



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

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

SEPTEMBER 12, 2012 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

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

HDRB Member Not Present: Brian Judson

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

City of Savannah Staff Present: Tiras Petrea, Zoning Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. [Approve Minutes of August 8, 2012](#)

Attachment: [08-08-2012 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve August 8, 2012 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

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

III. SIGN POSTING

2. [104 West Gaston Street](#)

Mr. Merriman said the first day the packets were received, he found three sites that were not posted. But, the next day, two of the three sites had their signs posted. **104 East Gaston Street** did not have a sign posted.

Mr. Engle said later during the month, this address did not have a sign posted.

Ms. Ramsay said on Monday this site still did not have a sign there. She understood that the petitioner is present and wanted to address this issue.

Ms. Rebecca Lynch said the signs were posted on the required review period. She noticed that the signs were up for a while. She learned yesterday that the signs were no longer posted. They immediately posted the signs again. They used zip ties to put up the signs which is a secured way. This was beyond their control that someone removed the signs in the interim. They did go about replacing the signs in a timely manner.

Ms. Ramsay asked Ms. Lynch if the signs were put up using the zip ties the first time they were posted.

Ms. Lynch said yes. The zip ties were still on the fence. It appears that someone ripped the signs off.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board needs to discuss the posting of this site.

Mr. Engle said that the last three months the Board discussed the posting of the property and decided that they were not going to accept it any more.

Mr. Gay said the only difference here is if the little zip ties happened to be there, this is an indication that the signs were posted.

Mr. Engle said the signs might have been there, but the ordinance says the property has to

be posted for fifteen (15) days. At least six (6) days this property was not posted. The signs probably should have been posted on the inside on the balconies instead of on the outside on the exterior of the fence. There is no sense in having an ordinance if they are not going to enforce it. There may be neighbors who wanted to know about this, but did not find out due to the lack of the required posting time.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Thomson, the MPC Executive Director, if he had any suggestions.

Mr. Thomson asked the Board if they knew how long the signs were not posted as required.

Ms. Ramsay said she went by the property on Sunday and the signs were not there.

Mr. Engle said it was at least five days.

Mr. Merriman said some Board members went by the property the latter part of the time period and did not see the signs; he went by the beginning of the time period and did not see them.

Mr. Thomson said if the Board believes the signs were down more than one day, then this has to be re-posted and be heard at a later time. The notice requirement is fifteen (15) days in advance.

Board Action:

Continue the petition due to improper posting.
Both posting signs were missing from the property
at least two (2) of the required 15 posting days.

Sec. 8-3030 (h) Public Notice: (1) Posting of Property. Except for minor repairs referred to in subsection (g)(3), a sign giving at least fifteen days' notice of a public hearing on a request for a certificate of appropriateness shall be erected on the premises of the building structure for which a certificate is being requested. Such sign (s) shall be furnished by the preservation officer; shall be weather resistant; shall have a minimum size of 22 by 28 inches; shall show the application number, a statement of the proposed - PASS

action, the scheduled date, time and place of the hearing, and the telephone number to call for further information. Such signs shall be erected within ten feet of any traveled public right-of-way or lane (if the proposed action is visible from such lane) to which the structure abuts and/or faces. The lower edge of the sign shall be of sufficient height to be read from the roadway.

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Nicholas Henry

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

IV. CONTINUED AGENDA

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

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams
Second: Reed Engle

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

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

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

Board Action:

Continue to October 10, 2012 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

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

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

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

Board Action:

Continue to October 10, 2012 per the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Reed Engle

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

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

Board Action:

Continue to October 10, 2012 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Reed Engle

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

V. CONSENT AGENDA

8. [Petition of Michael Schulz | 12-000230-COA | 418 East Bryan Street | Alteration/Addition](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval to enclose the nonhistoric porch on the second floor of the north façade (facing the interior courtyard) of the building because it is visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

Vote Results

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

9. [Petition of Dawson Architects | 12-000352-COA | 209 West Congress Street | Fence](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval for a new eight foot high (8') brick pier and cementitious fiber board panel fence because it is visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams
Second: Ned Gay
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Not Present

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

10. [Petition of Lott + Barber for Chatham County | 12-000370-COA | 123 Abercorn Street | Rehabilitation, alteration, and sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval for a new principal use fascia sign and alterations to existing door openings as requested because they are visually compatible and meet the Historic District sign ordinance. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

11. [Petition of Michael Connor | 12-000507-COA | 301 West Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

Approval for a new projecting principal use sign bracket because it is visually compatible and meets the Broughton Street sign ordinance. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ned Gay

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

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

12. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 12-000378-COA | 318 East Liberty Street | Exterior painting and alterations](#)

No action required. The petitioner has withdrawn the application.

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

Agenda A (Items 10-15 will be heard at 2:00pm in sequential order)

13. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | H-11-4569-2 | 412 Williamson Street | Amended New Construction Part I](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial Map.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Conditionally Approved Submittal Packet - May 9, 2012.pdf](#)

Mr. Pat Shay of Gunn, Meyerhoff, Shay architects along with two of their associates, **Muhammad Shareef and Saad Al Jassar**, were present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting to amend the approval for new construction Part I, Height and Mass, of a multi-story hotel at 412 Williamson Street. The amendment focuses on two main items. The model has been revised and resubmitted. It is on display today in the Hearing Room. The two-story pavilion on the northwest corner (at Williamson Street and MLK Jr. Blvd) was continued at the request of the petitioner to restudy the roof, columns and massing.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for the amended Part I, Height and Mass, of the proposed hotel at 412 Williamson Street upon clarification of the increased height with the following conditions:

1. Within the two/three story southwest corner, increase the height of the top floor window openings in the bays adjacent to the main entrance beneath the taller parapet be proportionate with the scale of the entry facade and porch openings below and to provide more void within the solid wall.
2. Within the two/three story southwest corner, provide a solid railing and enclose the openings around the entry arch to provide more solid within the open space to be compatible with typical commercial structures in the Factors Walk area. An open space could be provided behind a solid wall with punched openings of the same proportion of the window openings on the upper and lower floors.
3. On the north facade, provide additional columns of windows where the solid wall has increased to maintain a spacing of not less than two times the width of windows between window openings. Additionally, the increased height has created a large amount of solid wall between the visual expression of the first and second floors. Additional openings should be considered to reduce the amount of solid between floors.
4. Replace or screen the conical roof on the northeast corner with a raised parapet similar to other roof shapes on the building to be more compatible with the industrial nature of the design and contributing buildings to which it is visually related.

Dr. Williams asked staff to clarify what is meant by solid railing. Would it be a masonry parapet as opposed to an iron railing?

Ms. Ward answered that staff is recommending that this be more of a solid masonry wall. They have not gotten to the materials yet, therefore, she does not know what it would be. But, she believes that it should appear more as a solid wall because it is above a solid wall and is supporting a solid wall above. Therefore, it should appear more as a solid wall with punched openings. It could still be an open space if it had more solid appearance.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward if she would make the same recommendation for the conical corner. It has the same vocabulary of recessed opened space with framework.

Ms. Ward said no. She explained that her concern with the pavilion is that it is supporting a solid space above it. Therefore, it seems odd to have an open closure on the ground floor supporting a solid mass above it. Here they have porches and open space all the way from the ground to the roof.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward how high is she saying that the solid wall should be in the other location.

Ms. Ward explained, pointing to a railing, that staff is recommending that the petitioner replace this railing here with a solid wall; similar to the openings that

are created on the second floor. A similar pattern should be on the ground floor with the same portion of openings.

Dr. Williams asked if this would still have the recess behind it.

Ms. Ward said the petitioner could keep the open space behind it. It does not have to be conditioned space, but appear more as a solid as opposed to an open area supporting a solid mass above.

Mr. Engle looking at page A-10 said may be Ms. Ward could refresh his memory as it has been a while since they have discussed this. He asked Ms. Ward if the Board made a recommendation in May 2012 about the tripart nature of the windows and then going to the fifth (5th) floor where there are triple doors that had no alignment with anything below it. Did the Board make a recommendation to look at this again?

Ms. Ward answered that she remembers this was discussed at some point, but it was not included in the motion. After reading the minutes, there was a strong nod that this appeared as a main principal elevation which the petitioner originally intended it to be. If this isn't the main entrance, the petitioner could consider putting this may be on the Williamson Street side or revisit this and make this the main entrance. Ms. Ward said, however, she believes this is intended to be the main entrance. The petitioner has been continually working with the City on the right-of-way improvements along Montgomery Street. They are looking at putting in a public elevator in the space. Ms. Ward said the petitioner can answer Mr. Engle's question. However, she believes that it is truly meant to be the main entry into the building. She will pull the approval.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay said they almost agree entirely with the staff's report. The only difference they have is they would like to have the opportunity as they move forward into the design detail to study whether or not to retain the conical roof. He will not belabor each of the points that the staff has made, they agree and in fact, have studied many of the things that are in the recommendation and have modeled them. They believe that these are reasonable things for them to bring forward to this Board at the design detail level.

Mr. Engle commented that if the Board approves this for height and mass, they cannot come back later and say that they do not want the conical roof. This decision has to be made at this point. This is a major issue of height and mass. The Board cannot say that the petitioner may go back and restudy it. Are they not approving the conical roof at this point? He supposes they can do this, but they would not be giving full height and mass approval.

Mr. Merriman agreed with Mr. Engle.

Mr. Engle said this may be copied based on the Armory. But he does know what the Armory has to do with River Street. The Armory is not an adjacent

structure and he could not think of anything else on River Street that reflects the conical roof. The Armory is a nice building, but he is not sure it is relevant to this building.

Dr. Williams questioned the fenestration on the west elevation on Montgomery Street. His concern is the windows on sheet 13 that staff did not point out. He asked if the dotted line that is cutting through those two segmental arches over the entrance represents the floors.

Mr. Shay answered yes.

Dr. Williams stated that over the doors, two windows are shown on the second floor. The third floor windows align left and right with what is beside them, but the second floor windows seem low. The arches are over the garage and, therefore, there has to be clearance. Since the pavilion is on a different plane than what is to the left, there is not a lot happening to the right as it opens up into the perforated area. Could these three windows be raised? The windows above them have space below them. It appears that the window is setting on the floor, even though the floor is literally lower.

Mr. Shay stated that this is a mistake. He agreed with Dr. Williams and said this will be corrected.

Mr. Williams asked Mr. Shay that, therefore, this is not the way these windows will be.

Mr. Shay answered that when they come back for the design detail, all the heads of these windows will align and they will fix (pointing to an area) the windows over here to be more prominent.

Dr. Williams said that the staff's recommendation about the more solid than void that he is not convinced that solid parapets here will be the solution. All the railings are iron and he is not sure they have a brick parapet that might seem a bit an anomaly.

Mr. Shay said they have looked at it in brick and they are not unhappy with how it looks as a brick railing, in essence. They would like to keep, if possible, the ability to look beyond the first facade and see back into the building. Mr. Shay said they believe it is a good compromise solution.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Shay (he knows this is not height and mass) if he would incorporate any iron work on the top of the brick parapet that might help soften the transition from the brick. Iron is shown everywhere else on the balconies on the building. Just a low railing not a high railing.

Mr. Shay answered that they will look at this, too. However, he does not want it to be so high that it will become ridiculous. But, he hears that Dr. Williams is saying instead of letting it be 42 inches high in brick, if it was somewhat lower on the top half would make it a little more transparent.

Dr. Williams said he was willing that this be worked out with staff. If the Board had the option of saying A, B, and C, when these happens, but they do not have this luxury. Dr. Williams asked Mr. Shay if he had anymore comments about the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Shay said he reserves his comments. The staff does a good job. They sit down and take a look between the time they get the staff's report and when they come before the Board to see if there is anything unworkable; and they have not found anything unworkable. They are still fond of the conical roof, but it is not something that they cannot live without.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that they agree with staff's recommendations. He is pleased to hear that the petitioner concurs with most of the staff's recommendations. The finer points that the HSF wants to make are they agree that the conical roof is visually incompatible. The reference point of any sort of rounded building, they believe the curvilinear corner is good. However, it is the HSF's opinion that this could be achieved by having a rounded parapet, not the top, but a parapet wall. Mr. Carey believes this would probably suit this site and corner a little better without the conical roof. He said the parapet roof on sheet 13 sort of chamford an opening here. It is the opinion of the HSF that what works better here is a simple rectilinear sort of parapet; not shorter or stepped. He believes this is more in keeping with the simpler more industrial designs in this area. It would be better if this was done consistently throughout. This will make the northwest corner and this corner work better together and be more in keeping with the buildings in this area.

Mr. Carey said the windows in the center section need to be more proportionate and correspond with the windows above. He believes that the petitioner has acknowledged this and staff has made this point and the HSF agrees. Mr. Carey said that at this point, he believes things just need to be fine tuned.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry said he concurs with Mr. Engle's comments regarding the roof.

Mr. Engle said the Board needs to make a decision on this. He guesses there should be a solid pediment here. It can certainly follow the circular form.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Engle that when he says a solid pediment, does he mean pediment or parapet.

Mr. Engle said he meant parapet.

Dr. Williams said presumably rectangular following the contour of the rounded corner, but stepping up from the cornice height on the rest of the

building or just continuing what they see around the corner with nothing rising above. He said he was not sure what Mr. Engle meant.

Mr. Engle said he was saying probably step it up to accentuate it.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board was now getting into telling the petitioner what the building should look like. She explained that what the Board could do is to incorporate the staff's comments into a motion which says that it cannot look like that.

Mr. Engle said the staff's recommendation is to screen it. However, it is going to be screened, it will have a parapet that is eight (8) feet tall. He believes this is a little out of scale. Therefore, why doesn't the Board say replace with a parapet.

Mr. Merriman said the parapet wall could follow the contour.

Dr. Williams said he actually questions why you would need anything rising above. If there is no conical roof here, unless there is some reason that the conical roof is screening something underneath it that is rising up anyway. If the conical roof is just hollow for the sake of argument, he is visualizing that the roof be taken out and just have a continuous line. He is not sure it has to be made to look like a turret. It is rounded, but not every rounded corner is a turret. Dr. Williams said he was wondering if they needed a parapet. Just imagine the conical roofing disappearing and the straight line from the right just continues left or around the corner. Where would the parapet stop? How would you step it down? If it is three feet, would it make a difference? As he sees it, the design work here is fine; just as the other end, it goes straight off.

Mr. Engle asked staff to pull up the other elevation on the screen. He said breaking the huge mass and it is long into discrete units, he believes is a part of the design and is important. Most of the things on River Street are broken. There are big blocks, but they are only three bays wide typically. This tends to differentiate that block.

Dr. Williams said he does not see where Mr. Engle is saying to stop it. Would it be where the edge of the conical roof is or would it be the next bay over where the arch windows begin?

Mr. Engle said his personal belief is it would be where the conical roof stops. This is the discrete bay.

Dr. Williams pointed out that there is another bay to the left before you get to the arches. He does not see the benefit of the parapet.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board can eliminate the veribage that says "to screen the conical roof."

Mr. Shay said he wanted to be sure they all understood each other. Pointing to an area, he said this area is already a parapet. Consequently in any case, there

will be a parapet. He would like to have the opportunity to show the Board an alternative where this parapet was proud of the other. Then if the Board does not like it, he will eliminate it. They would like for the expression of the round to be just a little taller than the flat parapet around the rest of the building.

Dr. Williams said since they are talking about a relatively minor height and mass issue, could this detail be decided upon in Phase II?

Ms. Ramsay and Mr. Engle stated that there is no reason why Dr. Williams's suggestion could not be done in Phase II.

Dr. Williams said this would give the Board the opportunity to see what the petitioner is proposing.

Mr. Engle said the motion could be made to eliminate the conical roof and the mass will be decided in Part II.

Dr. Williams suggested that the same thing be done with the north southwest corner pavilion where it steps up into a triangle. He is inclined to agree with HSF that a simpler expression would be better for this parapet. Maybe these features could be removed, but allow the opportunity for the architect to submit an alternative as a part of Phase II.

Dr. Williams, for clarification regarding the windows' width on the north elevation, asked staff if they were saying that the third through the fifth floor windows would be as wide as the windows below and above them or just wider than they are now. Does the Board want to agree with staff or just say make the windows wider or do they want to be more specific and say they should be the same width as those at the top and bottom?

Ms. Ward explained that this elevation has already been approved by the Board. The windows got a little narrower, but the visual expression between the first and second floor increased the solid area. Therefore, staff is asking the petitioner to go back to the previous width. They need some kind of articulation if there will not be another row of windows or openings.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward if staff was advocating another row of windows.

Ms. Ward said staff's recommendation is "on the north facade provide additional column of windows where the solid wall has increased to maintain a spacing of not less than two times the width of windows between window openings." She explained that the petitioner could subsequently, increase the width of the windows as well to meet the standard.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward that when she says additional column on the seven (7) to five (5) bay elevation, if she was suggesting six (6) or more bay elevation.

Ms. Ward answered this is the staff's recommendation; however, they could

otherwise just increase the width of the windows that are here now. Additionally, the increase height has created a large amount of solid wall between the visual expression of the first and second floor. Therefore, additional openings should be considered to reduce the amount of the solid between floors. Ms. Ward said she was not going to recommend that these be longer. She does not believe this would be proportionally correct. She does not know either if they would want the ground floor to be bigger, although it could be as this is a low floor height.

Dr. Williams asked if a nine foot floor is here. If so, there is a floor here without a window.

Ms. Ward replied yes.

Dr. Williams said he was guessing, but this is a relatively short story that would have squashed windows below.

Mr. Shay said the floor is parking. They are going to study some openings that could be here that would not be windows, but will be consistent with the materials that they are going to show to the Board when they come back for the sprandels. He believes the Board will be happy with it when presented.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ramsay if the Board could also leave this detail as a part of Phase II.

Ms. Ramsay confirmed that they could leave the detail and discuss it in Phase II.

Dr. Henry, for clarity, asked if the Board was saying that they want to implement the staff's recommendation; removal of the conical roof.

Ms. Ramsay clarified that staff recommended a parapet high enough to screen the conical roof. However, the Board does not want this.

Dr. Williams said he questions the staff's recommendation of a "so called column of windows" which would change the bay structure of the elevation. He does not believe that this solves the problem. In other words making all the vertical elevation windows narrower by adding a bay, would make them skinnier.

Mr. Merriman said this would make the windows wider.

Dr. Williams explained that in the staff's recommendation was the phrase "or an additional column of windows." Therefore, he does not recommend approving this solution.

Mr. Johnson said the windows need to be a little wider.

Mr. Merriman said the windows need to be wider because they do not presently meet the ordinance as there is too much solid between them.

Mr. Engle said that a part of the staff's recommendation regarding number three (3) should be approved as they want the petitioner to do something with the solid mass between the two floors. It does not necessarily has to be a row of windows, but there has to be something here. Consequently, number three (3) should not be totally eliminated.

Ms. Ramsay explained that she does not believe the Board was saying to eliminate number three (3) totally as this is the wider windows.

Board Action:

Approve the amended petition for new construction, Part I, Height and Mass, of the proposed hotel at 412 Williamson Street with the following conditions:

1. Within the two/three story southwest corner, increase the height of the top floor window openings in the bays adjacent to the main entrance beneath the taller parapet to be proportionate with the scale of the entry façade and porch openings below and to provide more void within the solid wall.
2. Within the two/three story southwest corner, provide a solid railing and enclose the openings around the entry arch to provide more solid within the open space to be compatible with typical commercial structures in the Factors Walk area. An open space could be provided behind a solid wall with punched openings of the same proportion of the window openings on the upper and lower floors. - PASS
3. On the north façade, increase the width of the window openings to maintain a spacing of not less than two times the width of windows between window openings. Provide a greater amount of voids within the solid wall between the first and second floors on the north facade.
4. Eliminate the conical roof on the northeast corner and incorporate parapet solutions into the Part II, Design Details submittal.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

Ms. Ward stated that on July 11, 2012, the Historic District Board of Review approved the COA with the following conditions:

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

Ms. Ward explained that conditions one (1) and two (2) have been addressed in the revised submittal. The petitioner has studied widening the stair so the railing will align with the column, but contends that the resulting design was too wide and bulky. Additional examples of similar stair designs have been submitted by the petitioner who is requesting that the railing outside of the railing be inset two inches from the interior side of the column as provided in the submittal packet.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for the amended stoop and

portico addition because it is visually compatible and is replacing a missing feature which helps restore the center hall five-bay character of the front facade.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lominack stated that he was in agreement with the staff's recommendation.

Mr. Merriman stated that he remembers the Board approved making it wider so that the handrails die into the porch column. But, now the petitioner believes it will look bad and is requesting an amendment that the railing outside be inset two inches from the interior side of the column.

Mr. Lominack said what was approved previously was so wide and was awkward. This is not a unique situation to not come into the column within the Historic District.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

Board Action:

Approval for the amended stoop and portico addition because it is visually compatible and is replacing a missing feature which helps restore the center hall five-bay character of the front façade. - PASS

Vote Results

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

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial - Looking West.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photos.pdf](#)

Mr. Jeff Cramer was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction Part I, Height and Mass, and Part II, Design Details of four attached two-story town homes at 601-605 Tattnall Street. The vacant property is at the southwest corner of Tattnall and Huntingdon Streets. The town homes are oriented to front Tattnall Street as do the other existing structures within the block face. As part of this development, the parcel will be subdivided into four parcels. The petitioner provided a model that is on display today.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass and recommends continuance for Part II, Design Details, to address the following:

1. Final plans must show the tree lawn and tree canopy on Tattnall Street.
2. Construct a sample panel of the finish and scoring pattern on-site to be reviewed
and approved by staff prior to application/installation.
3. Provide material and color for doors and transom.
4. Replace frame-type lintels and sills with stone-type lintels and sills to be compatible
with historic masonry structures in the district. The door frame must be inset not
less than three inches from the exterior surface of the stucco wall.
5. Illustrate window frames in the elevation or detail drawings. Frames should be
recessed behind the stucco exterior.
6. Provide material for shutters. Within false window openings, shutters in the closed
position must not project forward of the exterior building wall but should be within
the three inch recess required of window sashes. Provide detail plan view.
7. Provide materials for railing. The column capital appears disproportionate to the
column base. Consider a wider column or smaller capital.
8. Provide a section detail through the masonry privacy wall for review.
Provide an
elevation of the sliding gate for review.
9. Restudy of the rear curb cut to comply with the curb cut width standard and the
continuous sidewalk standard. Provide streetscape views to show the
pedestrian
condition of Jefferson Street.
10. Provide materials and colors of service and utility screens if visible behind

the gates
along Jefferson Street.

Mr. Engle stated that it appears there is no longer a rear elevation. He said that number five (5) is not a rear elevation. It is taken from the street. This is the base. They no longer can see the porch. The earlier version of number five (5) was the cut that was taken so you could see the back porches. But now you cannot see it any longer. It appears to him that the columns now are stucco on the back porches.

Mr. Gay said the Board assumed initially that the columns were wood.

Mr. Engle said it appears that now they are stucco with wood railing.

Ms. Ward stated that she would like for the petitioner to address this. She does not believe that any changes were made to the columns or the railing. Ms. Ward believes they just need clarification on materials that will be used in the back.

Dr. Henry asked staff if they were comfortable relying on shutters. Once they are gone, it will look odd with those closed fake windows.

Ms. Ward explained that the shutters need to be operable and sized to fit the windows. In the back where there are paired window openings, bifold shutters must be here in order to cover the openings when closed. She believes, especially on this facade, that they help to fill out the blank wall. There is no requirement or mandate nor ordinance that says you must have shutters. This is what the petitioner submitted and staff is supportive of the shutters.

Dr. Henry stated that he agrees that the shutters look good; but his only concern is how long will they last.

Ms. Ramsay said no capitals are shown on the rear columns.

Mr. Merriman said the columns are stucco.

Ms. Ramsay believes that even with the stucco, the ordinance requires capitals.

Mr. Engle asked if the Board has ever approved stucco columns.

Ms. Ward showed the column capital that was in the submittal of the side elevation. The rear elevation shows no capitals. The revised submittal shows no detail. Consequently, she believes the Board is correct, this should be incorporated in their decision.

Ms. Ramsay said the petitioner has identified the shutters on the back that do not appear to meet the window, but do they know that they are bifold shutters?

Ms. Ward said the petitioner would need to confirm this.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cramer thanked the Board for considering their petition. He saw that there is some confusion and he apologized. He explained that after they simplified the window headers and sills, they decided to simplify the rear porch. They originally had a capital on the one column they had, but believed it would be more appropriate to use stucco columns and have a header going across the rear porch that would keep the water from coming down the wall onto the column. This is a water detail that goes across the top of the porch that signifies that a porch is here. The shutters are made out of wood. He has asked for a sample, but the supplier has had a hard time getting it to him. Nevertheless, they are wood louvered shutters and they do operate. The louvers do not operate, they will be substantial. The shutters on the rear are bifold because they must be in order to cover the window. The windows are sized to fit the shutters.

Mr. Cramer said regarding curb cuts on the back, as the Board suggested at the last meeting, they have figured out how to get a cantilever gate on the back. This works well with the curb cut. The gates are ten (10) feet and the curb cut will be twelve. This allows them to comply with the Historic District Board of Review's comments as far as not having more than a twenty-five feet driveway on each of the units. He apologized that this is not shown on the site plan, but they will address this on the permit plans. As far as the materials for the railings and the shutters, everything will be made out of treated wood that will be painted.

Mr. Cramer stated that he has submitted a new survey of the site showing the sidewalk, but he did not fix the one that was originally submitted. It showed the new subdivision that has been applied for at the City. The sidewalks are shown correctly on it, but he did not get the chance to change the development plan. Mr. Cramer said the staff's comments stated that he did not comply with comment one (1). He asked staff to please restate comment one (1).

Ms. Ward explained that the staff's comment one (1) was the final plans must show the tree lawn and tree canopy on Tattnell Street.

Mr. Cramer said they have met with the City Arborist.

Ms. Ward informed Mr. Cramer that he just needs to show it. The site plans appears that it is being done away with.

Mr. Cramer asked staff to explain comment nine (9) and ten (10).

Ms. Ward explained that comment nine (9) was restudy the rear curb cut to comply with the cut curb width standard and the continuous sidewalk standard. Provide streetscape use to show the pedestrian condition on Jefferson Street. She said regarding comment ten (10), the petitioner has provided the materials and colors.

Mr. Cramer apologized for getting the information late to staff. They were developing the plans and had some different items that they were addressing at the same time as the subdivision, and working with the Arborist, but they believe they have met the standard. Consequently, they want the Board to consider their petition as favorably as they can.

Mr. Engle said the revised sheet two (2), the off-hand unit, shows a stucco column on the porch. It shows a narrow, six foot high wall, a wood hand-rail is shown, but sheet five shows a six foot high wall continuing straight with the house. He said he does not believe he has ever seen a stucco column on a porch that sits on top of a garden wall. It is such an awkward situation here. He wonders why it is not a solid wall on this entire side. The stucco column does not make sense. Normally, you see a stucco column that was brick, then it was stuccoed, but you don't see a column sitting on a wood floor with stucco. He guesses that the six foot high garden wall is supporting it all. The Board has not seen an elevation; therefore, they cannot judge what is going on with the porch. An elevation was included in the original submission, but now there is not an elevation that shows the porch.

Mr. Cramer explained that a six foot wall is suppose to go behind the porch. He drew this on the plan, but it got lost in translation. It is to go to the back side of the porch, down the page and run into the side of the building proper.

Ms. Ward said she will attempt to explain what she has heard. The plan is shown wrong. The elevation is correct. She explained, pointing to a wall, this wall should come down here and meet the building wall which would create a planter's space along the porch.

Mr. Engle asked if a wood railing is on the porch.

Mr. Cramer answered yes. It is a wood railing just like all the other railings. It shows this in the old non-revised elevations. It has the same railings, but he changed the column to a stucco column because he simplified all the details.

Mr. Engle asked doesn't the ordinance require bases and capitals.

Ms. Ramsay answered yes.

Mr. Engle said, therefore, the stucco columns do not meet the ordinance. As far as he can read, the span on the porch railing is eleven (11) feet without any intermediate support. He assumed some would be put here. The drawings do not show this.

Mr. Cramer asked Mr. Engle if he was referring to the rear.

Mr. Engle answered yes.

Mr. Cramer said they will put two posts in the middle. However, his question is if you can not see it from the wall, he didn't think you had to do so.

Ms. Ramsay said she believes it can be seen through the gate.

Mr. Engle asked if a stringcourse, a beltcourse or something is on the southside elevation. A double line is here.

Mr. Cramer said it is on the top of the water table.

Mr. Engle asked if this is a projection outward to the water table.

Mr. Cramer stated that it is on the section detail.

Mr. Engle stated that he believes a better effect would be if more differentiation was put on the stucco and different patterning below the stringcourse. He asked Mr. Cramer if he said he added a beltcourse to the back elevation above the porch to give it character.

Mr. Cramer answered yes.

Mr. Engle asked if this will be continuous around the properties.

Mr. Cramer answered no. It will be just to the porch. It is somewhat like a header for the porch.

Mr. Engle said he believes the overall design could probably benefit with a little more detailing on the stucco. It could be differentiated between the beltcourse foundation, especially the side elevations. This would not cost any more money to differ the scoring patterns to accentuate the foundation.

Mr. Merriman believed the units across the street on Huntingdon are flat.

Mr. Engle said those units are masonry buildings.

Mr. Cramer said he does not believe they are scored.

Mr. Merriman said he knows that one is scored because he built the door.

Mr. Gay questioned the sliding gate in the back. He said that the MPC-5 shows that it is wide enough for a car to get through it; but when you go to MPC-2, it looks like the sliding gate on the right-hand is partly covered by the trash on the walls. Mr. Gay said, therefore, he was wondering if this intended to be parking. How would a car get in here?

Mr. Cramer said the opening is ten feet and the gate slides behind the garbage area. You need ten feet and this is a good place to hid the trash. He asked Mr. Gay if he answered his questioned.

Mr. Gay stated that on the right-hand side, a wall is here, too.

Mr. Cramer said the wall will be continuous all the way.

Mr. Gay asked how wide does the gate need to be to get a car through it.

Mr. Cramer said the opening is ten (10) feet and the gate is 10'-6." The cantilever has to be five (5) feet in order to hold up the gate. This has to be mounted on the backside of the wall.

Mr. Gay believed the lot is twenty-three feet wide. The wall appears to be almost sixteen feet. This only leaves seven feet to get the car in.

Mr. Cramer explained that he made the last lot wider so that he would not have to build directly next to the neighbors. It is twenty-six (26) feet wide. It is three feet wider than the other lots. This allows them not to be so close to the neighbors and gives them room to work.

Mr. Gay said the other lots are twenty-three feet and if they have the same dimensions, which it does, this still leaves only seven (7) feet for the opening for the gate to get the car in there.

Mr. Cramer explained that the gate is more than ten (10) feet wide and slides behind the recycle area.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Cramer if the 10 foot is the opening for the car.

Mr. Cramer answered yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Julie Gillart stated she lives at 222 W. Huntington Street. Ms. Gillart said the side elevation appearance has improved. She said in her point of view, the slide shows are misleading. The picture of the exact situation is not given as far as Huntingdon Street. It narrows to 35 feet, but none of the slides show the impact. Ms. Gillart said she is disappointed because this impacts her and the other owner who lives at 224 West Huntingdon Street. She does not believe that the Board is aware of the impact that the new building will have on them. If the street is 67 feet wide, they would not bother to be present at the meeting, but it is strange as the street narrows to 35 feet. Ms. Gillart invited Ms. Ward and the Board to go and look at this site. It is a strange situation.

Ms. Ramsay explained that the Board's purview is the visual compatibility factors and preservation standards. Ms. Ramsay informed Ms. Gillart that the Board has been to the site. This is a part of what they do. But, what Ms. Gillart is saying is not a part of their purview. They have nothing to do with making streets wider.

Mr. Merriman said the Board cannot tell the petitioner that he cannot build there because the street is not wide enough.

Ms. Gillart said she was not saying that the petitioner cannot build here because the street is not wide enough. She understands that this Board cannot

widen the street.

Ms. Ramsay asked Ms. Gillart what is her request.

Ms. Gillart said, pointing to an area, this is the elevation. She wants the architect to give her a little more details whether the elevation will be built right next to the sidewalk.

Ms. Ramsay answered yes.

Ms. Gillart asked if there will be two feet of green space.

Ms. Ramsay answered no.

Ms. Gillart said if there is one foot of green space, the architect would be able to plant some trees there.

Ms. Ramsay advised Ms. Gillart that the Board does not review landscaping.

Ms. Gillart said she was aware that this Board does not review landscaping; all she is trying to do is to make a special request. Maybe the architect will consider their request as he has said he is trying to be a good neighbor. If he can have a recess of one or two feet and plant some trees here.

Ms. Ramsay informed Ms. Gillart that she would personally have to talk with the architect about this. This Board cannot compel the architect to have green space.

Dr. Williams told Ms. Gillart that she might want to talk with the Park and Tree Commission regarding the tree planting.

Mr. Dana Stephens came forward and stated that he lives at 224 West Huntingdon Street. Mr. Stephens said he wanted to clarify what Ms. Gillart was saying. He said basically, Ms. Gillart was trying to give more proximity between their house. The front of their house is approximately 35 feet away. If you are on the east side of Barnard Street it is 65 feet. The road here is very narrow. He believes that aesthetically it will impact where they live.

Ms. Ramsay informed Mr. Stephens that the Board understood this. But there is nothing in the ordinance that allows them to do anything about this.

Mr. Stephens stated that he understood this, but he guessed the facade will make it dark. He knew this, but just wanted to have it heard that aesthetically it is a little close.

Ms. Gillart said she knew that the architect does not want to hear her opinion, as he is looking the other way.

Ms. Ramsay advised Ms. Gillart that her comments should be addressed to the Board and not the architect.

Ms. Gillart said she just wanted the architect to be reminded that the entire development has a visual effect. This is an impact on them. She said she wants the architect and the owner to remember that when he shows the property to a buyer in the future, no one will want to buy the property facing Huntingdon Street. She said the person will say I might as well be looking into the neighbors' bedroom. Why do I want to buy this house? She wanted to remind the owner that it is for his benefit as well as theirs.

Mr. Ron Melander resides at 517 Tattnall Street. He said he noticed that there is a discussion about three feet on the other side that was being given to the neighbor. As far as he knows this is not built on the property line. He knows where the zero lot line area is, but what about the idea of sliding the building down one foot; not for trees, but for foundation planting some sort of greenery between the masonry building and sidewalk. One foot of any kind of vegetation would soften the entire look.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with the staff's comments for a continuance. They have not seen the newly revised plans. Additionally, they were of the opinion that a lot of the window surrounds and detailing were more traditional of a wood frame construction. But now that they have been simplified, she believes they are still stucco. Ms. Meunier said he HSF is in agreement with this; however, they do not agree with the stucco columns that are being proposed for the porch and the rear. It has been clarified that bi-fold shutters will be on the rear windows.

Ms. Meunier said with regard to height and mass, they are okay with the hip roof, but do feel that it is very tall for the height of the rest of the building in proportion. In looking at the model, they feel that when looking at the elevation of building, the roof is very tall. It is almost as tall as one of the stories above. It is eight (8) foot – six (6) inches or eight (8) foot – nine (9) inches and each story is ten (10) foot. Therefore, they believe the slope could be reduced a little on this hip roof. To mimic what Mr. Melander said, they suggest that to mitigate some of the issues that maybe they can shift the building in its placement on the lot to reduce some of the impacts that the neighbors are expressing.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry wanted to know if the Board has the authority to ask the petitioner to move the building.

Mr. Engle said no. All the buildings on Huntingdon Street are right at the side. Therefore, where is the line of continuity issue?

Ms. McClain said the staff recommended a continuance as there are too many issues with Part II.

Mr. Engle stated that he believes they can approve height and mass, but continue Part II.

Ms. Ramsay said that the HSF recommended that the roof be reduced.

Mr. Howington agreed with the HSF. The type of house seems a little high. Most of the other neighborhood houses have a lower pitch. He is in agreement that the stucco pattern be reconsidered as it is not in style with the rest of the house as well; especially on the bay windows.

Ms. Ramsay said also there is some inconsistency with the drawings as well.

Ms. Simpson said the roof is included in Part I. Therefore, she assumed the Board is discussing Part I.

Mr. Howington confirmed that they were talking about Part I and the stucco part would be considered under Part II. With regards to Part I, the bays facing the rear of the building, he believes that the north and south windows appear to be too close to the end of building. He would like for the petitioner to restudy this.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Howington if he was talking about the second floor windows on the rear elevation .

Mr. Howington answered yes.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Howington if he was saying that the windows need to move down.

Mr. Howington stated that on the previous submittal they were in the center of the bedroom. But now they placed them over to align with the backset window. They seem a little too close to the edge of the building.

Dr. Williams said the windows do not align with the French doors below them. He said the windows being talked about are the ones above the masonry.

Mr. Engle said the shutter on the left is exactly at the corner. The one on the right is about one foot a way.

Dr. Williams said the right-hand window aligns with the window below it in every case. He asked Mr. Howington if he was saying that the previous consideration of this design the windows were different.

Mr. Howington stated that the windows on the plan were shown more to the right. But, in the elevation they were still shown this way. However, he is concerned that the shutters are too close to the edge of the building.

Mr. Gay said the shutters are bi-fold.

Dr. Williams asked if the windows are a part of height and mass.

Mr. Engle said the window openings are a part of height and mass.

Ms. Simpson said the staff is fine with the roof's pitch and so is she.

Mr. Engle said if they flatten it

Mr. Howington said do not flatten it, just bring it down.

Mr. Engle said it is right on line with the bay.

Dr. Williams asked if the Board could pass Part I with some conditions.

Ms. Ramsay answered yes.

Dr. Williams said it appears that Part II has too many issues.

Mr. Gay said if they look at some of examples given where there are bay windows, none have a high pitched roof. You don't see a roof at all from the street.

Ms. Ramsay said the petitioner would have to ask for the continuance for Part II. The Board is considering passing Part I with conditions.

Mr. Cramer asked for a continuance to the meeting of October 10, 2012 for Part II – Design Detail.

Ms. Ramsay asked the Board to visit this neighborhood and study the roof lines in this area.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for new construction, Part I, Height and Mass with the condition that the roof pitch on the main building and bays be lowered and the upper left-hand rear windows be shifted to match the upper right-hand rear windows - PASS

Vote Results

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

Board Action:

Continue the petition for new construction Part II, Design Details, at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

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

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. She explained that the petitioner is requesting approval for new construction Part I – Height and Mass of a four story 40 unit hotel structure on the property at 304 East Bryan Street. There is an existing one-story historic structure on the property and will remain and be incorporated into the hotel. The petitioner has provided a model that is on display today. Ms. Ward said this proposed structure was actually previously approved in 2006.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends continuance of Part I Height and Mass to address the following:

1. Restudy the proposed double house form fronting Bryan Street;
2. Restudy the four-story structure with three-story porch on Bryan street;
3. Restudy the four-story structure on Lincoln Street that steps back;
4. Provide distinctive exterior visual expression of the top floor of the portion of the building exceeding three stories in height as required for commercial buildings;
5. Restudy the visual expression of the floor heights along Lincoln Street;
6. Restudy the two-story brick porch on Lincoln Street façade.

Mr. Gay asked if there are actual entrances on Bryan Street or if all is façade.

Ms. Ward answered that they are entrances into a corridor.

Dr. Henry said the staff's recommendations are very heavy –duty recommendations for change.

Ms. Ward explained that the building form is the main standard that staff feels is not met. This has rippled down into other areas of the proposal.

Mr. Merriman said that when the staff says making the top story different, are they talking about the shape of the windows.

Ms. Ward said there needs to be some kind of distinguishing factor. The petitioner has had the staff's recommendations since last week. The petitioner and staff met last week and talked about the recommendations. The petitioner has come up with some potential solutions. The ordinance is not specific about what the distinguishing element should be, but she believes that in order to meet the building form requirement that the petitioner needs to choose a building form from this area to show the fourth floor to be really a gable with dormers. This is something that the petitioner is considering to do.

Mr. Gay asked if all of the façade will be stucco. He realized that they are not considering design detail today, but the three-story building next to the historic building next to the historic building you would think that it would be wood. But he does not believe that it is wood.

Ms. Ward stated that if she recalls from the previous approval and the applicant can speak to this during his comment, the darker areas were to be brick because the historic warehouse structure that is here is brick, the structure on Bay Street is brick, and the new construction next to this is brick. Therefore, the darker color structures were initially approved as brick and the lighter colors were stucco to help provide some diversity on the exterior.

Ms. Simpson asked that on the fourth-story if the height of the floor only has to be eight feet because it is residential in nature.

Ms. Ward read that the residential height standards say "exterior expression of the height of the first story or second story should not be less than eleven (11) feet. The exterior expression of the height of each story above the second story should not be less than ten (10) feet." Ms. Ward said on the top floor the exterior expression is being called eight feet, but it has a four (4) foot seven (7) inch parapet. Therefore, she believes it has a visual expression that is taller than eight (8) feet. She would not ask the petitioner to increase the height.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Ward if she was, therefore, saying that visually it appears to be eight (8) feet; but it is not.

Ms. Ward explained that the petitioner has eight feet listed on their floor-to-floor height, but the standards say a minimum of ten (10) feet. But, this is for the visual expression.

Ms. Simpson asked if the petitioner is meeting the standard.

Ms. Ward guessed that the petitioner might need to raise it four inches to be ten (10) feet floor-to-floor height if they want to consider the top of the parapet to the bottom of the floor.

Mr. Engle assumed that they were not talking about any roof HVAC that is not shown on the drawings.

Ms. Ward said this could be clarified with the applicant as she is not sure.

Mr. Engle said if they are talking about height and mass then it turns out that there are a bunch of compressors or units sitting on the roof. These are flat roofs.

Ms. Ward said the petitioner is saying this is totally hidden. Therefore, the petitioner needs to clarify this.

Mr. Howington said that the Sanborn map shows no setback on the old historic Sanborn map. This seems like it is on the last previous approval where this seems more consistent with the large scale development. He is not sure this was a part of the requirements of the last submittal.

Ms. Ward answered that she is not sure. She said in reviewing the prior approval and proposal, there was not a lot of discussion in the staff's report or the minutes about this. She believes the old standards were that at every 60 feet, you had to do something different. But, it did not exactly tell you what this was. Therefore, the recesses may have been a part of this.

Mr. Howington believes now the standards call for no setbacks.

Ms. Ward said that staff is recommending approval of the setbacks as proposed because a lot of the buildings within this ward are actually detached structures. Therefore, she believes the recesses help to reflect this as opposed to areas such as Gordon Row where you would have a complete solid wall against a street. But, here you actually have breaks between buildings. As she has said, she believes the recesses help to provide compatibility.

Dr. Williams said unless you take Bay Street, which is immediately to the north, as its context as opposed to the residential area. The commercial building lot line is no setbacks which were the historic pattern for commercial art factory.

Ms. Ward explained that a lot of it is gone now. She said, pointing to an area, that this is new construction; a detached structure is here and a detached structure is here.

Mr. Engle asked that in the future if the staff will check the submission requirements because he often have a hard time with the drawings. He said none of the plans label the streets and north is upside down. Consequently it took him a long time to get oriented on these things. The streets are not labeled, therefore, he could not figure out where Bryan Street was located. You might think that Bryan Street is at the bottom of the page, but it is not because north is south. It was a little hard for him to get oriented on this.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Gonzalez said he would give a brief history on their petition so that the Board would be able to understand the context of where they have been, where they are today, and how they are trying to respond to some of the staff's concerns. He said he will also point out some of the reasons why certain things were done and why they still think they should be done in that manner.

Mr. Gonzalez said one of the unique things about this property is it is in a ward that is delineated by the more traditional residential architectural to the east. But, of course, they have the parking structure to the south, Hunter McClean is on the corner, which has more than six stories. Therefore, this is somewhat a hybrid site. Also, as an incredibly unique zoning in that everything that has been referenced with regards to three-story would normally apply if this had been zoned in that same fashion, but it was not. This was zoned for four stories. In essence the way this has been discussed in the past, is that this is a transitional piece of property. It was zoned this way when his clients purchased the property.

Mr. Gonzalez explained that when they originally designed the building, they designed it always as the second phase to the hotel which is immediately to the north. It was dated 2006. In 2007, everything in the world came crashing down and this was immediately stopped. However, an incredible amount of effort was originally put into this project. They had numerous meetings with the neighborhood. A lot of what is shown in these plans is a reflection of all this input. Therefore, in light of this they are agreeable to most of the items that the staff has pointed out. They want to show the Board some of this, but at the same time, he wanted to point out a few of items that they have a little issue with.

Mr. Gonzalez said they are aware that the corner building is a contributing structure. It remains and was renovated in the first phase between the completion of the first hotel and where they are today. He showed the homes that Ms. Ward pointed out in the ward. He pinpointed the hotel that is immediately to the north; they all are familiar with the parking structure. Pointing to an area, Mr. Gonzalez said in this elevation over here is the existing residential building that Ms. Ward pointed out. One of the things that was requested of them by the neighbors in terms of how they transition this because if the Board notices on the opposite diagonal of this corner over here, Hunter-McClean is a much taller structure even than the hotel property. How do they transition this with the understanding that it is an allowable four-story structure? He explained that what they did at the neighbors request was to reconfigure the site so that the component of the property mimics the scale as accurately as possible.

Mr. Gonzalez explained that as Ms. Ward has pointed out, the stoops were lowered and they have new regulations regarding the stoops. They also have existing issues which require the stoops to be level with the doors; certain things were in the current code that could not be matched up to the historic scale. Mr. Gonzalez said as they proceeded along, they were dealing with the four-story structure. He said the area that Ms. Ward pointed out is

how do they address this section as a reflection of something that would not be necessarily four stories because there is no precedence for this in this ward as there is no four-story zoning in this ward. To the extent that they could, they took from other areas of the City and blended it.

Mr. Gonzalez said he wanted to show the Board a scheme in response to Ms. Ward's comments where they believe they can accommodate this. He said, pointing to another section, said they have a four-story but they expressed it in a way at the time and at their previous negotiations in terms of how the site was developed that they could make it appear to read three stories by a projection. A scale rendering was issued so you would perceive it as a three-story structure and not really the four stories that were behind. This was done intentionally. Mr. Gonzalez said that Ms. Ward has asked them to reinterpret how they deal with the bottom of this. They have no real objection to this. He said Ms. Ward pointed out the scaling of this building as it did not necessarily reflect a more traditional vertical element that you would see in commercial buildings as you turn the corner. This was done on purpose. This was done at the request of several persons. The idea was that they had a one-story building, the original 1840 warehouse, and the taller hotel beyond. The idea was to do a facade immediately at the street and then it would step back so that it would basically transition to scale between the 1840 tall structure and the single-story structure. This was done on purpose. He explained that they could easily bring it all up and make it more commercial, but they still do not believe that it is the right solution. This is the reason it was done. They think it is a valid argument and they certainly kept the detailing in the same manner as the warehouse structure.

Mr. Gonzalez said based on the staff's comments, they went ahead and redesigned the roof significantly and creating a dormer affect. Still achieving what they need to do programmatically and also give the appearance of a third-story. They believe this achieves what Ms. Ward requested. They had no objection to doing this. A comment was received regarding unifying the stoops. He said that they studied both ways when they presented this to the Board in the previous submission. Mr. Gonzalez said at that time everybody liked the separate better and they do as well. They believe it reinforces the forms a little better. He said they also modified the low level to reflect a structure that is more in keeping with Ms. Ward's comments. This was a matter of taste and they had no objections one way or another with this. However, they do feel strongly that the stepping is essential. They began to correlate more of the lines to reinforce the scale of the buildings beside it. However, they did not change the stepping. They simply reinforced the horizontal lines, more in keeping with the adjacent structures, to give it more strength. Mr. Gonzalez said in essence, this is how they feel they can address the questions of staff. He also wanted the Board to hear their thoughts with regard to how they approached the design and why they felt a certain way about some of the things that they would prefer not to do. They are not programmatic, but they feel that it is not a better solution.

Mr. Engle said he thought the staff's objection was that there are no three-story porches in this area; not the lower level. He asked the staff for

clarification regarding this matter.

Ms. Ward answered that it is a combination of both. If the petitioner can come up with a design solution that works, she believes it would be alright. Of course there are no four-story buildings. Therefore, there are no three-story porches because the buildings in this area are not this tall. The two-story porch that they have is on a two-story building. Therefore, you can say that it is full height and full width for that building. However, typically it would be on a foundation, about thirty (30) inches.

Mr. Gonzalez said in response to the question: they could easily make it a two-story porch and bring the scale back down. It does not change the ultimate scale of the building. However, they could do this if it would read better. However, the Board could judge for themselves, but he did not believe that this would be a better solution. If this is what the Board would like, they will not object to it. This could easily be accomplished and does not effect the building in terms of use, program, or anything else.

Mr. Gonzalez said, however, they just felt that this would be a better way to handle the awkwardness of the fact that they have a four-story zoning and are trying to be in keeping with residential scale and at the same time transitioning into this higher commercial that is adjacent to it. He is willing to accommodate the present Board and staff in terms of whatever else they can do to make this happen. However, he wanted the Board to appreciate their previous efforts.

Ms. McClain asked Mr. Gonzalez what changes were made at the bottom, as the changes are hard to see.

Ms. Ramsay explained that the staff's recommendation was for a continuance. She senses from the Board that they would not be able to vote today on what is being presented.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that Ms. Ramsay was absolutely correct. However, they believe it is better to get the Board's input. They do understand the Board's thinking and feelings on the petition. Therefore, when they meet with staff, they will be able to communicate with some understanding of how they want this project to be. They do not want to guess what are the Board's wishes. If the Board will indulge him to get some comments, he will move out of the way so the continuance will be able to go on. He is not looking for a vote today.

Mr. Engle said when he looks at the porch, he feels it should be on the side elevation of a house, not on a street elevation.

Mr. Gonzalez, pointing to a section, asked Mr. Engle: is it this one here?

Mr. Engle answered: no; the three-story porch. Every building he can think of with a porch like this, is a side elevation porch and not a front porch.

Dr. Williams stated that there is a two-story full height, full width porch one block to the east on this same street.

Mr. Engle stated, but this is three porches.

Dr. Williams said it is a two-story house with a two-story full galleried porch across the facade. Therefore, he believes the question would be: would the Board rather have a smaller porch with more of the facade shown or if this is a good compromise between mitigating the four-story height?

Mr. Gonzalez said Dr. Williams's statement could not have been stated better, as this is exactly what he is dealing with.

Mr. Gonzalez responded in an answer to Ms. McClain's question, pointing to an area, said: this is the one that was proposed. Now, look at the middle. This is what was revised.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Gonzalez if they changed the three-story building at all.

Mr. Gonzalez answered that they did not change the one with the three-stories. They changed some detailing on the bottom.

Ms. Simpson wanted to know what was changed.

Mr. Gonzalez answered that they basically changed the columns to read that it is a straight wood porch all the way down the street. They do not feel this is a good solution. They were just trying something. The whole real issue is what Dr. Williams pointed out, which is: what is the best way to reconcile this issue of the porch for a structure that doesn't really fit the mold.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Gonzalez if he considered making it look more like the skinny two-bay elements: four-story, two-bay.

Mr. Gonzalez asked Dr. Williams if he was saying "get rid of porch altogether?"

Dr. Williams answered yes, and repeat what was done on that one.

Mr. Gonzalez replied normally he would not do so, but if the Board insists, they will certainly do it.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the Board will not insist on anything.

Mr. Howington said his concern is that the consistency of bays seems to be off. He believes that Ms. Ward mentioned that in this neighborhood they have a three and a five bay. Mr. Howington said he does not know how the rest of the Board feels, but the two-bay appears out of place to him. He was not sure how the petitioner would fix this.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that it would be nothing to it. They can easily accommodate the plan to do this if they go to a three and a five bay if the Board felt this would be better. He explained that the reason they did not is because this creates a more lively rhythm.

Mr. Howington stated that he appreciates the fact that they tried to break this up. He also appreciates the fact that the petitioner tried to step the commercial building, but his comment is that he does not believe this is consistent with anything.

Mr. Gonzalez said: by way of suggestion, if the Board feels the stepping is inappropriate, they have no objection. This does not hurt the project.

Dr. Henry told Mr. Gonzalez that he is not an architect, but anything that he can do to meet the staff's recommendations would please him.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that he can meet all of the staff's recommendations, but his only question is: how does the Board want him to deal with the issue of stepping the building? He believes they have done what the staff has requested. They can meet the requirement of a three bay and a five bay. They can make it uniform without the stepping. The only thing left for them to try to resolve is whether the Board thinks it is a better way to solve this than to going to a two-story porch? If the Board can give him some feedback on this, he would be finished for today.

Mr. Engle said he was not sure if the fourth floor wants to look like it is an addition? All over Savannah, they have raised stories and if you look carefully you can tell it is a raised story. May be the fourth floor does not want to be an exact replica of the lower three, but it wants to appear that it was added at a later date. This means that a beltcourse of some type would be above the porch and you might have different fenestration on the fourth floor to make it appear as a later addition to an earlier building.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that he wanted to be clear. He believes Mr. Engle's position is to do a traditional two story-story porch and then let the third story line be the terminus with something else on top. He asked if he was representing this correctly.

Ms. Ramsay stated that this is one Board member's suggestion.

Dr. Williams said he does not believe the Board has to be so indebted to the past to say well there is no precedent for a two-bay building. Sometimes irregularity, such as something that seems almost inconsistent, are endearing details that they celebrate in other cities, as opposed to everything looking like it was stamped out by historic reproduction machine. Consequently, he believes there is a possibility that the two-bay could survive even if it does not have a direct precedent on the ward.

Dr. Williams stated that the historic building's parapet is sometimes called a boom-toe front. This is done is to make the facade look bigger. He was wondering if this element could be incorporated into the adjacent building a the base of the stepping.

Mr. Gonzalez said it would be two steps.

Dr. Williams said: right; focus on the parapet and don't be shy about letting it read as a parapet. Then whereas up the street it might come up to the height of the neighboring 1840s warehouse.

Ms. Ramsay cautioned the Board that they are getting close to designing the project.

Dr. Williams said, however, there were issues and concerns about the compatibility of height and mass on the stepped structure. The entire point is to give guidance and this is why he is suggesting something that has not been suggested.

Mr. Gonzalez said he appreciated all the comments from the Board and asked for a continuance.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Continue the petition for new construction, Part I, Height and Mass, at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

Agenda B (Items 16-20 will be heard no earlier than 4:00pm in sequential order)

17. [Petition of Dewberry Architects Inc. | 12-000373-COA | 145 Montgomery Street | Demolition and New Construction, Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Mr. Dewberry, Architect for Debwerry Architects, Inc., was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for demolition of the Chatham County Jail and new construction, Part I, Height and Mass, of the Chatham County Courthouse Expansion building on the south end of the property at 145 Montgomery Street. The new building is a monumental structure with a contemporary design expression and will maintain a principal point of entry on Oglethorpe Avenue. Ms. Ward said the petitioner has provided a nice model that really gives an expanded view of the district that shows the context.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for the demolition of the Chatham County Jail as requested. Staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass with the following conditions to be addressed prior to submittal of Part II, Design Details:

- a. Submit the General Development Plan for Site Plan Review and address the building- related items prior to Part II submittal.
- b. Introduce vertical elements into the glass projection on the north facade.
- c. Introduce more voids within the ground floor of the glass projection on the north facade.
- d. Refine and lower the mechanical rooftop screen.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dewberry stated that this was his first time coming before the Historic Review Board. It is a privilege to be here. Everyone has been tremendously wonderful to work for, work with, and has been very helpful to get to this process today.

Mr. Dewberry said they completely concur with the staff's comments. The north elevation requires significantly more work and they are continuing to work on this to make it more compatible with the rest of the building. They continue to move forward and refine the details of the elevations; the window treatments; and these sort of things. When they come back, they will be more refined than what the Board sees today. But, they have no issue with what was presented to them in terms of the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Engle said the model shows the HVAC on the roof which does not agree with the elevation. The model shows the HVAC spread out horizontally and this looks like they are vertically. Can this be reduced?

Mr. Dewberry said this can be reduced. They have been back and forth with the engineers in terms of the equipment that is going on the roof. At the time the elevations were done, the cooling towers was significantly taller. They

have been working on getting shorter ones. They are also looking at raising the stone parapet. He said that by raising the stone parapet and reducing the screen wall they can give the appearance of it being shorter than it is. However, they are working aggressively to bring this down themselves. They concur with the comment that the screen walls and the elevations are too tall and they are trying to get the engineers to work with them on this.

Mr. Merriman said: the cooling tower is not a mechanical room?

Mr. Dewberry said correct.

Mr. Engle said: overall, this is exciting and he thinks this is a great project compared to what is here now. He said the view from the southwest, the first floor windows [maybe this is just because it is a rendering and he has not seen the details] seem a little out of character with the rest of the elevation. Maybe there will be more delineation, but they are being asked for a blanket approval.

Mr. Dewberry asked Mr. Engle which section was he referring to.

Mr. Engle said the first floor windows.

Mr. Dewberry said they are working on this. At one point, there was a lot of discussion about whether there should be visibility inside the courthouse at the street level. At this point, they enlarged the windows. They are actually going in the other direction now as they think the vertical windows should go all the way down to the ground so that a very strong rhythm is moving all the way down the facade. Also, the functions that are going on behind there are really not something that you want to have that level of visibility from the street into the building. The next iteration that they have done is actually looking at these coming all the way down, just as they have in the middle portion, which will be stone. Mr. Dewberry said he believes they are on the same page with this in terms of where they are going.

Mr. Engle explained that the point is, if they approve this now, they would be approving the openings. He believes they would be introducing the horizontality when everything else is vertical.

Mr. Dewberry said they agree with Mr. Engle.

Dr. Williams said: the north elevation, the big window wall, image eleven (11). He said he believed it is optimistic to say that the reflection will be sky when the old court is right across the street. He said a factor to really think about is when he sees this what comes to mind is the modest buildings that have sheer glass walls that are purposely meant to reflect something significant in front of them. There is a great example in France of an old Roman Temple and a modest building across the street. However, the building across the street from this is not that interesting. He gathers this is to suggest something more transparent and accessible as opposed to a fortified courthouse.

Mr. Dewberry said it was also the idea of the two main blocks of the building being reflective of something that is more traditional, mass stone that reflects the historic grid of the City; and then the glass piece was an appendage onto the back of it. This has evolved over time; originally they had hoped that it would just cantilever out of the upper levels and be open at the bottom. The program has expanded and now it goes all the way down to the ground which is making them rethink this. But, this is what the original origin was.

Dr. Williams said his concern is the wall of glass, because when you look at it all you will see is the reflection of the big building 50 feet a way. Even if there was some kind of partition in front of it, the reflection will still be there. Therefore, he was wondering if there is something that can be done that is more kindly done on the south side, although they don't have the solar shading issues to worry about, but something that might break up the reflection. Dr. Williams said he believes it is great to have the contemporary quality, he is just opposed to the more traditional masonry quality of it. In this situation, there are so many great buildings in Savannah that it is a pity there wasn't one right across the street, in which case this would have been fine, but unless there are plans for this courthouse that they do not know about.

Mr. Dewberry said they will be reskinning the courthouse.

Mr. Howington believes there is a rendering of this on page 25.

Mr. Dewberry said a hint is only shown here. They are looking to reskin the existing courthouse.

Dr. Williams stated that one of the techniques might be to alternate reflective with less reflective panels, something that is not pure reflection, as well as the suggestion that staff has made about more articulation such as on the other side. He suggested that this factor be weighed into the design.

Mr. Dewberry said this is a great comment as they have struggled with this back portion a lot and they are not there yet. But, they will take everybody's input and work real hard to get there.

Dr. Henry informed Mr. Dewberry that he feels they have done a splendid job with this. He believes that everyone on this Board agrees that this has been a rational and coherent presentation as well.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Dewberry that when he comes back to please include a rendering that shows site lines from different points. They ask for this when they have roof issues, especially if a parapet is being raised and lowering a cooling tower.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for new construction Part I, Height and Mass, with the following conditions to be addressed prior to submittal of Part II, Design Details:

- a. Submit the General Development Plan for Site Plan Review and address building-related items prior to Part II submittal.
- b. Introduce vertical elements into the glass projection on the north facade.
- c. Introduce more voids within the ground floor of the glass projection on the north facade. - PASS
- d. Refine and lower the mechanical rooftop screen/cooling tower.
- e. Restudy the first floor windows on the southwest corner to provide greater verticality.
- f. Reconsider reflectivity of glass and windows on the north elevation.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Keith Howington

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

Board Action:

Approve the petition for demolition of the Chatham County Jail as requested. - PASS

Vote Results

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

18. [Petition of Dawson Architects | 12-000377-COA | 126 West Bay Street | Amended Balconies](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Jennifer Deacon was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to change the previously approved balcony design for the fourth and fifth levels on the River Street (north) facade of the building at 126 West Bay Street. The proposed changes to the balcony design are the result of further development of the structural engineering required for the previously approved continuous balcony design and structural testing of the existing historic masonry at the north wall of the building. Given the size of the proposed full length balconies and the condition of the existing historic masonry at the north wall of the building, the structural engineering makes the continuous balconies impractical. The structural design involves removing large portions of the historic masonry and floor systems at the fourth and fifth levels in order to cantilever the balconies from inside the building.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval of the proposed amended balcony design for the north facade of the building at 126 West Bay Street because the individual balconies are visually compatible and meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

Mr. Engle said the Secretary of Interior's guidelines for replacement of missing historic features, particularly metal, say it is not recommended to create a false historical appearance by replacing architectural metal features based on insufficient historic, pictorial, and physical documentation. They know that from historical documentation that there were continuous balconies. In fact, they raised this issue thirteen (13) months ago when this was first done as it was a unique situation. It is the only building of this size that had full length continuous balconies on two stories. There are no balconies there now. How do you justify going from reconstructing what was there to putting up something that was never there at all? Isn't this creating a false historical

appearance? How do you use the Bohemian as a compatible example when it is a three year old building? What concerns him is that they are getting to the point that they are fantasy land. Someone is going to come along and say they are not usable balconies as they are only two feet deep. They are nothing like the original continuous balconies.

Dr. Williams said: could they apply this standard to the hotel that they looked at earlier that had stoops and staircases that are going nowhere? This gives a false sense of history.

Mr. Engle said it is a new building.

Ms. Michalak said she was not involved in the previous submittal, but it is staff's opinion, she believes the continuous balconies are actually a much more conjectural feature than individual balconies. The Secretary of Interior's Standard number 3 reads "each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such adding conjectural features or elements from other historical properties, will not be undertaken." She explained that "conjectural" is defined as "the formation or expression of an opinion or theory without sufficient evidence or proof." Therefore, in staff's opinion, the continuous balconies are actually a conjectural feature because they did not know what those balconies look like; yet, they are attempting to recreate them without sufficient pictorial proof.

Mr. Merriman informed Ms. Michalak that she knows they existed because of the Sanborn Map.

Ms. Michalak said: right, but to recreate them without knowing what they looked like, in staff's opinion, is more conjectural than individual balconies that they know didn't exist to begin with. The individual balconies that are in a modern design are actually more obvious that you are not trying to recreate something that was not there. She believes that a "conjectural feature" means that the designer would be saying that this is what they think was there or would have looked like if they were continuous balconies.

Ms. Simpson said, however, you knew that the original design was not a historic balcony.

Ms. Michalak said: this is right, but it was based on the continuous balcony change. She knew that this was approved previously. She also knows it was contingent upon being continuous. This is conjectural to say that they were continuous and this is what they might have looked like if they were. Ms. Michalak said her point is if they are going to call this one now conjectural, in her opinion this was more so.

Dr. Williams asked what were the materials of those continuous balconies on the Sanborn Map.

Ms. Michalak answered that it is the same exact materials.

Dr. Williams asked if there were iron balconies.

Ms. Michalak answered no.

Dr. Williams asked if the balconies were wood.

Ms. Michalak stated that the Sanborn Map indicates that the balconies were wood.

Mr. Engle said they were wood decking. There is no evidence.

Ms. Michalak said in this case, however, in staff's opinion, the continuous balconies could have been considered even more conjectural, where these are modern designs and are not pretending to be the continuous balconies.

Dr. Williams said this shows them that they are continuous, wood, and there is no indication of metal at all.

Ms. Ramsay said also that the decking was wood.

Ms. Michalak said there is no way to know this necessarily.

Dr. Williams said all they see from the Sanborn is that they are open face and made of wood.

Mr. Engle said it also shows the entire bridge on the front being made of wood and they know it is iron supports with the wood deck on it. All the bridges are shown as wood because they have wood planking on them.

Ms. Ramsay said she believes they all will agree that they do not know what the railing looks like.

Mr. Gay said they just do not know.

Mr. Engle said no, they don't; but they do know that they are continuous.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Deacon said she wanted to review their process and design of the balconies on this project. When this was originally presented, the only information that they had to go on was the information they found in the Sanborn Maps. Therefore, this design was an attempt to make it work with the requirements that their client had for this hotel. She said that beyond the structure requirements there are some priorities, or more like difficulties, that came along with this design as well in terms of how hotel users would be able to use these balconies. Security and safety between units were also to be considered along these continuous balconies. People could essentially climb from one balcony to another. Or, if panels were placed between balconies, could be dangerous if people did try to climb from one side to another.

Ms. Deacon said: but more important than this, they designed the balconies before they became involved with the structural engineer and his analysis of this wall, that the Board saw in some of the photographs they presented, the normal portion that they would have for brackets on the balcony in these photographs, a large portion of the bricks in this area do not exist anymore. These were pocketed directly above the area that would have been bracketing

for the balconies. Currently, there is only a single wythe of brick on any of these locations on those floors. This is a typical condition on both the fourth and fifth floors. Therefore, this really limited the structure design. Not only will they have to remove some of the masonry at all of the openings, there are close to 40 penetrations with steel beams along the masonry wall. Also, the beams have to come back eight (8) feet into the building to attach to another beam that would attach to the existing horizontally screwed walls. Consequently, they will probably lose a good bit of their original framing in the building as well as brick.

Ms. Deacon said they really did make an attempt to make the design work. They now no longer think it is the best solution for the building. They do feel that there are many examples of balconies that are compatible with what they have designed on River Street. They could possibly make a design that will work with the continuous balcony, but it would need to be only about twenty-four (24) inches deep. They are really limited by the structural capacity of those northern walls. Therefore, they feel this is the best solution to the problem at hand right now.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms Deacon: why did she make the newer design only twenty-four (24) inches deep?

Ms. Deacon stated that the new design is twenty-four (24) inches deep.

Mr. Engle said these are not really balconies.

Mr. Henry said he also questions why the balconies are so shallow.

Ms. Deacon said if the Board looks at the detail, previously the balconies were being cantilevered through the wall and carried onto the masonry walls on each side. Now, the balconies are being attached to the wall with the steel plate. Therefore, they are much more dependent on the strength of the brick in order to stay in place. The fewer people that you can get on the balcony, the less load you will have that will be affecting the structural capacity of the brick. Really, by limiting the size, they are limiting the load on those walls.

Mr. Merriman stated, therefore, the only thing holding the balcony onto the building is a plate anchored into the brick.

Ms. Deacon said the new design is completely based on the capacity of the brick.

Mr. Gay asked if the brackets under the balcony are structural.

Ms. Deacon stated that those are decorative balcony brackets. It is not shown in the diagram, but the places where they have the brackets are the places where the portion of the brick has been removed. Therefore, there is really not adequate bracing for any sort of structure.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Deacon if the safety engineer signed-off on this.

Ms. Deacon answered yes. She explained that they designed this with the engineer before bringing this back to the Board.

Dr. Henry wanted to know if the City Engineers have approved this.

Ms. Deacon answered no. They brought this to their engineers to come up with the design that would work. They wanted to bring it back before the Review Board before they move forward.

Dr. Henry said this sounds dangerous to him; but he realized this was not his territory.

Mr. Merriman agreed with Dr. Henry, but it is this Board's purview to just decide the visual features.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said now that the issue of integrity that has now come forward she would intend to agree with staff that, conjecturally, if you are putting a continuous balcony in that they did not know what it looked like, therefore they would be trying replicate a historic feature. Basically, they would be trying to put something back here that they did not know what it looked like, she personally believes that it would be better to put something here that is visually compatible as opposed to a guesstimate of what would have been here.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Meunier how she feels about the depth of the balcony.

Ms. Meunier answered that in terms of visual compatibility if they are functioning balconies, she does not know if she has any further comments on this.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle stated that he pulled up every photo that he was able to retrieve of River Street to show the balconies that existed historically. He wanted the Board to think about a couple of things because there are only a few continuous balconies that were shown. There were balconies with very little consistency. This bothered him. Now, there will be twenty-six balconies going back exactly symmetrically and it just wasn't that way historically. Everything was hodgepodge. Balconies were not as common then as they are today because they have been slapped up for the last 30 years. Every time something was converted to condos, they put balconies on it. There are many elevations here that no balconies are on at all.

Dr. Williams asked that the lower historic right balcony photo be shown again. He said the balcony looks regular to him.

Mr. Gay said there are quite a few balconies show here.

Mr. Engle asked the Board to look at the width of the balconies. They are much wider than the one window. He believes that picture 11 or 12 shows more balconies than the others. The Cotton Exchange row added a tremendous number of balconies. But take a look at the variation. They are much wider. The third balcony down is continuous. It crosses three bays; but there are a lot

of hodgepodes of things and the depth is functional. What bothers him is that they would be putting something here that they know was not here as they were continuous. They would be putting back balconies that are not as deep as any balconies originally were. They are somewhat like the grids that they put up to cover air conditioning units that stick out of windows. This is the death of them.

Mr. Engle said he believes it would be better not to put the balconies back at all. Why reconstruct something that they know isn't anything like what was here historically? This is not the Bohemian, which is a new building. He said he did not have a problem with the Bohemian, it is a new building. But, this building is a historic building and, therefore, they are treating it on a different standard than they do for new buildings. If they cannot reconstruct accurately, then don't reconstruct anything at all; because this is a reconstruction; it is not rehabilitation. They would be putting something here that does not exist.

Dr. Williams said if the balconies are not reconstructing what they know were here continuous; if they are not replicating historic style; they are not replicating historic depth; they tend not to be a new feature in light of what is on the roof. Therefore, he wonders if they are able to look at this through just one lense, treating them as reconstructions if they are a new feature. It is an historic building with a new feature on the roof. Dr. Williams explained that he was not saying the Board has to support this, but the way he thinks about it is looking at the reconstructions is the wrong concept. If they want them as reconstructions, then he agrees that that they should look like things that are three feet deep and may be a little wider. He does not know about making them random. If they look at each warehouse as individual buildings, he believes individually like the other photo, he thinks the set of balconies look like they are more regular.

Mr. Engle asked if this was done to the Pink House. This is a prime elevation; it is not a secondary elevation. They would be putting new features on a primary elevation. This is not the back, it is River Street. If it had a side, they could probably go along with the side, but they do not allow new features going on primary elevations.

Dr. Williams said the new feature on this building is actually on the roof. The entire point is for it not to be visible.

Mr. Engle said they have done their best to make it invisible.

Mr. Howington said the fact that they are only two feet deep is different than they would normally have been, as they would have been three feet deep and the fact that they have a more contemporary design. The balconies are removable without damaging the building. Does this help the fact that, obviously, this would be a new feature to the building?

Mr. Merriman said this would be like a reversible addition.

Mr. Engle stated that he does not believe that the average public will understand. They will think they are original.

Dr. Henry said he thought that when something new is put on a building, it is supposed to be shown that it is not original. Certainly, these balconies will do this.

Ms. Ramsay explained that what Mr. Engle is saying is that they would be adding something to a primary elevation.

Dr. Henry said to him, this would be another issue.

Mr. Engle said they just denied an apartment complex on Forsyth Park because it was putting a balcony that never existed on a historical prime elevation. Yet, they are now going to allow 26 balconies?

Dr. Henry said he thought the balconies existed.

Mr. Engle explained that the continuous balconies existed; not 26 individual balconies.

Mr. Merriman said these are balconies that they don't have any way of knowing how to re-create accurately. He believes that Mr. Engle may be right, although he was not convinced to start with, but the more they have talked about this, it would probably be better to leave the balconies off completely.

Dr. Williams said the Board has approved them having continuous balconies on previous consideration of this design. If the Board denies this design, could the petitioner go back to that design?

Ms. Ramsay said, yes.

Mr. Engle stated that this was to be a modern railing because they did not know what was there. It would be the right scale and the right size for the contemporary design. Then no one could confuse it. But, this is not feasible.

Ms. Deacon said they want to make a new proposal. They can go back to the original elevation that was approved if it was only twenty-four (24) inches deep and have essentially a very similar structural detail, if this is amenable to the Board

Ms. Ramsay said the Board originally approved the depth for 36 inches.

Mr. Gay said now it would be ornamental.

Dr. Williams said this would be more in keeping with the evident historic character of the building.

Mr. Engle said he could live with this because he believes that people will not confuse it with believing that it is historic when it is twenty-four (24) inches deep.

Ms. Simpson asked staff for their opinion regarding the new proposal coming now from the petitioner.

Ms. Michalak said that she does not support it.

Ms. Simpson asked her why she does not support it.

Ms. Michalak said she believes it makes it conjectural to put a continuous balcony here.

Mr. Gay said they know it was here at some point; therefore, it is not conjectural. It may look like it, but it is not.

Ms. Michalak said according to the Secretary of Interior's Standards it is a conjectural feature.

Mr. Engle asked where are they starting the copula on the hospital?

Ms. Michalak said in her opinion, the individual ones do not copy anything.

Mr. Gay said they do know that a continuous balcony was here at some point. They just do not know what it looked like. He believes what Mr. Engle is saying that if they go back to the full balcony and instead of making it thirty-six (36) inches, which would be as it probably was to begin with, make it twenty-four (24) inches then it would be obvious that this is not what was there initially; it is not historic.

Dr. Henry said, therefore, this is not conjectural.

Ms. Ward said she believes that they could all have different interpretations and different levels of interpreting the standards and this is okay. However, she does not believe that they can always find the same common ground or answer. Therefore, she believes they need to do what they think is best in accordance with how they interpret the standards. They can have different levels of distinguishing elements from historic to new. It can be subtle or it can be extreme. There are a variety of levels between this. This is something that they may not come to an agreement on.

Dr. Henry stated that it may be a good idea to go with what the petitioner has proposed.

Dr. Williams questioned: which proposal.

Dr. Henry said the twenty-four (24) inches deep, the separate balconies.

Dr. Williams asked the separate balconies, not the continuous balconies?

Dr. Henry stated that he is aware that the Board does not consider safety issues, but he is sympathetic to the security issues.

Dr. Williams said he is concerned about the effect of the continuous balcony that when it is factored in whether the wall would be strong enough to support the twenty-four (24) inches deep balcony. From the visual compatibility point, this is not a reconstruction. If it was a reconstruction, it would be one thing. It is a modern balcony which would be a more imposing feature on the façade and have a bigger impact in terms of visuals. He said he respects Mr. Engle's concern about falsifying history, but he is also concerned that in a sense, these will dominate the façade and potentially detract from the ability to read the historic fabric.

Dr. Henry asked Dr. Williams what is his preference.

Dr. Williams answered that the Board cannot deny the petitioner to build balconies as they can do so. The petitioner already has a proposal where they have been approved to build continuous balconies. If he had a choice of the three feet deep continuous balconies that the Board originally approved and these balconies that are contemporary in design or the smaller more easily reversible twenty-four (24) inch deep cosmetic balconies, perhaps less functional balconies. The other is not a reproduction, they are not an interpretation. They have two modern interpretations of balconies. One comes close to what was here, but it is not a reconstruction. If it was, he would be leaning towards it.

Mr. Gay said the petitioner cannot do what was approved because the structural engineers have said that they cannot put up a thirty-six (36) inch continuous balcony. Therefore, this is really not approved because the petitioner cannot do it.

Ms. Ramsay said obviously the Board has two different ideas about this. She believes the best way to resolve this is for someone to make a motion and the Board vote on it.

Board Action:

Approval of the proposed amended balcony design for the north façade of the building at 126 West Bay Street because the individual balconies are visually compatible and meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. - PASS

Vote Results

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

19. [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](#)

See comments and motion for this petition under Item III. "Sign Posting."

20. [Petition of Becky Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects, PC | 12-000384-COA | 22 Habersham Street | Rehabilitation and Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

NOTE: Ms. Simpson and Mr. Gay left the meeting at 6:25 p.m.

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to enclose and extend an existing rear porch on the east façade (facing the interior courtyard) of the residence at 22 Habersham Street.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval to enclose and extend the non-historic porch addition, with the condition that the wall sconce be submitted to staff for review prior to construction, because it is visually compatible, meets the standards, and is minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Lynch thanked the staff for their review and suggestions. They concur with the staff's suggestions.

Ms. Lynch reported that both the Historic Savannah Foundation and Bee Hive Foundation hold protective covenants and easements on the property. They worked with both agencies to refine this design to their approval before submitting it to the Historic District Board of Review. They are hopeful that this will make it a more agreeable proposal as well.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that just as the petitioner said, the HSF did work with the petitioner and have approved everything on their level for their easement. It is all in compliance.

Board Action:

Approval to enclose and extend the nonhistoric porch addition, with the condition that the wall

sconce be submitted to Staff for review prior to construction, because it is visually compatible, meets the standards, and is minimally visible from the public right-of-way. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

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

21. [Petition of Gary Sanders | 12-000408-COA | 443 Whitaker Street \(101 West Gordon Lane\) | Rehabilitation and Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to extend an existing porch in an interior courtyard and relocate existing French doors to an existing masonry opening at 443 Whitaker Street, which historically, was the carriage house for 101-103 West Gordon Street.

Ms. Michalak explained that some background information that was stated in the staff's report of 2007 was found to be inaccurate. She stated that on May 9, 2007 the Historic District Board of Review approved an addition to the first floor of the carriage house extending it to the courtyard. It was not constructed in 2007 as the Staff Report indicates. The project indicated in 2007 was, in fact, a project similar to the one proposed today where the existing porch is extended. However, this project was never constructed and therefore, there was some confusion. But, the existing porch still remains nonhistoric. According to the 1973 Sanborn map, the existing porch did not yet exist. There was some sort of one story structure in this location at this time.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval to extend an existing interior courtyard porch 16 feet six inches (16'-6") and relocate existing French doors because they are visually compatible, meet the standards, and are minimally visible from the public right-of-way, with the following conditions:

1. The existing relocated French doors must be set back not less than three inches (3") from the exterior surface of the façade of the building.
2. The existing relocated French doors must be constructed of one of the permitted materials as described here within.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Sanders stated that he is the architect for the project. He explained that they are attempting to match the railing that is already here. The French doors are from the carriage house. They were on site already.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the doors are wood.

Mr. Sanders answered yes. He does not know if the doors are original, but they match the ones that have been here for a long time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval to extend an existing interior courtyard porch 16 feet six inches (16'-6") and relocate existing French doors because they are visually compatible, meet the standards, and are minimally visible from the public right-of-way, with the following conditions:

- PASS

Conditions:

1. The existing relocated French doors must be set back not less than three inches (3") from the exterior surface of the façade of the building.
2. The existing relocated French doors must be constructed of one of the permitted materials as described here within.

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

22. [Amended Petition of Jason Mathis for Durban Development, LLC | H-11-4458\(S\)-2 | 610 MLK Jr. Blvd | Staff Review - Existing Windows and Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 610 MLK Jr. Blvd. Amended 4458-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet H-11-4458-2 Amended COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Amended Petition of John L. Deering for Greenline Architecture | H-11-4522\(S\)-2 | 201 Papy St. | Staff Review - New Construction](#)

Attachment: [COA - 201 Papy Street - H-11-4522-2 Amended 8-29-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 Papy St. H-11-4522-2 Amended.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Amended Petition of Jamie Durrence | H-12-4599\(S\)-2 | 1 W. Liberty St. | Staff Review - Awning/Windows/Rehab/Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4599\(S\)-2 Amended 1 W. Liberty St..pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4599\(S\)-2 1 W. Liberty St..pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of Gary Sanders | H-12-4701\(S\)-2 | 125 W. Gordon Lane | Staff Review - Roof Repair/Existing Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4701\(S\)-2 COA 125 W. Gordon Lane.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4701\(S\)-2 - 125 W. Gordon Lane.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Marchese Construction | 12-000049-COA | 234 MLK Jr. Blvd | Staff Review - Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 234 MLK Jr. Blvd.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 12-000049-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Victory Sign Industries | 12-000050-COA | 111 W. Congress St. | Staff Review - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 111 West Congress St. 12-000050.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 111 W. Congress St. - 12-000050-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 12-000052-COA | 209 W. Congress St. | Staff Review - Revised Fence layout](#)

Attachment: [COA - 209 W. Congress St. Amended 8-9-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 12-000052-COA Amended 8-9-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Doug Patten | 12-000122-COA | 4 E. Bay St. | Staff Review - Roof Replacement](#)

Attachment: [COA - 4 E. Bay Street 12-000122 8-15-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 4 E. Bay Street 12-000122-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Suzanne H. Fricks | 12-000136-COA | 424 E. Liberty St. | Staff Review - Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 424 E. Liberty St. 12-000136-COA 8-15-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 424 E. Liberty St. 12-000136-COA 8-15-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Paul Miller | 12-000164-COA | 224 Houston St. | Staff Review - Stucco Repair/Repointing](#)

Attachment: [COA - 224 Houston St. 12-000164-COA 8-16-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 224 Houston St. 12-000164-COA 8-16-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 12-000165-COA | 232 W. St. Julian St. | Staff Review - Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 232 West St. Julian Street - 12-000165-COA 8-16-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 232 W. St. Julian St. - 12-000165-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Jennifer Jenkins for Coffee Fox, LLC | 12-000179-COA | 102 W. Broughton St. | Staff Review - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 102 W. Broughton St. 12-000179-COA 8-17-12.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 12-000179-COA 102 W. Broughton St..pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Keith Woods for Commonwealth Construction of GA, LLC | 12-000206-COA | 214-222 Houston St. | Staff Review - Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 214-222 Houston St. 12-000206-COA 8-17-12.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 12-000206-COA 214-222 Houston St.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Doug Bean for Doug Bean Signs | 12-000217-COA | 201 W. Oglethorpe Ave. | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 201 W. Oglethorpe Avenue 12-000217-COA 8-20-12.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 W. Oglethorpe Avenue 12-000217-COA 8-20-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of David Kennedy | 12-000237-COA | 121 W. Hall St. | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 121 W. Hall St. 12-000237-COA - 8-20-12.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 121 W. Hall St. 12-000237-COA 8-20-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Amy Howell for Coastal Canvas | 12-000238-COA | 301 W. Broughton St. | Staff Review - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 301 West Broughton St. 12-000238-COA 8-21-12.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 301 W. Broughton St. 12-000238-COA 8-21-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Sam Carroll for Concrete Interior Forms | 12-000251-COA | 106 E. Taylor St. | Staff Review - Relocate Iron Gate](#)

Attachment: [COA - 106 East Taylor Street - amended 12-000251-COA 8-21-12.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 106 East Taylor St. - amended 12-000251-COA 8-21-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of Natalie Aiken for SCAD | 12-000253-COA | 101 MLK Jr. Blvd. | Staff Review - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 101 MLK JR. BLVD - 12-000253-COA 8-21-12.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 101 MLK Jr. Blvd - 12-000253-COA 8-21-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Petition of Carol Sellers and David Legasse | 12-000276-COA | 51 Barnard St. | Staff Review - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 51 Barnard St. - 12-000276-COA 8-22-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 51 Barnard St. - 12-000276-COA 8-22-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. [Petition of Ron Jacobs for Jacobs Builders, Inc. | 12-000301-COA | 31 E. Jones St. | Staff Review - Roof Repair/Stucco Repointing](#)

Attachment: [COA - 31 East Jones Street - 12-000301-COA 8-23-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 31 East Jones Street - 12-000301-COA 8-23-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. [Petition of Downtown Chevron | 12-000303-COA | 147 MLK Jr. Blvd. | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 147 MLK Jr. Blvd - 12-000303-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 147 MLK Jr. Blvd - 12-000303-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. [Petition of Michael Connor | 12-000322-COA | 301 W. Broughton Street - #1A | Staff Review - Replace the Existing Corner Projecting Sign](#)

Attachment: [COA - 301 W. Broughton St. - #1A 12-000322-COA 8-29-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 301 W. Broughton Street #1A - 12-000322-COA 8-29-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. [Petition of Amy Howell for Coastal Canvas | 12-000440-COA | 38 Whitaker St. | Staff Review - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 38 Whitaker Street - 12-000440-COA 8-30-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 38 Whitaker Street - 12-000440-COA 8-30-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

45. [Petition of Amy Howell for Coastal Canvas | 12-000466-COA | 405 Whitaker St. | Staff Review - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 405 Whitaker St. 12-000466-COA 9-5-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 405 Whitaker St. 12-000466-COA 9-5-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

46. [Petition of T. Jerry Lominack | 12-000472-COA | 309 E. Liberty St. | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 309 E. Liberty St. 12-000472-COA 9-5-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 309 E. Liberty St. 12-000472-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

47. [COAs](#)

Ms. Ward apologized for not giving the Board an updated report this month of work performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA).

Ms. Ward reported that many items have been deleted from the list by the City Zoning Enforcement.

Ms. Ward reported that:

1. The Chevron Station on MLK and Oglethorpe Avenue put up some signs that were not approved, but they have now removed them and have been approved for their after-the-fact paint color.

2. The Taco Abajo sign at 217 West Broughton Street has been elevated to meet the minimum vertical clearance requirements.

3. The canopy at 36 MLK was painted different colors, they called staff, but have not come to the office yet.

4. The canopies are no longer illuminated at the Salt Table at 51 Barnard Street. They put light guards on the fluorescent lights. Therefore, the lights shine down and do not illuminate the awning from the interior.

5. 307 East President Street, the 1790 Restaurant, removed the replacement door. They went back with the door that was there before.

Mr. Merriman asked staff if they checked the Great Savannah Races museum.

Ms. Ward answered yes. She is comfortable as it is exactly what was approved.

Ms. McClain asked about the Blick Art sign.

Ms. Ward said this will be added to the list. Staff was working with the petitioner who promised that the sign would be removed in two weeks, but now it has been more than two months. This has been brought to the attention of Zoning.

Mr. Engle asked if the entire sign has been removed.

Ms. Ramsay said no, the sign is still there.

Mr. Engle asked how old is the sign.

Ms. Ward explained that the free-standing pole sign has been here since before the ordinance. She believes that the ordinance was written to include the sign. But, they replaced the sign face. The concern is that they did the change without approval (COA). This adds three signs for that one business, which is not permitted under the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Engle asked what happens to the sign pole once the sign face is removed? Does it get painted and remain here forever?

Ms. Ward said the business is no longer here. Therefore, the entire thing should be removed.

Mr. Engle asked if the petitioner owns the entire property.

Ms. Ward answered that she believes they are leasing the property.

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

48. [Next Meeting - Wednesday October 10, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

Ms. Ramsay stated that when petitioners submit things late and the Board does not get to review them prior and in some cases the staff does not get the chance to review them, how do they handle that? Today, they had two and the staff only saw one of the two.

Dr. Henry said maybe there needs to be a certain number of hours for submittal before the Board's meeting.

Ms. McClain said they don't have to submit anything.

Ms. Ramsay explained that if the petitioner has to submit something and wants the Board to comment on it at the meeting, it takes a great deal of time trying to figure out what is old, what is new, etc. She said either the petitioner can submit changes 48 hours before the meeting or the Board should not see it. The Board needs to come up with something to address this matter.

Ms. Ward said she cannot stop someone at a meeting from showing the Board their revisions.

Mr. Howington said maybe the Board needs to decide that if it is a lot of changes, they have the discretion to say that it is too much to consider at the present meeting.

Ms. Ward said she believes the Board did the right thing in both cases today in continuing their petitions. This is what the staff was recommending anyway. However, she hears the Board's concern, but does not know how to prevent petitioners from taking the time to work on revisions and then tell the petitioners that they can not show it in the meeting.

Mr. Engle said a harder thing is the Historic Savannah Foundation. He has to deal with a committee. Obviously, the committee did not have a chance to review any of those changes. Therefore, how do they comment on them?

Ms. Ramsay informed staff to strongly encourage the petitioner(s) that if they are going to make revisions, that they submit them 48 hours (or in some amount of time that staff can submit the revisions to the Board and the Historic Savannah Foundation prior to the meeting).

Ms. Ward asked the Board that if the petitioner does this, would staff just post this on the website as an addendum? She not only needs to provide the information to the Board and the Historic Savannah Foundation, but it is supposed to be available for the public. This is why they have fifteen (15) days in advance of a meeting where the public can come to the office and review the plans.

Ms. Ward explained the process. The petitioner submits their packet. The staff goes through the packets and informs the petitioner that their packet is complete or it is incomplete. The petitioner is given four (4) business days to get the additional information to staff. But, sometimes, especially on big projects such as those two, it is not until they get into the very fine details of the staff report that they have all the conditions. Sometimes, the petitioner does not find out until the Board gets the packets that staff has all these concerns. Therefore, the petitioner is using the time between the packet and the meeting to work, which she encourages them to do. She believes the petitioner should be working to address whatever they can.

Dr. Henry said when the staff recommends a continuance; the Board will know what to look for.

Mr. Engle said that Tattnell Street was so confusing.

Ms. Ramsay said the drawings were difficult.

Mr. Thomson stated he knows that the Board has noticed this, but he wanted to mention that the three folks sitting here (Ms. Ward, Ms. Michalak and Ms. Mitchell) particularly the two that do all the writing, just this last month, not counting going to the enforcement meeting and dealing with persons doing things without a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA), there were forty-four (44) different cases these folks had to handle in a twenty-two day period, along with handling the other districts (Victorian, Mid-City, and Cuyler Brownsville).

Ms. Michalak has been made a full-time regular employee. He just wanted to let the Board know they have a great staff. A lot of investment is being made in the Historic District and this is a good thing. The announcement about the Berrien House was a plus.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Ward what is the total now for the year?

Ms. Ward said she does not know, but it has to be a high number.

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

49. [Adjourned.](#)

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

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 10, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 East State Street.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah P. Ward
Historic Preservation Director

SPW:mem

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