and, therefore, it is very clean and will appear exactly as the Board sees it now.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that he wanted it to be clear that his remarks are restricted to the fact that this is in the National Historic Landmark District. He said he is a lover of art and appreciates it in a lot of different contexts. However, he does not believe that this is the appropriate context for this.

Mr. Carey said he would argue, just as Ms. McClain pointed out, that this in the shadow of Blick's Art Materials is a sign. This is advertising; it is painted art work on an art supply store. He does not believe that it requires a lot to

make the connection between materials and so forth regardless of the independent nature of thirty-eight (38) of these going up around the county in various cities. It is less than subtle, he believes, to what the message is. This is the place where you get your art supplies. If no sign was here, it would be a different story. But, a prominent sign is here. Now, this art/sign is being requested. Mr. Carey said he was somewhat confused on the staff's report when they talked about art and advertising. It appears that the lines were blurred in the report. There was a reference to ghost signs which [did, not does or not do] have somewhat a role in the Landmark District. It did at one time, but currently in his opinion they do not; although in their conservation state they are very appropriate, but not new ones. Mr. Carey said he believes the blurred line of advertising art is a sign. However, if it isn't a sign for argument sake say that it is not, he gets back to what is it visually compatible to. If they are talking about the building itself, the mid century model; it is a bright streak with a lot of activity and color, but the pedestrian walking down Broughton Street in the heart of the National Historic Landmark District looking at this, he believes the visual compatibility is to the experience of the pedestrian walking on the street seeing that and not what is its relationship to the building on which it sits. How does this work in the overall Historic district? He does not believe that it does work.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. McClain said this is another sign and this will be her reason for rejecting the mural.

Dr. Henry said this Board cannot base their disapproval on saying that it is a sign.

Mr. Engle said they have to say that it is incompatible.

Mr. Howington asked if they will get to hear any thoughts from the Historic Site and Monument Commission.

Ms. Harris said she would be happy to answer the Board's questions, but she does not have an opinion. She is only present to hear the Review Board comments and opinions.

Ms. Simpson said she is torn over this project. She agrees with staff and they have already painted the stucco. In thirty (30) days they can paint over the mural. If this was brick or a true ghost sign she would be inclined not to approve it; however, this can be easily fixed in terms of reversibility. The concrete block is already covered.

Mr. Gay said it is not a case of being bad art. It actually is very pretty; but the location is the concern.

Mr. Engle said there are more than 250 murals in Philadelphia and they become more important than the architecture. You walk down the street and you are looking four blocks ahead at a mural and some are six (6) stories tall. Now, don't think that this Board will not get those requests on River Street. Once they say that murals can be put in the Historic District, you have opened

the door. Do they want to have five (5) or six (6) requests every month?

Ms. Ramsay said this could not be this Board's reasons for not approval.

Mr. Engle said there is no historical precedent and signage on the side of a building is not fine art. This is fine art and there is no precedence in Savannah for historic fine art on the sides of buildings unless you are talking about the Morton Salt Girl or something. But, they have a fragile resource here. They are not Philadelphia or San Francisco. They don't have to do what everybody else does. He believes the Historic District every day is getting more compromised and this is just the beginning. If they approve this as much as he likes it [he would love to see it up in the Victorian District or Habersham Village], but he does not think the Landmark Historic District is the place for it.

Mr. Howington asked not even Broughton Street.

Mr. Engle said no. The Berrien House is totally visible behind this. You can see the gable of the Berrien House. They are going to restore the Berrien House.

Mr. Judson said this cannot be the Board's criteria either.

Mr. Engle said he realizes this, but the mural is incompatible.

Mr. Judson said he was thinking about a point that Ms. Simpson made about the surface. He, too, is torn between this; he loves the art and does not really have a problem with its placement on Broughton Street. He hears some of the Board members concern about precedence and to him it does make a big difference if this is on a painted white brick wall as opposed to someone trying to do it over a historic brick wall. Mr. Judson said he does not know if this is a distinction that they can clarify in their recommendation.

Mr. Gay asked if they are saying it is okay to paint the mural, then why would they want to do it in the first place if they are thinking about reversing it.

Dr. Henry said they need to be specific in their reasoning as compatibility. He said he is torn on the compatibility part. He sees Mr. Carey's point that three blocks away, you will be able to see the mural.

Mr. Judson said he knows they have already had issues on this site with signage, but he wanted to ask Ms. Reeder if she would discuss with her client relocating the principle use sign so that the mural would be a stand-alone piece of art. If this is done, it would change the way he looks at this.

Dr. Henry said this would make him feel better, too.

Mr. Engle said this would not change the compatibility issue.

Ms. Simpson said murals are meant to be seen. She believes that historically, murals have been painted downtown. Philadelphia is still very historic.

Mr. Engle said Philadelphia is 1960 historic. The historic program started in Philadelphia in the 1960s.

Ms. Simpson said, however, the historic program is continuing.

Board Action:

Denial of the petition for the mural because it is not visually compatible within the context of the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

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

20. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 12-000841-COA | 232 West St. Julian Street | Rehabilitation and alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Preservation Brief 44_ The Use of Awnings on Historic Buildings_ Repair, Replacement, and New Design.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Neil Dawson was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for four (4) new awnings with signage, exterior light fixtures and fans at 232 West St. Julian Street for the new business, Wet Willie's.

Ms. Ward explained that typically the approval of awnings is at the staff level, but the petitioner is proposing a ground supported awning and the staff normally brings this type of request to the Board as they are more significant than just a canopy over the entrance.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the ground supported awning, fans, and lighting on the south facade (St. Julian Street) because it meets the preservation and design standards with the condition that the 26 foot long awnings on the west (Jefferson Street) and north (Bryan Street) facades be reduced to correspond to the width of the openings below, the signage be revised to correspond to the revised awning dimensions, and resubmitted to

staff for final review and approval.

Mr. Engle asked staff if there is a requirement that not more than six (6) inch high letters be on awnings.

Ms. Ward answered that six (6) inch high letters are exempt; they do not get calculated into the signage.

Mr. Engle asked if these letters get calculated into this signage,

Ms. Ward answered yes. The petitioner is allowed to have the letters. However, they cannot exceed one linear foot of the awning.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson said their only issue is with regards to segmenting the awnings on this side. They feel that these are principle use retail sections of the building. The building is divided into thirty (30) foot bays with doors, not only on the St. Julian Street side, but a door and inside a bay and another bay with a door that is centered. Of course, back around the corner, is a similar type bay. Therefore, each one of these is really a principle use entrance into this building. In fact, in past history, it has had multiple tenants within this floor. So, they feel that they have the same kind, historically, of punched openings along St. Julian Street that allow for a single awning over a thirty (30) foot bay. Mr. Dawson said in fact, this is a consistent theme throughout the Historic District. They feel that because this has a retail feel along Jefferson Street side and it is divided into bays and each one has a commercial entrance door, that they are appropriate to detail with awnings that are twenty-six (26) feet long to reflect the thirty (30) foot bay in the entrance that is associated with it. They will be using each of the doors as entrances into the retail space. Therefore, they will be active doors and they want to encourage participation street level pedestrians entering into their space. Consequently, they feel that it is important in terms of the operation of the business to have awnings associated with those doors and the signage that goes with it.

Mr. Dawson said they have applied for street sidewalk dining. There will be dining out there; obviously, there is a functional rationale for having longer awnings that would allow dining continuously.

Mr. Engle said the awning is only three (3) feet wide. How can someone dine underneath a three (3) foot deep awning?

Mr. Dawson said the tables would be probably two-top tables, but the awning would offer some protection and some continuity. They are trying to activate that street as a retail pedestrian street, which they think is appropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he agrees with staff. The standards are explicit. There are too many awnings that are doing this; combining three and four pieces and parts of fenestration. If this was not going to be self-supported it would be a totally different thing; but it isn't.

Board Action:

Approval of the ground supported awning, fans, and lighting, on the south façade (St. Julian Street) because it meets the preservation and design standards with the condition that the 26 foot long awnings on the west (Jefferson Street) and north (Bryan Street) facades be reduced to correspond to the width of the openings below, the signage be revised to correspond to the revised awning dimensions, and resubmitted to staff for final review and approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle
Second: Nicholas Henry

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

21. [Petition of Jennifer Deacon for Dawson Architects | 12-000842-COA | 115 East Bay Street | Addition, alterations, and fence](#)

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

Mr. Neil Dawson was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. She stated that the Board has seen this before, but the petitioner is requesting approval to amend the Certificate of Appropriateness for additions and a privacy wall at the rear of the property at 115 East Bay Street.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the amended petition for additions and a privacy wall at the rear of the property at 115 East Bay Street because it is visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards. A sample of the stucco color and texture must be submitted to staff for final approval.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson entertained questions from the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval of the amended petition for additions and a privacy wall at the rear of the property at 115 East Bay Street because it is visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards. A sample of the stucco color and texture must be submitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

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

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

22. [Amended Petition of Timothy J. Bright for Holder Properties, Inc. | H-120910-4323\(S\)-2 | 22 Barnard St. | Staff Review - Exterior Light Fixtures](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision H-120910-4323\(S\)-2 Amended 22 Barnard Street.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - H-120910-4323\(S\)-2 Amended 22 Barnard Street.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Patrick Phelps | 12-000482-COA | 2 East Broughton Street | Staff Review - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 2 East Broughton St. 12-000482-COA 9-24-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 2 East Broughton St. 12-000482-COA - 9-24-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Patrick Phelps | 12-000521-COA | 111 and 117 Lincoln Street | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 111 and 117 Lincoln Street - COA 12-000521-COA - 9-10-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 111 and 117 Lincoln Street - 12-000521-COA 9-10-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of George and Sharane Springer | 12-000815-COA | 307 and 309 W. Hall St. | Staff Review - Replace Balcony Porch Deck](#)

Attachment: [COA - 307 and 309 W. Hall Street - 12-000815-COA 9-24-2012.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 307 and 309 W. Hall St. - 12-000815-COA 9-24-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Kent and Lyn Gregory | 12-000917-COA | 3 East Gordon Street | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 3 East Gordon Street - 12-000917-COA 9-28-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 3 East Gordon Street - 12-000917-COA 9-28-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Amy Howell for Coastal Canvas | 12-001050-COA | 312 West Broughton Street | Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 312 West Broughton Street - 12-001050-COA 10-4-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 312 W. Broughton Street - 12-001050-COA 10-4-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

28. [Certificates of Appropriateness](#)

Ms. Ramsay asked if work was being continued on the building at Gwinnett and Whitaker Streets, increasing the sizes of the openings.

Ms. Ward said no exterior work has been approved for this building. She will check to see if a permit has been approved for this work.

Ms. McClain said she knows that the Board denied the petition for Blick Art Supply. The sign is still up, but she wanted to know if it will be removed.

Ms. Ward said the Zoning Administrator has written Blick Art Supply a letter stating that the sign has to be removed or there will be pending further action. This is being enforced.

Ms. Ward reported that the tenants are changing at 321 Berrien Street this month. They would like to use this opportunity to correct the stoops in front of Berrien Street. She said the issue she is having is that the Certificate of Appropriateness expired on August 10, 2011. The petitioner is submitting a new application with the same information to meet the recommendations of the Board of that meeting. Ms. Ward asked the Board if they feel that the request needs to come back to them or do they authorize staff to approve it exactly the same as was approved by the Board one year ago.

The Board authorized staff to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness.

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

29. [Next Meeting - Wednesday November 14, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

New Business

30. [Nominating Committee for 2013 Officers](#)

Ms. Ramsay appointed Mr. Engle, Mr. Gay and Dr. Henry to serve as the 2013 Nominating Committee.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

31. [Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Ms. Ramsay adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Ward, 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.