



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
February 13, 2013 2:00 p.m.  
Meeting Minutes

**FEBRUARY 13, 2013 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING**

**HDRB Members Present:** Linda Ramsay, Chair  
Ebony Simpson, Vice Chair  
Reed Engle  
Dr. Nicholas Henry  
Keith Howington  
Brian Judson  
T. Jerry Lominack  
Zena McClain, Esq.  
Stephen Merriman, Jr.  
Robin Williams, Ph.D

**HDRB Member Not Present:** Sidney J. Johnson

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

**City of Savannah Staff Present:** Tiras Petrea, Zoning Inspector

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

1. [Called to Order](#)

**Ms. Ramsay** called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. In attendance at the meeting were Professor Thagine and a Design Studio class from SCAD. She informed the students that they were welcome to make comments during the public comment section of each application.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2. [Approve Minutes of January 9, 2013](#)

Attachment: [01-09-2013 Minutes.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve January 9, 2013 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

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

### III. SIGN POSTING

### IV. CONTINUED AGENDA

- [3. Petition of J. Leander, LLC | 12-002146-COA | 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

**Board Action:**

Continue to March 13, 2013 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

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

- [4. Petition of J. Leander, LLC | 12-002149-COA | 212 Houston Street | New Construction, Part I, Height and Mass, for a two-story residence](#)

**Board Action:**

Continue to March 13, 2013 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye

T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

5. [Petition of Joe Kesler for Southern Pursuit, Inc. | 12-002196-COA | 305 West Harris Street | New Construction, Part I Height and Mass, of a two-story commercial structure](#)

<b>Board Action:</b>	
Continue the petition to March 13, 2013 due to an incomplete submittal.	- PASS
<b>Vote Results</b>	
Motion: Brian Judson	
Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

**V. CONSENT AGENDA**

6. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | H-12-4702-2 | 201 West Bay Street | Amended Addition](#)

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

<b>Board Action:</b>	
<u>Approval</u> of the amendment for exterior courtyard improvements at 201 West Bay Street along West Bay Lane including the addition of an outdoor bar, gates, and alterations to the small canopy <u>with the condition</u> that a masonry base be used with the stationary metal fencing.	- PASS
<b>Vote Results</b>	
Motion: Reed Engle	
Second: T. Jerry Lominack	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye

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

7. [Petition of Signs for Minds | 12-002274-COA | 7 East Bay Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Existing Photograph.pdf](#)

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

**Board Action:**

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

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Robin Williams - Aye

8. [Petition of Signs for Minds | 12-002275-COA | 134 Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Existing Photograph.pdf](#)

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

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

**Board Action:**

Approval of the principal use projecting sign and the building identification projecting sign as requested because they meet the standards and are compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

9. [Petition of Your Pie | 13-000091-COA | 120 West Bryan Street, Suite 101 | After-the-Fact Signs](#)

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

<b>Board Action:</b>	
After-the-fact approval for under-awning signs as requested because they are visually compatible and meet the standards.	- PASS
<b>Vote Results</b>	
Motion: Reed Engle	
Second: T. Jerry Lominack	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

10. [Petition of Laura Potts-Wirht | 13-000333-COA | 107 West Liberty Street | Porch Addition](#)

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

<b>Board Action:</b>	
Approval for an addition and alterations to the rear porch for the property at 107 West Liberty Street with the following conditions:	
1. Ensure that both proposed doors/frames meet the standard or match the inset of other existing doors on the building.	
2. The newel posts at the top and bottom of the stair shall have a base molding. Both the base molding and the cap should compliment that of the existing rear porch.	
3. Ensure that the distances between balusters do not exceed four inches.	
	- PASS
<b>Vote Results</b>	
Motion: Reed Engle	
Second: T. Jerry Lominack	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye

Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

11. [Petition of Trey and Deanne Skinner | 13-000345-COA | 318 East Broughton Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval for the masonry screen wall at 318 East Broughton Street as submitted because it is visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

12. [Petition of David A. Levy & Associates | 13-000382-COA | 38 Montgomery Street | Windows, Doors, and Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Entry Door Example.pdf](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approval to replace the existing windows and doors on the ground floor and for new signage at the property located at 38 Montgomery Street with the condition that the height of the steel bases on the West Congress Street be increased to a minimum of 18 inches high. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye

T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

13. [Petition of Doug Beans Signs | 13-000392-COA | 411 East River Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

**Board Action:**

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

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

14. [Petition of Doug Beans Sign | 13-000393-COA | 10 Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

**Board Action:**

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

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

15. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 13-000394-COA | 9 East Bay Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

**Board Action:**

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

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

16. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 13-000395-COA | 13 East York Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Existing Photograph.pdf](#)

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

**Board Action:**

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

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

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

**VII. REGULAR AGENDA**

**Agenda A**



17. Petition of John Deering for Greenline Architecture | 205 Papy Street | H-110922-4521-2 | Amended New Construction

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Sample Panel Guidelines 120309.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

**Mr. John Deering** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to amend the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the new parking garage at 205 Papy Street as follows:

1. Eliminate brick from towers and replace with exposed concrete to match the other concrete on the exterior.
2. Eliminate or reduce glass within openings on towers as illustrated in the plans submitted.
3. Revise and simplify window pattern in storefront sections.
4. Eliminate all louvers.
  - a. Replace louvers with spandrels panels above retail storefront sections. The color of the panels is still to be determined.
  - b. Replace louvers on second floor with Doralco Blades in front of concrete bumpers. Finish to be clear anodized aluminum or similar.
5. Storefront frame finish proposed to be clear anodized aluminum.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval of the amended design for the parking garage at 205 Papy Street with the following conditions:

1. Reduce the appearance of the horizontal concrete members in the second and third tiers of the corner elements to help anchor the building and discontinue the strong horizontal composition in the center sections.
2. Provide a detailed wall section with the construction documents to verify that the storefront will be recessed a minimum of four inches (4") from the face of the building once the brick veneer is eliminated.
3. Construct a sample panel on-site for review and approval by staff, in accordance with the adopted Sample Panel Guidelines (attached).

**Mr. Merriman** asked that without eliminating the windows at the top and leaving it open, is there a way the petitioner can meet the open air requirement of the garage?

**Ms. Ward** answered that the petitioner would have to answer this question. She knows that the petitioner has studied this for several months with different alternatives and has tried to keep the original design as long as they could. However, they have gone to a new direction and are trying to keep it in a very contemporary design.

**Mr. Merriman** said it takes away from what they had before.

**Mr. Lominack** asked how far are the horizontal concrete pieces recessed from the face of the building.

**Ms. Ward** explained that the wall section shows the cable rails and the concrete panels are behind it. She believes it is in keeping with the same plane as the concrete panels.

**Mr. Lominack** asked, therefore, they are only a few inches back.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes. She believes there are some solutions the petitioner can explore to

strengthen the verticality of the bays.

**Mr. Engle** asked if any effort was given to keeping the grid and not glaze it.

**Ms. Ward** answered that the petitioner did consider this.

**Mr. Engle** asked, "wouldn't that have met the air exchange criteria?"

**Ms. Ward** stated that this question would need to be answered by the petitioner as this is not her area of expertise. However, at one time they talked about this, but said that it would have to come back to the Board for consideration.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Deering** came forward and entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Deering if he considered using a grid and leave off the glazing.

**Mr. Deering** said they explored this, but did not feel that this solution was as successful as putting the air light horizontal railing across those openings. The grid left there without the glass reminded them of the windows that were broken out of the Central of Georgia building located on West Boundary and Louisville Road that was left there all those years. They did not want to have an empty frame effect.

**Mr. Engle** explained that he remembers very well the conversation they had on this. The Board's concern was horizontality and this enforces it and totally eliminating the verticality. The brick was there to reflect what is across the street, which is SCAD. But, now they have eliminated the brick and all there will be is a big concrete parking garage which they have elsewhere in the city.

**Mr. Deering** told Mr. Engle that he begs to differ with him. They have put a lot of study into this parking garage; they have done two other successful parking garages in the historic district. He believes this is a pure modern building and there is no reference necessarily to historical architecture or implied historical architecture. The brick at the ends did serve sort of a book image thing. Mr. Deering said [pointing to a section] that he believes with the vertical members here, they still act as bookends to the building. It has a very strong vertical element that is rhythmic through the entire façade. He believes it is pretty successful.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes this is an improvement.

**Dr. Williams** asked what is the percentage of openness and what would be the contributing percentage taking away the glazing and towers.

**Mr. Deering** explained that the elimination of the louvers are not necessary for the open air requirement. This was an issue early on when they reduced the amount of louvers when they came back to the Board in October, 2012. This is a value engineering item. The louvers and the storefront glazing were driving the cost up.

**Dr. Williams** said the towers are relatively a small proportion of the building.

**Mr. Deering** stated that this one of those things that they were looking for everything they could. They feel they have been sensitive to the context with the solutions that they have provided.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Deering how he felt about the staff's recommendation regarding somehow eliminating, diminishing, disguising and hiding those hyphens that exist.

**Mr. Deering** said they can look at doing something to minimize them. They are about two feet tall now and they match the end of the concrete tees that form the floor system. They sit four (4) inches back from the face of the vertical mass.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Deering what is the opportunity to move it back more than four inches.

**Mr. Deering** said this is definitely a possibility, but they would need to talk with the precast concrete manufacturer to see if they can do this.

**Dr. Henry** told Mr. Deering that he does not remember the October 2012 presentation and asked him to speak to the issue of the louvers.

**Mr. Deering** explained that the louvers made up the rail system between all the concrete bays. They were the guardrail system.

**Dr. Henry** said in looking at this in terms of the verticality, he is not sure which one is the better of the two versions. A parking garage is in close proximity and has shutters.

**Mr. Deering** said they designed this garage. In the initial design, this is what they were attempting to do.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Deering why he dropped this design.

**Mr. Deering** said this was dropped due to the budget.

**Mr. Merriman** said initially, this was a very good looking project and is this is why he was in agreement with it. But, now this changes things a lot.

**Mr. Deering** told Mr. Merriman that if he may address his comment, he believes that if he looks at the historical railroad shed across the street, all of the modern elements are all concrete and glass. The only brick portion of the railroad shed is the historic portion. He believes that this sort of corresponds to that as it is a modern building; it is all concrete and steel. Mr. Deering said he believes that it works well with the railroad shed that has become the SCAD museum.

**Mr. Lominack** said he likes it being simplified, but he, too, has a problem with the horizontal band. But this is a minor problem, but he believes taking the brick off is sort of icing on the cake. Mr. Lominack said, therefore, letting it go ahead and be an honest concrete building makes a lot of sense. It looks like a place where cars are parked and this is what it is.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the Board wants another deck that looks like what is in Ellis Square. This is a marginal grandeur appearance, but the petitioner has stripped it down and made it more modern. They are looking at something that is sitting behind a hotel that Mr. Deering's client wanted a history and you are sitting across the street from a modern museum that is housed within a historic shed. Therefore, it is not just pure concrete; it has brick which is actually closer to this. Across the street is the historic row shed. The petitioner has contextual issues. This is the challenge.

**Mr. Deering** said the context is also the automobile development that happened in this district. There is probably more of that than there is of what is left of the Central of Georgia aspect.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Deering, "what is implicitly not modern about brick?"

**Mr. Deering** answered it is not that it isn't modern; one of the things that that they could remove to value engineer of this building was the brick. They are trying to get everything they can out of the project because of the budget. However, knows that the Board does not need to consider this.

**Dr. Williams** asked if this would be done at the expense of something that they would be proud of in the Historic District or just say that is an unfortunate reality budget constraints and other value engineering required it to be so simplified that it is not something that they will be proud of and 50 years from now it could not be said that it is a contributing building to the district.

**Mr. Deering** said that once the garage is constructed, they may actually like it.

**Dr. Williams** said they cannot build it first and then decide if they like it.

**Mr. Deering** said the garage has changed very little. The fenestration pattern has changed, the louvers have been removed, and the brick has been removed. It is essentially the same building.

**Dr. Henry** said there is more concrete.

**Mr. Merriman** said the things that are being removed are the elements of the building that really made it for him when the Board originally approved it. Originally, it was great and would be a bonus to the area that it is going in. But, as Dr. Williams has said, it reminds him, too, of the Ellis Square parking garage.

**Mr. Deering** said he begs to differ. The Ellis Square parking garage was steel and concrete structure that they skinned with dryvit in the 1980s. This is quite different than that.

**Dr. Williams** explained that the overall simplicity of it is obviously slightly more overtly classical. The Board does not have a sample panel. Concrete can run the gambit from looking cheap to high quality concrete. He asked Mr. Deering where on this spectrum is the evidence of the standard of concrete.

**Mr. Deering** said this will come when they do the sample panel for the Board's approval.

**Dr. Williams** said the Board would have to base their decision on the hypothesis that it going to be good.

**Mr. Deering** said it would be the standard precast concrete finish. It is smooth and relatively nice like the Bryan Street parking garage.

**Dr. Williams** said he was trying to visualize the Bryan Street parking garage.

**Mr. Lominack** said the Bryan Street garage is precast. The ability to control the quality of precast concrete is incredible. It is not like taking a shovel and throwing it.

**Ms. Ramsay** informed Mr. Deering, as he is well aware, the budget is not an item that this Board considers. The Board judges visual compatibility.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they believe that the previous differentiation materials for the corner towers help to anchor the structure and emphasize verticality as many of the Board members have mentioned. The HSF agrees with the staff recommendation to reduce the appearance of the horizontal concrete members in the second and third tiers of the corner elements to discontinue the strong horizontal composition present in the center sections. Ms. Meunier said the HSF encourages the petitioner to use glazing along the upper stories within the towers similar to the original submittal to emphasize more verticality and differentiate the corner elements more.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Henry** said he realizes that a parking garage is a parking garage, but so often they hear the term "honest" design, which often means cheap and ugly. Now, he was not saying that this is cheap and ugly, but he believes there is someplace where there can be a compromise.

**Mr. Merriman** said that besides this being a parking garage, he believes a retail space is here too. Therefore, it is not just a parking garage as it will be a place of business.

**Mr. Engle** said the Board initially looked at this as being a united project in relation to the hotel, itself. He was assuming that the hotel will go along as originally planned. However, the two complimented each other and complimented SCAD.

**Ms. Simpson** said she believes that removing the bricks take way from the relationship that the garage has with the hotel.

**Mr. Merriman** said this changes everything. This is now totally different than what the Board originally approved.

**Dr. Williams** asked what would happen if it had the glazing reinstated in the towers but not the brick. Or had the brick, but not the glazing.

**Mr. Merriman** said this would not change his mind.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she believes that the Board would have to see it.

**Mr. Deering** asked for a continuance.

**Board Action:**

Continue to March 13, 2013 at the petitioner's request.

- PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle

- Aye

Nicholas Henry

- Aye

Keith Howington

- Abstain

Sidney J. Johnson

- Not Present

Brian Judson

- Aye

T. Jerry Lominack

- Aye

Zena McClain, Esq.

- Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

- Aye

Linda Ramsay

- Abstain

Ebony Simpson

- Aye

Robin Williams

- Aye

18. [Petition of Twin Rivers Capital, LLC | H-12-4672-2 | 702 West Oglethorpe Avenue | New Construction, Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

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

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

**Mr. J. J. Lamberson** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Part I Height and Mass, of a new commercial structure on the property at 702 West Oglethorpe Avenue. Part I, Height and Mass was continued at the petitioner's request from the June meeting. She pointed out that the model for this project is on display in the center of the table. The general development plan for the project was actually submitted almost a year ago. The comments from the review departments are still underway. They are still developing them and most

significantly is the change to the project based on all the comments were to relocate the main entrance to be on Oglethorpe Avenue. As the Board recalls, it was proposed to be on the side facing the parking lot. But, now the petitioner has relocated the entrance to front Oglethorpe Avenue. The City Traffic Engineer Department is requiring a minimum of 24 foot wide curb cut at the Fahm Street entrance. The Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) requires a minimum curb cut dimension along Oglethorpe Avenue. Ms. Ward said staff has asked the GDOT to them what the dimension is; but GDOT has not responded yet. Because Oglethorpe Avenue is considered a highway, GDOT has requirements on this road.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction, Part I, Height and Mass of the commercial building at 702 West Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions:

1. Provide hardscaping forward of the front façade along Oglethorpe Avenue;
2. Establish a two-story building height and reduce the height of the center bay in the east east and west facades;
3. Provide a low wall or screen adjacent to the building around the parking areas near Oglethorpe and Fahm Streets. Provide elevations and wall sections of all proposed walls and screens for review.
4. Curb cut widths must not exceed the minimum width required by the City Traffic Engineer and Georgia Department of Transportation be consistent with the Intent of the ordinance and meet minimum traffic requirements.
5. Where intersected by a new driveway, the sidewalk must serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

**Mr. Judson** said one of the staff's recommendations is that the petitioner establish a two-story building height. He asked Ms. Ward if staff was saying 25 feet at the parapet or 25 feet at the side elevations.

**Ms. Ward**, pointing to a section, said 20 feet here and 25 feet here.

**Mr. Judson** asked that to comply with a two-story height, they would be looking at how much of an addition.

**Ms. Ward** answered that she does not know if they would need to increase the overall height. This is similar to the Family Dollar on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. She stated that she is not the designer, and, therefore, does not want to say how they can or cannot do it. They could be creating a two-story mass in the center that goes back with some sort of openings. But, she believes it should be contemporary to be consistent with the spirit of the design. Ms. Ward said she believes there are a lot of different ways that the petitioner can do it.

**Dr. Williams** asked, therefore, the zoning here and the standard that the Board deals with is two-story. Is there a minimum?

**Ms. Ward** answered that the minimum is two-story. The maximum is five-story.

**Dr. Williams** said he remembers that when he and Mr. Lominack were on the committee that wrote this, they specifically did not put a height, sub-stories, but articulated stories. Therefore, you can have a forty foot (40') building with two twenty foot (20') stories as opposed to saying that this is the height of a two-story building, therefore, it passes. He stated, however, this is a one-story building.

**Ms. Ward** said yes, this is a one-story building and the standard is for a two-story building.

**Dr. Williams** said maybe Mr. Lominack might want to comment on this, but he believes the committee's feeling was that they did not want everything being the same height.

**Mr. Lominack** commented that he believes what influenced this was they have seen it happen in other locations where the maximum height said every building was 40 feet regardless.

**Mr. Judson** said as they were reviewing this, this was his understanding of that rationale. He said, however, with this building and its context, given the Greyhound Bus Station he does not have a

problem with the building being one-story. His point is if they create a façade to reflect a second story because he knows what they did on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the Board previously rejected canopies without windows. There are canopies over the eastern/western elevations. They are over the walls, but there are no windows here. Do they meet the awning standard?

**Ms. Ward** stated that staff would support the recommendation to remove the canopies. There is no specific design standard in the ordinance that says they have or do not have to be over a window. However, she agrees with Mr. Engle's comment.

**Mr. Engle** asked, in the Secretary of Interior's Standard, they do say that they go over openings?

**Ms. Ward** clarified that this, however, is new construction and therefore does not fall under this section. But, she agrees with Mr. Engle and staff would support that recommendation.

**Mr. Lominack** asked staff, how high is the low wall?

**Ms. Ward** answered that the minimum required by the ordinance for screening parking is 36 inches. It could be a hedge wall or a masonry wall to match the material of the building. She said she would like for the petitioner to propose something and then they could look at it.

**Mr. Engle** said judging from experience and when he looks at MLK as this is similar to MLK, both flanking window units on the front elevation have panels behind them. You cannot see in; therefore, all you are seeing is the center section. He believed the entire point of storefronts were visibility. When shelving units are put all the way across, you might as well not have windows there. This concerns him as it appears they might end up with the same situation here as on MLK.

**Ms. Ward** said there is a line in the Board's purview and the petitioner is required under the ordinance to have fifty-five percent (55%) transparent glazing. They will cover this aspect in Part II. Therefore, anything over fifty-five percent, especially transoms and so forth, you may have opaque glass. However, what the petitioner does on the interior of their building is out of this Board's purview.

**Mr. Engle** stated that it is not transparent when paneling is there.

**Ms. Ward** said the glass would be transparent. The petitioner may put a piece of drywall next to it and this is where the Board's purview does not extend to it.

**Mr. Howington** said previously an entrance was facing the parking lot, but the Board requested more frontage on Oglethorpe Avenue. When he looks at it, he believes there should be both; entrance fronting Oglethorpe and the parking lot.

**Ms. Ward** said this is something that the petitioner would need to address. They may have a security issue with only wanting one entrance.

**Mr. Engle** asked if there was an entrance on the parking lot side on MLK.

**Mr. Howington** said no; the entrance is on Oglethorpe Avenue.

**Mr. Lominack** stated that he wanted to make a comment about the presentation technique. From the standpoint of reviewing a project, rather than saying front, rear, left and right, better understanding would be to say north, south, east and west.

**Ms. Ward** said staff will look at the checklist.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Lamberson** came forward and entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Lamberson if it would be possible to put a door on the parking lot side as a secondary entrance.

**Mr. Lamberson** answered that Ms. Ward was correct in her response about security. The way they are set up with staffing, store room and cash registers, they can only operate with one entrance. They had the original proposed entrance facing the parking lot, which is what Family Dollar prefers as they believe most of the customers will come via car. It was like pulling teeth for Family Dollar to agree to have the storefront doors away from the parking. Mr. Lamberson said they proposed a corner entry which would be somewhat hybrid which would say front/Oglethorpe/south. He is not an architect and if he had not followed the project, he, too, would be confused as Mr. Lominack stated. The south/west corner of Oglethorpe Avenue towards the parking has a prototype where a corner entrance could be put there. It would still be on Oglethorpe Avenue, it would not be central, would be closer to the parking lot, but would not be in front of any parking spaces. Mr. Lamberson said he knows he would not be able to get Family Dollar to do two entrances.

**Dr. Williams** said this would not be the paradox character as the corner entrance would not be on a corner.

**Mr. Lamberson** said this would be even further away from the parking if the entrance was on Fahm Street.

**Dr. Williams** stated that given that the bus station and the Thunderbird Inn across the street and the parking garage from the previous applicant, with all the stores around the ground floor, it will probably be a lot more foot traffic than one might think based on the current situation on the ground here. He said given the corporate model of the layout, having the entrance door on Oglethorpe Avenue is his preference.

**Mr. Lamberson** said they will have to convince Family Dollar to accept the Oglethorpe Avenue entrance. Nevertheless, they can accommodate this.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Lamberson if he had a problem with eliminating the metal canopies where there are no windows.

**Mr. Lamberson** answered no and said that he noticed on the east/west that canopies are on either side of the glass. He believes that the architect believed that this would be wanted, but they can eliminate this and have it only over the glass.

**Mr. Engle** said he also had a problem with the cornices at the top of the parapet.

**Mr. Lamberson** said this could be reduced. They received comments about wings, canopies and things [he is not an architect]. However, it is large and you can see the cross section from the other side; it does stick out quite a bit and they could reduce that.

**Mr. Engle** said, what is at the bus station is nine feet long and flat.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Engle, what part is he talking about?

**Mr. Engle** explained that there is something huge on the roof edges and are nine (9) feet long. They are sitting on top of the parapet. He does not know what purpose they serve nor what classical illusion they are coming from.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated this is what Ms. Ward is recommending to be removed.

**Mr. Lamberson** said this could be lowered and remain here, but in accordance with the staff's recommendation, they will be lowered anyway, which would not make sense to have them at all. He said, however, pointing to a different area, that one is here, too.

**Mr. Engle** said there could be a reason for them being here, but he is not sure of the reason.



**Dr. Williams** said maybe they could be scaled down as he actually believes they help make this look a little different from a standard Family Dollar that would be at the corner of Oglethorpe Avenue and Fahm Street.

**Ms. Ramsay** questioned, both on the east and west?

**Dr. Williams** said personally, he would not eliminate them. Maybe scale them back a little.

**Mr. Engle** said the electricity is here.

**Dr. Williams** said maybe the one on the entrance if it is the same from front to back. But since it is a motif it seems to be a smaller version of it. They are crowning the lower corner walls. He asked if he was correct in believing that concrete is across all the walls. He asked if it is E.I.F.S.?

**Mr. Engle** replied yes.

**Dr. Williams** said he thought they were prohibited against having E.I.F.S.

**Mr. Lamberson** said they will get the correct information to the architect to accommodate the request of the materials

**Dr. Williams** asked, "what are the big pieces above this that they were talking about?"

**Mr. Lamberson** said it is a painted piece of metal coping.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Lamberson to please respond to the low screen wall on the parking.

**Mr. Lamberson** stated that he has looked at all the staff's recommendations. He believes they can accommodate the low screen wall on the parking. There is not much distance on the Fahm and Oglethorpe entrance because the building is on the corner. There is not much length to those walls, but they can do a wall on either side of the cut when it gets to screening the actual parking spaces. He does not know if they want it too high for safety issues as in the winter time when it gets dark at 5:15 p.m. and the store is open until 8:00 p.m. He said, pointing to an area, there is a parking lot back there, a front door here and he was not sure if they want big walls from the sidewalk and people on the street cannot see from the parking lot and they have created a "L" shape shoebox behind the building, but to screen the parking, they certainly can do that.

**Mr. Engle** said typically they have gone about forty eight inches. This will screen the cars, but not the people.

**Ms. Ramsay** said just as Mr. Lominack said, they can have a transparent base of iron on top of it.

**Mr. Lamberson** said if it was too high such as an eight foot screen wall he does not believe that would be a good idea, but they can provide a low wall. They can accommodate the east and west façade. But, they cannot lower the center section, they will keep it the twenty foot-eight all the way across.

**Mr. Lominack** said he thought it was the same as the rest of it. He said eliminate it and save money.

**Dr. Williams** asked what is to be eliminated.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the petitioner could eliminate the higher parts on the east and west.

**Mr. Engle** said, look at the right elevation. If they got rid of the canopies on the north and south ends, then they would have the big stucco walls with no differentiation at all. He believes that since this is height and mass, there ought to be some type of differentiation of this wall. Putting a canopy on it is not the answer. Maybe you recess a portion of it; he does not know what the answer is, but they will end up with a big stucco box and he does not think that Fahm Street deserves this.

**Mr. Lominack** said ideally it might be wonderful.

**Mr. Howington** said especially on the corner on Fahm Street.

**Mr. Engle** said there should be some glazing even if it has drywall inside.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said the petitioner indicated that Family Dollar is intended to have a lot of their clients come and park their vehicles. She said that the HSF understands that the context and development of this area does reference certain parts of the automobile age, etc, but they feel that parking does not need to be as dominant as it is now. They believe that the parking could be reduced or focused toward the rear of the property. They also suggest possibly eliminating the vehicle entrance along Oglethorpe Avenue if allowable by GDOT. If so, this would allow for more frontage along Oglethorpe Avenue. Ms. Meunier said the HSF strongly feels that there should be a second story, preferably over the whole building. They would also like to see windows and some sort of glazing along the second story. They also think that Fahm Street should be treated as a primary façade as well. She noticed that there was a lot of discussion about the parapets on the east and west. Mr. Engle made a comment about having more differentiation along Fahm Street and, the HSF too, would love to see more glazing here as well.

**Ms. Meunier** said they also support a higher wall, possibly masonry with additional iron or something else above as Mr. Lominack mentioned.

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

**Mr. Lamberson** said in showing the site plan that they are happy to raise the center parapet on Fahm and this would address some of the comments. Staff wants to lower those and only have the Oglethorpe entrance higher. They can go either way with. However, they did try as they have had comments about this is a corner and this is a primary façade, but looking at the elevations they do see storefront glass, a higher façade with a wing. They can lower it or not lower it. They did incorporate the bike rack here and they are connecting to the sidewalk a Fahm Street with a sidewalk area as they had comments to make it an entrance from that side where you could come in; an arbor and landscape features on the side. This is not shown on the architectural elevations because it is not a part of the actual architecture building. But, this would enhance this elevation and could lead customers to come in under the arbor to the door. There is a little additional enhancement to the right elevation that is not shown on the actual building elevation.

**Mr. Lamberson** said he believes they need to keep the Oglethorpe access for loading. There will be a combination of walk-in and car traffic. They will be happy to screen what is masonry between the parking areas. He believes they can meet the staff recommendations, and he guessed his only question is if they feel they can provide some hardscaping for the landscaping on Oglethorpe Avenue they could do some type of wall that ties in with the screen walls to screen the parking lot which would take care of some of the recommendations. City Traffic and GDOT require a minimum of 24 feet, they could agree with the staff's recommendation which is not to exceed this. They can take care of the sidewalks which is recommendation #5, but one comment is to lower the east and west elevations while one comment is to establish two-story building height. He said he was not sure he understood it enough to tell an architect what to do. Is it a two-story building height and if so, is there a height rule written? They can increase of the whole building overall, yet, not have the center park stick up. He believes they can accommodate this, but he does not believe he understands exactly what to do. The strip center to the left is one-story and the Greyhound is one-story. The street elevations that their architect has done they feel it fits in the context well, but yet it is not a two-story building, but it is approaching a two-story building height; which in a lot of instances is twenty-four feet and the center sections are twenty-five feet high.

**Mr. Lominack** explained that he guessed in an urban context when they talk about a two-story building, he believes that in an ideal situation it would be a second floor within that building that could be used for something. There could be apartments or offices in it, but it should have some function. When they take a suburban building and try to put it in an urban area, there are some real problems. He was not sure whether they are solvable problems unless somebody goes back to zero and do not start out with a preconceived building to try to force it into a special location. Therefore, he thinks the more they can simplify the building, the better. He believes the arbor further designates this as an entrance, which does not exist. The sidewalk that runs parallel to the other sidewalk paves more of the site. This really does not accomplish anything because this is not any entrance. He told Mr. Lamberson if he wants to give the public space that was a park and it had places where people

could sit, this might be something else; but to imply that it is an entrance and it is not one, he finds it very bothersome personally as an architect.

**Mr. Engle** said to him, the arbor is an ancillary structure and it should be reviewed by the Board. Whatever they do here, they are not approving the arbor. They are just looking at the height and mass and they do not know what it is.

**Dr. Williams** said it has to come before the Board for their perusal.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Lamberson if his client would be willing to consider making this a two-story building with rental on the top.

**Mr. Lamberson** answered that he did not believe that they could do so in this instance. If someone wanted to buy the parcel and put a two-story building here and found a tenant for the first floor and secondary story is everyone's prerogative, but the SunTrust Bank, he is not sure what era of design it is, but not on the street front old building heading towards dilapidation with drive-through and such as this is what it is today. He said they believe they are bringing a great national retail tenant and there are customers in the area that will love and enjoy it. They think they can make this a very nice building, but he knows that within their structure, they are not going to come in and add a second floor for an office or apartment.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Ms. Simpson** stated that within this area, there are no two-story buildings.

**Mr. Engle** said the hotel is across the street.

**Ms. Simpson** said there is no commercial building here that would be similar to the design of what the petitioner is presenting now.

**Ms. Ward** stated that there are two historic buildings in the vicinity that this building could relate to. Both of the buildings are shown on the model. She explained that there is the one-story Greyhound Bus Station, which is why staff feels that the one-story height is visually compatible. It is just problematic that it does not meet the design standard. There is the two-story Thunderbird Inn across the street diagonally. Therefore, there is a one-story and a two-story building here.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes that the spirit of what they were writing back in the day was more in thinking of carriage houses and other things east of MLK and not necessarily in this district. They also did not want to invite ten foot tall buildings. He believes that from a height point of view, the petitioner is correct that is the spirit of the area. The Board may ask the petitioner if he is willing to raise the walls to give it more visual presence.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Ms. Ward if the Board found the height agreeable, "what would be the implication of not following the design standards?"

**Ms. Ward** answered that she does not know. She has talked to the staff of the Zoning Board of Appeal's about this. She does not know that it is a variable standard. Ms. Ward believes that if the Board made a finding that because of the number of feet, that the building meets the intent of the standard. She said the Board needs to make it very specific to this site, though. As Dr. Williams has indicated, she believes that when this standard was created, it was not necessarily for the architecture of this area as what they call the "western boundary." Ms. Ward explained that the Board may want to consider an amendment for future discussion to allow one-story buildings in these far east and west districts as allowed in the Beach Institute area. However, she believes that if the Board made a finding very specific to this site because of the over-all height of the building that it complied with that standard for the two-story they may be okay. She said she was a little nervous, though, because it does not meet the two-stories.

**Mr. Engle** asked if, twenty-five feet does not make two-stories?

**Ms. Ward** answered that this is not the way they wrote the ordinance. It is not about feet, but about the number of stories. This is why she believes that if the Board made a finding that this is their interpretation of it. They are just interpreting the standard a different way. They need to make the finding very specific to this character area and why it is allowed here. Otherwise, they would have to

say this holds true for everywhere within the district.

**Mr. Engle** said on MLK, they put windows on the second floor to pretend that there was a second floor. This was not very effective since they covered the windows and you cannot see in them.

**Ms. Simpson** said she does not believe that a building such as on MLK is relevant for this location.

**Mr. Lominack** said the ordinance is very specific. It says "that buildings throughout the historic district that fronts on a street should be at least two stories, except the Beach Institute Character Area or accessory buildings which front on a lane."

**Ms. Ramsay** said she believes this is the question.

**Mr. Engle** explained that when they talk about height and mass, in mass it is equivalent to a two-story building. This is where the ordinance is a little unclear.

**Mr. Merriman** said the ordinance does not say how many feet equal a story.

**Mr. Lominack** said the ordinance states that exterior expression of commercial buildings that the ground floor shall not be less than twelve feet that is a total of twenty-six feet – six inches.

**Mr. Engle** said they do not meet this standard. It needs to be a little higher to be that.

**Mr. Merriman** said any way the ordinance is interpreted, it does not meet it either way.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes it is impossible to cover all areas and then try to put a plausible statement on it, especially in this particular area a visually compatible two-story building with eight windows and a fake second floor seems to be a worse option to him.

**Mr. Engle** agreed with Mr. Howington.

**Mr. Lominack** said he would not suggest a fake second floor.

**Mr. Howington** explained that this is what the story would end up being.

**Dr. Henry** asked, what if this Board makes this an amendment for this specific area and the Zoning Board of Appeals says no?

**Ms. Ramsay** said she believes that maybe when the height map was done, they did not thoroughly consider this area.

**Dr. Williams** said Ms. Ramsay is correct.

**Mr. Engle** said the Board could insist that it go to twenty-six feet then it would meet that much of the ordinance.

**Dr. Williams** said the center parapet could go up one foot and in this way by one criterion; it meets the letter of the law. If they meet that one foot, they would meet the second criteria which the petitioner has said is no problem. He supports everything that has been said about not faking the second story. The important difference on MLK is that every other building was at least two stories or more. He said, and a Family Dollar that looks like this on MLK was completely out of character - speaking to the adjacent bus station particularly. The issue of compatibility here is the code is constraining and forcing them in fact to create something incompatible. He said, therefore, he would feel comfortable going with a supersized one-story approach.

**Mr. Engle** said if the Board wants to be consistent, the code says it has to be fourteen (14) feet for the first floor. This has no expression of fourteen feet.

**Dr. Williams** said it says a minimum of fourteen feet.

**Mr. Engle** pointed out that it is ten feet to the top of the windows. But there is no expression of fourteen feet horizontally.

**Mr. Lominack** said it states "not less than."

**Mr. Engle** said it should be a horizontal expression of top of the first floor somewhere at fourteen

feet if they are going to carry through that standard.

**Mr. Judson** said he disagrees. He believes they are trying to build a hybrid policy. He personally has no problem with a one-story building in this area. Mr. Judson thinks that in terms of what they are looking at in terms of massing and scale and if they start tweaking and looking at raising a story another foot or a foot and one-half; if the proportions are different, then they need to start looking at the project again. He said any portrayal of a false second story is too hypocritical. Yes, this is the way that the ordinance was written and he believes they have had a recommendation or an opinion from staff that they are capable of making a decision with the finding fact to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals. He disagrees that they then need to look at other elements of the ordinance and say that it needs to be finished at fourteen feet.

**Mr. Judson** said in his opinion, if they are going to approve a one-story building in this space with a twenty-five foot primary façade parapet that this Board feels is in keeping with the area, then they make that finding of fact and they do not need to try to satisfy other portions of the ordinance that they are not in fact enforcing.

**Ms. Ward** said she wanted to be clear that this Board, for the specific standards they are talking about, does not have the ability to grant variances, modify the ordinance or make amendments to it. So making a finding that it is compatible is the way to go, but the Zoning Board of Appeals would have to grant the variance.

**Dr. Williams** said he gets the point that it meets the massing of a two-story building and it is also compatible with the area. Therefore, the Board has two ways in which they could argue that they are inside the zoning even if it is literally not two-stories.

**Mr. Engle** said they would still have modifications that they will eliminate the canopies.

**Mr. Judson** stated that he was not saying there is another point of recommendation.

**Mr. Engle** said the question is do they eliminate the canopies. Then they would have that great two-story stucco wall with no detailing at all. How is this going to be dealt with, particularly on Fahm Street?

**Dr. Henry** said this would not be the purview of this Board.

**Mr. Engle** stated that it would be. They are going to put windows in there; adding the canopy will affect the height and mass. So if you are going to put in recesses; belt course that is height and mass. They are not saying what it is made of.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked the Board members if anyone was ready to make a motion or whether the petitioner needs to ask for a continuance.

**Mr. Lamberson** said an approval with a list of conditions would be more ideally as they are under a time pressure crunch from when they started. He believes they initially started with the MLK building and that did not work.

**Ms. Ramsay** said there are so many issues that she believes the Board would want to see the effect of the conditions before they automatically approve them. However, they could hear Part I with Part II. She told Mr. Lamberson that he has heard the comments and very good minutes of the meetings are kept. She told Mr. Lamberson he is welcome to review the minutes.

**Mr. Engle** said if the Board accepts this massing, is there any reason that they could not go ahead and ask for a variance and still hear the detailing the next time?

**Ms. Ward** asked Mr. Engle if he was saying make a finding of that.

**Ms. Engle** said yes; make a finding that the massing is compatible. Let the petitioner proceed at least to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

**Mr. Merriman** said this would make it go better when they come back if they already have the variance.

**Mr. Engle** said, however, the Board is not approving the massing today.

**Ms. Ramsay** explained to Mr. Lamberson that the Review Board would need to vote on the height recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals providing that a Board member is willing to make a motion that that they make a finding fact of the height.

**Mr. Lominack** said he does not think that the Board wants to draw a centerline down MLK and say west of that centerline is suburbia. They have clearly gotten a suburban shopping center built in the historic district and it does not fit. He believes it is a blatant violation of the intent of protecting the historic district. He believes that the Board has been guilty of allowing this to happen in other locations. This does not make it right by letting it happen someplace else.

**Mr. Judson** said if the Board does make it a finding of fact on this project they are not drawing any lines anywhere else. He understands the road they see them going down given the use of that particular corridor and those few blocks, he disagrees. But, he just wanted to make it clear that it was not his proposal that they draw the line anywhere in this entire district.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the original submission of the parking lot was in the front on Oglethorpe Avenue. Eighteen months ago the parking lot was on the front elevation on Oglethorpe Avenue.

**Mr. Judson** said the only pedestrian was beyond.

**Mr. Lamberson** said his only worry is timing. He believes he would appreciate it that if in the March meeting they could do Part I and Part II assuming that they make the staff and Board happy with Part I, then they could hear Part II. This would help. His worry is about approving this at 25 feet or whatever it might be. If they are saying that it has to be a variance to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals [he does not know what their schedule is] it would be better for him to come back and make it 27 feet. Does this make it clearly a two-story building? They are never going to get this approved as a one-story building without going to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

**Dr. Williams** told Mr. Lamberson that he needs approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

**Mr. Lamberson** said if he understands it correctly, the interpretation is not what is on the inside, but what is on the outside. MLK was approved, but it is not a two-story building. Mr. Lamberson explained that his question is, does MLK qualify as a two-story building because it looks like a two-story building? This building has one set of windows, but functionally it is the exact same building inside.

**Mr. Engle** said the Board does not want this building faked up. The Board is saying that they can live with the mass.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the other aspect is "visually compatible," buildings on MLK made it a different situation.

**Mr. Lamberson** said either way rather they are twenty-five; twenty-six or twenty-seven feet, he understands that the fact is since the building will always have the appearance of one story because they do not want to fake a story means that they will have to get approval for a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals for a one-story building.

**Mr. Judson** asked Mr. Lamberson if he was clear that if the Board makes this finding a fact one way or the other that he will ask for a continuance and that he is okay with it.

**Mr. Lamberson** replied yes.

**Ms. Ward** said she needed a little clarification on the continuance. She said there has been a discussion about the solid to voids. The Board does not have to agree with her, but she wanted to point out that in the staff's report that staff is supportive of the solids to voids that are proposed. The staff's report states that the contributing Greyhound Bus Station features very long spans of solid brick walls that are divided by columns without any openings. If the Board wants something else on those walls, staff needs guidance to help them and the petitioner understand what is needed here.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she believes that Mr. Engle brought up glazing on the Fahm Street side.

**Mr. Engle** responded that he is not wedded to glazing. He believes that Mr. Lominack brought this up. However, there needs to be some kind of articulation; either recesses, pilasters or something to

break up the expanse. The bus station is broken up; it is not one surface.

**Dr. Williams** asked within this context because of the issue that was raised at the outset with worrying about displays, drywall and other things. If there is glazing where merchandise it will only go up about six feet or so. He believes that Mr. Lominack made a comment that on Fahm Street and may be on the west elevation the glazing on these two side elevations at a higher parapet create a misimpression that these are entrances; there are no doors, but just glazing. Dr. Williams said he was wondering if something more akin to the bus station with a band of solid glass and brick all the way across.

**Mr. Lamberson** said it would be clerestory windows rather than storefront glass coming down near the floor, but continue brick, block, different material and just have windows two or three feet from side-to-side

**Mr. Engle** said the Board is now getting into designing the building.

**Dr. Williams** said fenestration is about height and mass.

**Mr. Judson** said staff has informed the Board that they need to give them and the petitioner some guidance.

**Dr. Williams** said he was not micro managing or designing the building, but was proposing a response to the comment about glazing coming down to the sidewalk. He said he was throwing this out as an idea to the petitioner.

**Mr. Howington** said he agrees that Fahm Street is also a primary façade. Therefore, they don't want this to look like the side of the building as well in the efforts to redesign the building.

**Dr. Williams** stated that maybe you don't worry about having left and right mirror images of one another because one can never see them simultaneous anyway.

**Mr. Lominack** said there is no reason why all the glass has to be the same height. There can be some marketing advantages of being able to look into a store and see what is there.

**Ms. Ramsay** told Mr. Lamberson that she believes the Board has given him a lot of ideas.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Ward if staff was okay with the given guidance.

**Mr. Lamberson** asked for a continuance of Part I with the request that, if possible, Part II be heard on the same agenda to help with with their schedule.

**Board Action:**

Continue to March 13, 2013 at the petitioner's request.  
Both Part I and II may be submitted concurrently. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain

Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

**Board Action:**

Hereby find that the one-story tall building in this location, at the proposed dimensional height, is visually compatible with the surrounding historic structures to which it is visually related. - PASS

**Vote Results**

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

19. Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | H-12-4727-2 | 600 East Bay Street | New Construction, Hotel I: Part I, Height and Mass, Phase B

- Attachment: [Staff Report - AMENDED.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Aerial Views.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - AMENDED.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Part I Phase B, of Hotel One on the property at 600 East Bay Street. Ms. Ward stated that due to the size and significance of this project, and upon conference with the petitioner and the Board Chair, Part I, Height and Mass review is considered in two phases. Phase A considered height, proportion of structure's front façade, rhythm of structures on the street (setbacks and any parking standards that affect setbacks), massing including recesses and scale. Phase B will consider proportion of openings, rhythm of solids to voids, entrances and balcony/porch rhythm, and any parking standards that may affect these openings or entrances, walls of continuity, and roof shape. Directional character is considered by both the building's form and openings, and applies to both Part I reviews.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass with the following conditions as provided in the amended submittal packet:

1. Strengthen the presence of entrances along the Bay Street façade. Additional entry doors could be provided at the southwest corner.
2. On the south façade (Bay Street), introduce voids in the westernmost bay over the entrance adjacent to Bay Street and redesign the adjacent glass curtain wall to be more compatible with other building fenestration on the same façade. Provide greater architectural variation within the recesses and projections on the ground floor adjacent to the sidewalk to break-up the large area of solid wall surface.



3. Consider more voids within the round corner to help balance the solid wall created by the internal stair on the south façade.

4. On the north façade (River Street), increase the amount of voids within the solid wall perpendicular to River Street. Provide greater regularity to the placement and size of voids within the center bay adjacent to River Street to establish a clear and apparent rhythm. Increase the width of independent openings in the ground floor or floors. Display cases could be increased to appear as storefront. Provide vertical divisions within the first two floor to clearly distinguish the two end sections of the building and provide subtle breaks with the horizontal base.

5. On the east façade, provide greater amounts of voids within the most visible sections adjacent to Bay Street, over the entrance, and adjacent to River Street.

For Part II, Design Details, staff recommends paired or ribbon window frames within the larger openings instead of center double-hung sashes flanked by sidelights and solid transoms as provided in the finding above. The sidewalk must serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

The material standard must be met and the sustainable roof certified by the City Manager and submitted with the Part II, Design Details, application for the Certificate of Appropriateness for the additional story above the height map as conditioned in the Part I, Phase A approval.

**Mr. Engle** asked Ms. Ward if the Board should be looking at the amended elevation.

**Ms. Ward** answered that she was discussing the original submittal first because this is where their report began. She will then go to the amended elevation to show how the petitioner has addressed it.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the drive-through shown around the display was a part of the previous submission.

**Ms. Ward** said they did not look at openings in the previous submission. This is the first time they are looking at openings.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the openings concern the design of the windows.

**Ms. Ward** said only the openings. However, she did put some information in the report for Part II.

**Mr. Merriman** asked Ms. Ward, what is a ribbon window?

**Ms. Ward** said she used the ribbon term, but she is trying not to use it again. She explained that she used this term for anything that is over a pair of windows. It is a multiple set of sashes that do not have a break in between them. She explained that instead of the petitioner using a center double hung with sidelights, they could probably do a pair of windows which would be more compatible with River Street. Ms. Ward said she does not know if the petitioner can fit if it is a series of three sashes in here on some of the openings that are larger. This is what she means by three.

**Mr. Lominack** said Ms. Ward has spoken both times about the lining up of the windows on the lower level on the north elevation. He said the center section is actually a curved surface and the surface behind it was a flat surface. The only time you see these, whether or not they are in line or not, is in elevation because they are not on the same plane.

**Ms. Ward** explained that staff's recommendation was for just the two bottom floors, not the alignment with the upper floors. Staff was saying that the roof above be regular rhythm, but not behind.

**Ms. Simpson** said that Ms. Ward mentioned the cupola. She noticed that there is an option one and an option two.

**Ms. Ward** explained that in the staff's first recommendation they asked the petitioner if he would consider alternatives. In talking with the petitioner, apparently they considered a number of alternatives and different roof shapes for that copula. They have provided two examples in their amended packet. She believes that the petitioner would be able to explain this better.

**Ms. Ward** pointed out the proposal with the dome is a more modern interpretation. She does not

believe that this is as successful and she recommends going with the dome over that. Therefore, she eliminated that recommendation from the staff's report.

**Ms. Simpson** stated that she believes the top piece is ten feet. She does not know the use and asked if it necessary.

**Ms. Ward** answered [pointing to a section] that she believes the whole element is a result of the Board's comment to provide some sort of gateway on the corner.

**Ms. Simpson** said on option II, there is a ten foot piece and a twelve foot piece under it. Since the Board has already given directions for this, but just possibly, can they remove the ten foot piece and keep the twelve foot piece?

**Ms. Ward** said this would be between the Board and the petitioner.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes that Mr. Shay, in his letter, stated that they were still studying the development.

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

**Mr. Lominack** said this project has come along way and he is happy with what he is seeing; but he does not agree with the location. Nevertheless, he believes that Mr. Shay and his staff are to be commended in the way they have brought this.

#### PETITIONER COMMENTS

**Mr. Shay** stated that present with him today was Mr. Saad Al Jassar and Ms. Maggie Ward. He complimented staff with the way they have been able to work together and interact on getting feedback to continue improving the building. Mr. Shay thanked Mr. Lominack for his kind words. This building will continue to get better as they move forward with the design details. Every suggestion that they received from the staff has already been incorporated into the revised drawing packet that the Board has in front of them.

**Mr. Shay** explained that on some of the elevations the Board will see sections of railings that are between the elements of cornice are setback a safe distance from the roof line basically to keep people from wandering too close to the edge of the roof. These are not things that would be seen from the ground level or probably from anywhere. They do strictly appear in the elevation and this is probably why there is some confusion about the particular railings.

**Mr. Shay** wanted to make a brief statement about the cupola. He believes that the drawings they presented to the Board today demonstrate that they are following good recommendations, but what it does not show the Board is the normal satiety of this building in a sense that he believes that at the urging of Dr. Williams it actually has a curve façade that is very elegant and extremely difficult to draw in an elevation. It has a very curved element at the intersection that is very deliberately set up to be a bit of a landmark. There was discussion among the Board about how there was a desire to create a landmark. The way that they are presenting these to the Board for a variety of conventional reasons flattens everything out; and he does not believe that it helps the Board see that having something that was a curved element on the roof that would be seen in silhouette would be an excellent bell weather and help the Board understand that this is a three-dimensional object that has that curved satiety in it.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Shay to please comment on the staff's recommendation about the ribbon windows and the additional windows.

**Mr. Shay** explained that he believes the comment about adding a wider bit of glazing or may be even two windows in that wall is something that they are willing to study in Part II. They have some conflicts with the floor plan, but given some time, they will figure out how to work this out. He explained that the aspect of the ribbon windows of doing groups of three or two, he is not sold on it yet. However, they have studied it and he is willing to keep an open mind on it and come back to the Board. Mr. Shay said he really likes the façade; as divided as it is into segments, there is something about those window ribbons that make them feel centric. Since there is really not an opportunity for the ribbon effect which is a long horizontal band, he is ambivalent and knows that if it is handled in some ways it can make the verticals stronger, but they think that by having the panes on the side, the

flankers without the horizontals would do the sash bar. Mr. Shay said they would like to hear the Board's comments on this and have the opportunity as appropriate and bring this back in the Part II Design Details.

**Dr. Williams** said in talking about the windows, the current configuration would serve as a variant of what is called a Chicago window. He said when Mr. Shay was talking about the railings, his comment would be true if the Trustees Garden was not across the street. The Trustees Garden is elevated.

**Mr. Shay** said [pointing to an area] it is about the level that is here. If you were standing on the high bluff on the opposite side of the street, you would be at approximately that level.

**Dr. Williams** said he does not know how far back the railings are, but he was saying for sake of clarification, that the point of view will not be on Bay Street that is falling down hill, but rather looking at the model by the Morris Center, there will be an opportunity from an elevated vantage point to look across and see the roof area perhaps more so than that section suggests.

**Mr. Shay** said you have purview over what is visible from the right-of-way, but they will have a section through this area to be less obtrusive as possible.

**Mr. Judson** asked Mr. Shay to show on the screen the 24 foot span that currently shows the narrow vertical strip of windows. He said he just wanted to clarify as Mr. Shay made in his comments that this is something that the Board may revisit in the design detail. As a Board member he is happy to stipulate that additional openings come back to staff for review, but it needs to also be clear that it is a part of Part I, Height and Mass.

**Dr. Williams** said he assumed that the ground floor will be activated commercial space. He was surprised to see the drive-through component. The Board did not see this before.

**Mr. Shay** explained that what they did in order to mitigate some of the staff's concerns was while they came in and made most of this the predominant glazed area.

**Dr. Williams** said this is the principal entrance to the hotel. He was surprised by the carved out driveway [he does not know if it is this phase or the next phase regarding the openings], but they are going to be the most significant openings along this level. Dr. Williams said, therefore, he believes they need to be handled with extreme care. Currently, they look like voids as opposed to entrances.

**Mr. Shay** said they agree. But, there will also be more delineation here of the three part massing along the front. The continuity of the sidewalk will be of such that although they will be what the traffic engineer refers to as a "dust pan." The materiality will be such that it will be clear to pedestrians that this is their territory.

**Dr. Williams** said it looks like window matter of a foot or so from one side of the opening and a yard or so on the other side.

**Mr. Shay** said this is because they want the vertical alignment with the windows above and it has to do with the spacing of the hotel rooms above it.

**Dr. Williams** said this is the instance where the petitioner might have to make some sacrifices on the position given that these are significant apertures.

**Mr. Shay** said they will look at this.

**Mr. Howington** said he wanted to piggyback on Mr. Lominack's comment. This has come a long way and is successful in many areas. On the north façade, next to the Savannah Electric and Power Company (SEPCO) building, the beams are quite classical and successful to him. Mr. Howington said he likes the heavy masonry base along the north elevation and as you get to the curved part, the window rhythm changes. He does not know if the petitioner looked at studying that block above as may be a brick building and even the corner tower as brick. He is of the opinion that this would help to diminish some of the weight on the corner and start with the appearance as if this was a cluster of buildings. It is such a large building and some of the language of the windows started changing there and on the curved part and even as you go around to the Bay Street side, some of the fenestration and rhythm changes. So, it would seem that this is a good opportunity to create a cluster of historic pattern.

**Mr. Howington** said as far as the display, he was not sure of what Mr. Shay was just talking about actually be used for. He does not want to go against staff, but he believes it would almost be better not to have that in the opening. As you jump back around to the corner, since the material changes on Bay Street, what is very successful is the heavy line across the bottom and the classical cap on the other side; then as you come around Bay Street, it is broken up which feels like, especially on Bay Street, General McIntosh, it would be more appropriate to have a very heavy band, but be opposite of the wall. He realizes he is going into Part II, but he was thinking of how this all will come together. Mr. Howington said he believes this would be more successful as well as coming around instead of breaking those up.

**Mr. Shay** said the exterior of the building will be all masonry. It will be approximately 70% brick and about 30% natural stone. But, this does not mean that all the natural stone has to be the same color and texture. He has presented buildings in the past that used different colors of brick; he is hesitant to do this again, but they are looking at those issues and are really excited about getting to the part where they can get their teeth really into the stone detailing that comes next. Therefore, with the color, texture, and rhythm they may be back and say this might be something other than just the same brick that is above it. They need to have the chance to get to this level and study it.

**Dr. Henry** said great progress has been made, but he was wondering if the petitioner's only reservation is about the staff's amended recommendations, the perpendicular windows. Are there other concerns?

**Mr. Shay** answered that at one time there was a recommendation against the dome and he would have objected to that, but it seems that this has gone away. They agree that they will come back in Part II and study the window groupings, but he is not telling the Board that he will do exactly what staff is recommending.

**Mr. Judson** said they have talked about the opening in Part I.

**Mr. Shay** stated that the area of void within the massing will be the same. He is now talking about how they will place the sashes and mutins within that void.

**Ms. Simpson** said that on the north elevation there is a single arch over a long group of windows. She does not see a relation to this arch anywhere else.

**Mr. Shay** that it relates to nothing, they just like it. It nods a little to the building next door which has segmented arches. They are not trying to mimic that building.

**Mr. Lominack** said one is also shown on the south elevation next to the bottom level of the tower.

**Mr. Shay** said they like it because it actually defines the base a little better.

**Dr. Williams** stated it is worth remembering that the arch is in the middle.

**Ms. Simpson** said although the arch is in the center, it is just arbitrary; it is still an arch.

**Dr. Williams** said if there were more of them nodding to the neighboring building.

**Ms. Simpson** said she was not suggesting more arches.

**Mr. Lominack** said he did not believe that the Board needs to get into that.

**Ms. Simpson** stated she believes the Board does need to look into this. She thinks this is important.

**Mr. Lominack** said it is not the Board's responsibility to design the building.

**Ms. Simpson** said she was not trying to design the building.

**Mr. Shay** said he has heard the comment and he understands it and will take it under consideration.

**Mr. Lominack** said he agrees that there should be a larger opening for the main entrance.

**Mr. Shay** said the Board wants the display case to go away. He asked the Board if they still want the openings to be glazed or wide open.

**Mr. Lominack** asked Mr. Shay if he was speaking of the car openings.

**Mr. Shay** explained that he believes what the Board is saying is that they think these are not really that important. If the display case went away would they still want glass?

**Mr. Lominack** asked Mr. Shay if he was speaking about the façade.

**Mr. Shay** said yes, on the façade.

**Mr. Howington** said to clarify his comment, he agrees that by putting glass out there takes away the function. This reminds him of what is down there on River Street near Wet Willie's [he is not sure what ramp it is] that there are openings like this. He agrees, however, that this is a little wider. However, what he is saying is the cluster; this is a bridge that is connected maybe a history of buildings and the north elevation with the arches would be successful to him. The bridge helps strengthen the cluster and the north elevation almost could go all the way through to Bay Street façade. There is a different order on the back side of that.

**Mr. Shay** replied that it physically can and he hears what Mr. Howington is saying.

**Mr. Howington** said the petitioner has created a window which is starting to be successful an entrance, but then there are two small bays and it changes. Therefore, this whole corner feels like it is something that could go through the building and relate to the other building. Maybe pop up the barefoot or something and give it something different as it is already different.

**Dr. Williams** said he just wanted to reiterate on Mr. Howington's comment about the base two-stories being a like on the north elevation. When coming from the east, he is not sure you would be able see both sides of the building because it is almost like a wedge building. He is not sure how much the recesses would affect that view, but he believes it might invite a similar treatment all the way around as there is a possible moment there of kind of a flattened building. This might suggest the continuity between the two as a base.

**Dr. Williams** said he was trying to interpret Mr. Howington's and Mr. Lominack's comments about the entrances in those display windows. He asked if they were suggesting like the Cotton Exchange where there are openings and columns and basically open up the whole thing. You would want some kind of support in the middle.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes the columns would be important, but he is not sure of the glass in the display area, unless the petitioner needs it.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he would like to leave the voids where they are and leave the mass where it is. It has been recommended that in this area that they take a look at how they handle the openings themselves as to whether they are glazed or not. Maybe they can come up with some ornamental metal work or something in this area. But, he wants to have a chance to study it and not design it right now in a meeting.

**Mr. Engle** said he believes the driver would be confused and will not perceive this as being the main entrance. The Mansion on Forsyth has a very nice drive around and it is very open. However, you know that it is a drive around.

**Dr. Williams** said, however, they need to be careful with the curve.

**Mr. Shay** said he wants to be sure that he has enough wall here so that the sort of elegance of this gentle curve still reads through.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Shay that when he was studying the cupola dome feature, he remembers that one of his first comments went back to the curving wall and this site and to think about how this belongs to a set of warehouses. The warehouses are odd because they have two faces and have high style on one side and a more industrial on the other side; and the petitioner has a building here that is also two-sided. He was thinking more of an industrial cupola.

**Mr. Engle** said at one time one was on Kehoe Iron Works.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes that there maybe models that could be a little less overtly classicizing. He believes this is elegantly restrained. He concurs with his colleagues as he thinks this

is just the one thing that is not quite in the right spirit for what the petitioner has been achieving.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation** said they had a chance to review the amended submittal and they believe it is much improved over the original submittal. Overall, their first impression in looking at the amended drawings is that they prefer the second option of the drawing without the cupola, the flat addition on the corner. She believes it is because it is keeping, more visually, with the rest of the side of the building. Additionally, they felt that the dome was very classical and it was just opposing the design of the rest of the building. After this discussion, she feels that something definitely needs to be said about the massing. Therefore, the HSF is still open to that; however, their first reaction was that they prefer the flat as opposed to the cupola.

**Ms. Meunier** said that the HSF agrees with all the staff's recommendations or any additional recommendations upon the amended petition. Their additional comments are on the south façade, they feel that a great deal is going on with the number and the configuration of bays. She knows this has improved a little and they do like the storefront area on the end as opposed to the interior of the building as was originally proposed. However, these two bays match and that is good, but this one is a single bay of windows and the other is a little different. Therefore, they would like to see more simplification; possibly, having less projecting bays, but make them wider.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Meunier to clarify what she said.

**Ms. Meunier**, pointing to a section, said there is one bay here that has two windows and both are recessed; these two bays here have vertical lines and they match, but this one is a single bay. The rhythm is a little bit off. Therefore, the HSF thought that this could be simplified a little by getting rid of one projecting bay and make the other a little bigger or wider. She said that on the north façade, they would be interested in seeing what the ground level would look like without the display case. She realizes that the petitioner has talked about studying this, but she thinks that it would be interesting not to have the display case and have columns in there too as the Cotton Exchange that was brought up. Ms. Meunier said on the east façade, the section that is a little further recessed, they feel there should be an additional vertical bay of windows. The rhythm along the rest of the building seems to be more consistent with the vertical bays of windows. She said in looking at the plan, she might be incorrect, but she believes there are four rooms spread across the space. They feel that it might make sense to just have two bays over the windows.

**Ms. Meunier** said for Part II as she knows they have been talking about some considerations for the windows and how it might impact the actual openings. They agree with the staff's recommendation for paired windows, not necessarily ribbon windows, she believes the HSF wants more vertical than horizontal, but they do like the windows that are on this building. She said, pointing to a section, they like these that do have the sort of horizontal bars that go all the way across. Ms. Meunier said she knows it has been talked about inverted Chicago-style windows here. They do like having the horizontal bar a little lower just to give some variation. But, they are definitely open to having double windows there as well.

**Ms. Ramsay** called for additional public comments.

**Mr. Daniel Carey** came forward and said he was not presenting the HSF, but speaking as a citizen. Mr. Carey said he struggled with the notion of how to treat the cupola, whether to flatten it or leave it alone. His only comment to further confound, this is that it would be important to consider features among all the other buildings in this area along River Street that are, as Dr. Williams pointed out, for the most part are industrial warehouses whether they are sort of dressed up or not, the cupola would definitely be different. Maybe this is too far away. But the other thing to think about as it is such a landmark is City Hall. It is the center piece of our city and he thinks nothing should come close to mimicking that. He was not suggesting that this is, but there ought to be a singular architectural element along the riverfront. Perhaps, this does work and he believes that hopefully Mr. Shay will go back and come up with a good solution. Mr. Carey said he knows this may make things more difficult. To be honest, there was internal debate at the HSF about this, but he personally thinks this works a little better in the sense that it is a little more contemporary and is a little more respectful and complimentary to the other sort of warehouse buildings in this area; does not overdress

something and, yet, is still a feature.

**Ms. Ramsay** called for additional public comment. No one came forward. She invited Mr. Shay to make comments to the public comments, if he so desired.

**Mr. Shay** said in earlier presentations when they were getting started initially on this, they showed the actual building that was on this site along time ago. It was an industrial building and had a cupola on it. He believes this is how this entire conversation got started. They will go back and look at this as an originating idea and then come back with something that is both industrial and has a nice silhouette.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Lominack** said there have been several comments made about changing of the pattern for windows on the different facades. He believes that one of the things that really happens on this building that he believes that kind of relieves the sea is that it introduces a good bit of variety to the building. But it is clearly a single building. The materials and even the details the way the windows are handled [their placement and their relationship to each other varies], but this is a varied site with varied exposures, some faces east, some faces north, and some faces south. Nevertheless, he believes that it clearly fits together as a single building and this is really good. Sometimes, they see bits and pieces of stuff that really do not make sense. As far as the cupolas are concerned, he would love to see something more playful and not try to relate it to anything. Just make it fun would be his choice as far as the way to handle this.

**Dr. Williams** said as he stated earlier, as one approaches the building there will be a moment when you can see the whole building as a singular building. He understands what Mr. Howington has said in terms of looking at this and how potentially to break it up. There are some warehouses that actually articulate in the middle, the one building, but then they respond differently to the curving site of the river. Some of the warehouses that have joints, bends and elbows, yet they have gables at each end and the central element. But, ultimately, they come together cohesively as a whole; yet, respond.

**Dr. Williams** said he also concurs that there is an opportunity to be playful with the corner tower; even taking the massing and stepping it back, wedding cake like, and maybe go higher with the cylinder.

**Mr. Howington** said just to clarify what he was saying, the horizontal base of this building is one of the strongest elements. He would also like to see this up and down General McIntosh instead of being broken up.

**Dr. Williams** stated that he agrees with Mr. Howington.

**Dr. Henry** said he likes the cupola. He does not like the flat thing. He believes the others are a little too classical and that something else could be done a little more industrial. Dr. Henry said he agrees with the comments about simplifying the south elevation and he does not like the windows. They may be called Chicago inverted, but they look like a lot of "H's" to him.

**Mr. Engle** said as he thinks about the Westin across the river and the two cupolas, he believes this ought to be very different. If not, it will look like a reflection of the Westin. They can check the photograph of the Kehoe Iron Works. But, they should avoid this hotel looking like a reflection of the hotel across the river.

**Mr. Judson** said he believes that the Board will allow it to come back for restudy although it is a part of Part I.

**Dr. Williams** said it sounds like it is such an isolated feature and just as the petitioner has provided option I, II that falls within the guidelines, it seems as if there are a lot of varieties and some ingenious solution that the petitioner might hit upon, but as it did not come up in any of their comments, he might hesitate to present it to the Board. Therefore, he wanted to encourage the petitioner to be creative and present options.

**Mr. Engle** said there is another one on Hotel II, which he assumes this is what it is. He reminded the Board that this one had the cupola originally. However, he does not know if it is there any longer.

**Mr. Merriman** said he likes the cupola. When the Board had its annual retreat, the individual who spoke with them went into great deal about the cupola that is on Candler Hospital and explained how they are traditionally on public buildings and sometimes on hospitals, and so forth. There has to be some room, maybe not as exactly like it is now, for some compromise.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she believes that the Board agrees that the cupola needs to be restudied.

**Dr. Henry** asked if this is the only time that they can address the openings about the arched window.

**Ms. Ramsay** said it is an opening and this is the only time unless the Board wants to restudy this.

**Ms. Simpson** said something else may not work, but the petitioner said he will look at this.

**Mr. Engle** asked Ms. Simpson if she was talking about the curve on the south elevation.

**Ms. Simpson** answered that it is on the north elevation.

**Ms. McClain** said there are two. One on the south and there maybe two on the north elevation.

**Mr. Shay** said to Dr. Henry that this is not the Board's last chance. He will not come back in a month and say the Board approved it with an arch. They have a long way to go on this entire project. They will restudy this in good faith and if it makes sense, they will bring it back and if it doesn't then they won't.

**Ms. McClain** said the windows round out into the elevation and somewhat ties in.

**Dr. Williams** said that on the southeast corner there appears to be four of them around the perimeter of the tower.

**Ms. Simpson** said Dr. Williams is talking about the south elevation, but she was talking about the north elevation.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked the Board if they were concerned about the arches and the tower.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes these are insignificant.

**Ms. Simpson** said she believes it is fair for everyone on the Board to share what their concerns are.

**Mr. Lominack** said that in the whole scheme of things, there are so many more things about this building that are more important.

**Mr. Judson** said he hears Ms. Simpson concern, but he does not agree.

**Ms. Simpson** said she knows that the Board probably does not agree, but they made the recommendation to make the corner where the curve is located a landmark. However, when looking at it, she believes it would be just as lovely without anything being at the top. The curve makes the statement enough to her.

**Dr. Williams** said on the ground floor in the curving façade, there is a classical building in Rome that has a curve and columns on the ground floor with openings. He said that the petitioner might want to see if that might be a way of retaining the continuity of the curve, yet having a more open central area. He said the elevations are reversed; east is listed as west and west is listed as east.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she believes that Mr. Shay has heard the Board's comments. She called for a motion.

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for Part I, Height and Mass with the following conditions [revisions addressing items 1-5 were provided to the Board but additional voids are needed to address item 4 as underlined]:

1. Strengthen the presence of entrances along the Bay Street façade. Additional entry doors could be provided at the southwest corner.



2. On the south façade (Bay Street), introduce voids in the westernmost bay over the entrance adjacent to Bay Street and redesign the adjacent glass curtain wall to be more compatible with other building fenestration on the same façade. Provide greater architectural variation within the recesses and projections on the ground floor adjacent to the sidewalk to break-up the large area of solid wall surface.
3. Consider more voids within the round corner to help balance the solid wall created by the internal stair on the south façade.
4. On the north façade (River Street), increase the amount of voids within the solid wall perpendicular to River Street. Provide greater regularity to the placement and size of voids within the center bay adjacent to River Street to establish a clear and apparent rhythm. Increase the width of independent openings in the ground floor or floors. Display cases could be increased to appear as storefront. Provide vertical divisions within the first two floors to clearly distinguish the two end sections of the building and provide subtle breaks within the horizontal base. - PASS
5. On the west façade, provide greater amounts of voids within the most visible sections adjacent to Bay Street, over the entrance, and adjacent to River Street.
6. Restudy the cupola. Restudy the vehicular area and consider replacing the display cases with columns.
8. Study the bay rhythm and spacing on the south elevation.

The material standard must be met and the sustainable roof certified by the City Manager and submitted with the Part II, Design Details, application for the Certificate of Appropriateness for the additional story above the height map as conditioned in the Part I, Phase A approval.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

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

20. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 12-002192-COA | 319 West Congress Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

**Ms. Marjorie Webb** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction Part II, Design Details, of a three (3) story mixed-use building at 319 West Congress Street. The general development plan was submitted for site plan review on January 4, 2013.

The Board approved Part I, Height and Mass on January 9, 2013 with conditions. Additional items that were approved in Part I, Height and Mass that have changed in this application include:

1. The window and door configuration on the lane elevation have changed due to required changes for access to the shared mechanical area. The openings on the elevation will be re-reviewed for Part I compliance with this application.
2. A storefront opening was added to the stair enclosure above the roof and will be re-reviewed for part I compliance with this application.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass because the project is in compliance with the Visual Compatibility Factors and Design Standards.

**Ms. Michalak** also reported that staff recommends approval for Part II, Design with the following conditions to be submitted with the construction documents to staff for final review and approval:

1. Provide a sample of the proposed stucco finish to be reviewed and approved by staff prior to construction.
2. Reduce the overall height of the storefront base to a maximum of 24 inches.
3. Revise the storefront window design to have continuous transoms that match the height of transoms shown above the storefront doors.
4. Locate electric vaults, meter boxes, and communications on the rear façade.
5. Locate refuse storage areas within the building.

**Dr. Henry** said he saw the sample and the zinc looks more like a stainless refrigerator.

**Ms. Michalak** said it might not be an actual zinc sample. This is a question that the petitioner can answer.

**Mr. Engle** said it will quickly turn dark grey when it is exposed.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Webb** came forward and entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Engle** said since the Board is being asked to approve a material that is not on the list, he has a problem with the stucco lintels. He tends to think of stucco lintels being used on new construction, residential or when they do not want to put in a real lintel. He asked Ms. Webb if they considered using cast stone lintels on it. They are doing such an elegant first floor and then they are just going ahead with stucco lintels. Everything on this block has very elegant lintels. In most cases, cast iron is here, but he was not suggesting this. How much more would it cost to use cast stone lintels? He was speaking about compatibility and he does not believe that there is a single building in this block that has stucco over the lintels.

**Ms. Webb** said this is a new building and not an old building.

**Mr. Engle** said, however, it is trying to look like an old building and trying to be compatible.

**Mr. Merriman** said it will be right between two old buildings.

**Ms. Webb** said she believes they can consider the cast stone lintels.

**Mr. Engle** said it is that every new construction, residential or townhouses do not use real lintels any longer, they use stucco lintels. He has a problem with this.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier** said that the **Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** agrees with the staff's recommendations; especially that the transoms be included in all the storefront windows all the way across. They also feel that the proportions of the windows on the upper floors could be further improved by making them taller if possible. They do not know if they could make the windows taller between the floor heights, but they just wanted to emphasize a little more verticality. Now that they are paired, the actual opening itself is more of a square shape. Therefore, if they could be made a little taller, would be good. Obviously, they also agree that they would prefer cast stone lintels as opposed

to stucco lintels.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** said he just observed that the paired double-hung portions of these are actually taller than the building two doors to the east in the picture on page 2. His point is that two doors down they have similar windows with different treatment over the lintels. Dr. Williams said he does not know how much room is left on the façade to alternate the proportions. He believes the picture shows paired openings which he guesses is squared already on the block.

**Mr. Merriman** said if the petitioner does the cast stone lintels, he is fine with everything else as recommended by the staff.

**Board Action:**

Approval for Part I, Height and Mass because the project is in compliance with the Visual Compatibility Factors and Design Standards.

Approval for Part II, Design Details with the following conditions to be submitted with the construction documents to staff for final review and approval:

1. Change the stucco sills and lintels to cast stone to match the cast stone on the base. - PASS
2. Provide a sample of the proposed stucco finish to be reviewed and approved by staff prior to construction.
3. Reduce the overall height of the storefront base to a maximum of 24 inches.
4. Revise the storefront window design to have continuous transoms that match the height of the transoms shown above the storefront doors.
5. Locate electric vaults, meter boxes, and communications on the rear façade.
6. Locate refuse storage areas within the building.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle

- Aye

Nicholas Henry

- Aye

Keith Howington

- Aye

Sidney J. Johnson

- Not

Present

Brian Judson

- Aye

T. Jerry Lominack

- Aye

Zena McClain, Esq.

- Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

- Aye

Linda Ramsay

-

Abstain

Ebony Simpson

- Aye

Robin Williams

- Aye

**Agenda B (Items 20-24 will be heard no earlier than 4:00pm)**

21. [Petition of Anil R. Patel and Kirit R. Patel | 12-002200-COA | 135 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. \(508/512 West Oglethorpe Avenue\) | New Construction Hotel: Part 1, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Historic Building Map - South Oglethorpe Ward.pdf](#)

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

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

**Mr. Jasper Waynecrocker**, engineer/architect, was present on behalf of the petitioner.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction, Part I Height and Mass for a six-story, 130 unit, hotel located on the vacant parcel at 135 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard (508-512 West Oglethorpe Avenue). The parcel is L-shaped, with street frontages on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, Ann Street and Alton Street. The hotel is oriented to face Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard as do the other existing structures within the block face. The General Development Plan (GDP) was submitted to the City on December 31, 2012. The design has been revised since that submission, prior to the January 24, 2013 Historic District Board of Review (HDBR) deadline to address comments. The revised GDP needs to be submitted.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends to continue Part I, Height and Mass of the proposed hotel to consider the following items:

1. Increase the width of each of the two central architectural segments along the MLK Jr. Blvd to meet the 15 foot minimum bay width standard.
2. Enlarge the southernmost bank of storefront along MLK to match that of the other storefront banks on the MLK façade.
3. Increase the width of the narrow storefront windows on the Oglethorpe, Ann, and Alton Street facades to be at least as wide or wider than the punched openings above.
4. Create two bays at the easternmost bay of Oglethorpe faced to match the southernmost bay on the MLK façade and adjust the westernmost bay to have the three window grouping.
5. Redesign the windows on the easternmost bay of the Alton Street façade to meet the "distance between windows" standard.
6. Clarify the location of the storefront window in the "Office" on the Alton Street façade. The elevation drawing and the plan drawing do not match.
7. Provide a consistent cornice height along the main architectural segments fronting MLK.

For Part II, Design Details:

- The material standard must be met and the sustainable roof certified by the City Manager and submitted with Part II, Design Details to include the additional story.
- The required information, per the application checklist, for site walls, fences, and any appurtenances including any visible structures that may be associated with gardens, patios, dumpsters, and pools must be submitted with the Part II, Design Details.
- Signage is indicated in concept only. The required information on the checklist must be submitted for review of this element and can be a separate application from the building application.

**Ms. Michalak** informed the Board that the petitioner wants to address some of the comments with them, but before the petitioner does so, she will address the comments they have for staff.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Michalak to pull up page 3. He asked where will the hotel be located and where is the parking lot.

**Ms. Michalak** [pointing to a section] said the hotel is here and the parking lot is there.

**Dr. Henry** replied that this is what he was afraid of.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that actually what the petitioner is doing is basically opening this back up how it was historically.

**Dr. Henry** asked, what is the petitioner opening up?

**Ms. Michalak** pointed out where the petitioner's property is located. Presently, the street no longer goes through. As the Board can see in the site plan, the petitioner is reopening this to be a street again. The project has changed a lot before it was submitted to the Board. Originally, there were five stories and it spanned Alton Street.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the petitioner will deed the street back to the City.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that the petitioner will need to be asked if they are giving it back to the City of whether they are going to keep it.

**Dr. Henry** said he reviewed this yesterday. He commended the petitioner for trying to get a fancy product. He believes the petitioner felt it possibly reflected the historic district. This proposed hotel is more impressive than the first proposed hotel. Dr. Henry said maybe the first hotel was a little too simple.

**Mr. Engle** said may be he missed something in the staff's presentation as he is looking at Alton Street and reads it, the four bricks between window sill and window head makes at best twelve (12) inches. Something has to be wrong with the elevation spacing.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that she does not know what is the petitioner's interior construction.

**Mr. Engle** said the windows would be sitting on the floor. The section shows 28 inches. Therefore, the entire elevation is suspect. The proportions are all wrong as solids to voids. The Board cannot judge solids to voids on this elevation.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the Board can ask the petitioner about the proportions.

**Dr. Williams** said Ms. Michalak made a comment and a recommendation regarding the east end regarding the Oglethorpe elevation. He said Alton Street elevation also follows this same logic, but he does not recall that a recommendation was made for this elevation. Whatever happens on the south side, should happen here.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that this actually steps back here a story. It is shorter and, therefore, is not the same as the other side. The other side has more of a tower on the corner. She said in her presentation, she commented that the distance between the window standards had to be resolved.

**Dr. Williams** asked if this applies to both sides.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes.

**Mr. Lominack** asked Ms. Michalak if this would be the horizontal distance.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes that the vertical distance does not agree with the section either.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that this is what Mr. Engle was saying. This is a question for the petitioner.

**Mr. Engle** stated that if this scaled off, the ratio on these are not right.

**Mr. Howington** said something is off with the doors on the first floor.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said they were aware of the staff's comments as they were emailed to them approximately a week ago. They went ahead and made the changes. As a matter of fact, they made a lot of changes on the windows. Actually, they made the windows a little bigger. They have floor to ceiling windows. In looking at some of the windows on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, they were very large. This is somewhat the older way of doing things such as having bigger windows. Mr. Waynecrocker said they wanted to have one big window instead of two windows per bay. He explained that they rearranged the windows to be fifteen (15) feet to base spacing.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** told the Board that he would go through each of the staff's recommendations

and then entertain comments from them. He said that staff's first recommendation is for them to "increase the width of each of the two central architectural segments along the MLK Jr. Boulevard to meet the 15 foot minimum bay width standard." He explained that they made floor to ceiling windows and actually increased the size to five (5) foot by eight (8) four and drew a section through the wall to scale with a ten (10) foot floor-to-floor height on the upper levels. They got 14 foot-six for the first floor and twelve foot for the next floor and then ten foot on the rest of them. He has 15 feet between the windows. Therefore, they met the 15 foot minimum bay width requirement. They also meet the 3:5 ratio. They worked out the area and actually have 24% now of window areas on the upper stories. The other rule was you must have two times the width of the window for the spacing. He explained [pointing to a section] that they would have five feet window width here and ten feet here. This gives them 15 feet center-to-center.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said staff's second recommendation is "enlarge the southernmost bank of storefront along MLK to match that of the other storefront banks on the MLK façade." He reported that they went ahead and added the four bay windows all the way along and moved the doors on the stairs. They have balanced the windows all the way across. He has a floor plan also, but guessed the Board is concerned with the elevation.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Waynecrocker if the staff has seen what he is presenting now to the Board.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** answered no. They were told that they could not resubmit.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said staff's third recommendation is 'increase the width of the narrow storefront windows on the Oglethorpe, Ann and Alton Street facades to be at least as wide or wider than the punched openings above.' He said that he will cover each of the streets. They reorganized and put more windows there. On the right side of Oglethorpe, they went ahead and put the same windows here as they have everywhere else. They will have eight inch (8") hollow course slabs for their four inch (4") ceilings. Consequently, it works out that they will have from the finished floor to the bottom of the window eight inches (8") on every room and four inches at the top for trim. This is what they are proposing.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the windows would be functional or double-hung.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** answered yes they are double-hung.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if there will be guard rails or something on the inside to keep people from falling off.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said there could be a guard rail. The Board sees how it is double hung.

**Mr. Engle** asked if these are changes that do not show on the transverse.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** answered yes. These are new things that they brought with them today.

**Mr. Engle** said, therefore, they don't have any sections that show exactly what they are.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** answered that the Board does not, but he would like to go over them to get feedback on what they think. He continued with his explanation by saying that the next street when going around the building is Ann Street. They somewhat did the same thing here. They added some more windows and made them bigger. They took the cornices and made them straight across. On Alton Street, similarly, they put in bigger windows on the bottom and got some storefront windows where there will be a conference room area. This could also be a wedding chapel. The new street they are talking about where Alton Street was, they will have a drop-off here for the hotel patrons. He said over here [pointing to a section] would be the conference center, offices and so forth. They are matching everything pretty well.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said staff's fourth recommendation is "create two bays at the easternmost bay of the Oglethorpe façade to match the southernmost bay on the MLK façade and adjust the westernmost

bay to have the three window grouping." He explained that he really did not do it exactly as this, but tried to make it look like MLK on the upper levels. On the lower levels they matched the windows. They did not want to put storefront there as it is really a property line and adjoins a service station.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said staff's fifth recommendation is "redesign the windows on the easternmost bay of Alton Street façade to meet the distance between windows standards." He stated that on Alton Street, they added another row of windows. Now, they meet the distance requirements of two times the window width. They have the same big windows here, which they really like. Actually, they believe that it will be more economic to have the big windows instead of two windows. They moved the windows around, but still have the thirteen (13) foot room width. They moved the windows around where they missed the walls. This is how they accomplished this.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said staff's sixth recommendation is "clarify the location of the storefront window in to the "Office" on Alton Street façade. The elevation drawing and the plan drawing do not match." He said they have it all matching now. He showed the Board their floor plan.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said regarding the staff's seventh recommendation to "provide a consistent cornice height along the main architectural segments fronting MLK." They have actually done this on every elevation. He explained that on MLK, on the left, they went ahead and raised the cornices to the top and all the way across. They have a small area up there with three bays that will be raised eight or nine inches. Therefore, this makes it look different and when you walk down the street you see that this is the entrance. They did the same on the other elevation.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** stated again that on all the work, they went ahead and it all one cornice all the way across. They still have four feet behind it. Therefore, they can put solar panels or whatever on top of the roof, which will be hard to see from the ground anyway. On Ann Street, they lowered the cornice height there and added some more windows. They have done the same thing on Alton Street. They have a standard cornice all the way across the building.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said all the above covers the staff's comments and recommendations. He did not know if what he is about to say applies to the Board, but they got a letter from the Department of Transportation (DOT) today that they are going to approve the curb cut for Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. The owner does not want to deed the street over to the City as he wants to keep it as a driveway and parking for the hotel so the people can be dropped off, etc.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked the Board if they had questions for the petitioner.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Waynecrocker to please pull up the MLK elevation and asked why is the piece missing at the top right corner.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** answered that there is a rule in the ordinance that you can only go so many feet without having a change in roof height. They went ahead and added a change.

**Dr. Williams** asked him, so many feet from where to where?

**Mr. Waynecrocker** [pointing to a section] said from this edge to that edge.

**Dr. Williams** said Mr. Waynecrocker has already changed the part he is calling the entrance.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** stated that it has to be one-half story or more.

**Mr. Engle** said he thought this was in the adjacent building where Mr. Waynecrocker had to setback 30 feet.

**Ms. Ward** explained that in commercial zoning districts you can only go 120 feet before you have to have a change in roof line. However, she believes this is to meet the roof line variation standard for the massing. Initially, the building spanned longer and needed to do that variation, but when they pulled it back to open Alton Street, they were okay on this standard. However, this is used to meet the massing standard. This may have worked better when a bay was there.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said [pointing to a section] that if the Board prefers, they can move it from here to here.

**Dr. Williams** said given the floor plan at the lobby area is a very open plan; they have a seven (7) bay elevation with exactly the same space between every column of windows, every bay. He told Mr. Waynecrocker imagine moving the entrance one bay to the south and in fact, he would not have a wall right beside the entrance if he did this. He asked Mr. Waynecrocker to go back to the elevation. There is no walls or anything inside that would condition this; he asked him why not make this a symmetrical façade. He said disregard that little chunk that is missing and imagine that little chunk in the top right corner was there, why not make it a symmetrical façade with a central entrance? Dr. Williams said the petitioner has seven bays and given the vocabulary using basically a renaissance plats of forum, it just seems that with its tripod elevation and the massing, he asked Mr. Waynecrocker to explain why the entrance is not centered.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said that when they looked at the large scale development and the first floor needed to have different uses, he knew (pointing to a section) that the hotel was here. Therefore, he centered the hotel here and put this part here for the coffee shop. He wanted to do this so when someone goes to the hotel they will know that some else is there [the coffee shop].

**Dr. Williams** asked if the hotel extends over coffee shop.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** answered that the hotel extends over the coffee shop.

**Dr. Williams** said, therefore, the building is basically a hotel and has a small coffee shop. The petitioner is subjugating the elevation because there is a coffee shop. However, he would say that the overall symmetry of the façade was the central entrance and a little more coherence would still allow a little bit of variance to have a door and a coffee shop on the left; especially if there are six sets of commercial windows [three to the right and three to the left], you could still have the coffee shop with a formal door, fire escape door and still maintain something that is more akin to the symmetrical, orderly façade. Dr. Williams said he was troubled by the elevation among other features. He said he was not compelled by Mr. Waynecrocker's explanation that the three bays alone are read as the hotel part, which would then according to the petitioner's logic, the other three bays belongs to the coffee shop. This is a lot of building for a little coffee shop.

**Dr. Williams** said from what he is understands, there is a seven (7) bay wide hotel that needs an entrance; and by putting it in the third bay from the right, the petitioner is diminishing the importance of the hotel's entrance by doing this. If it is put in the middle, then the whole building reads as a hotel.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said they do not mind moving this. This was just his opinion about it.

**Dr. Williams** said that Mr. Waynecrocker mentioned solar panels on the roof. He believes the solar panels would be angled up and not flat. Is this correct?

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said this is correct.

**Dr. Williams** informed the petitioner that the Board would need to see a section view through this building that not only shows the height of the parapet relative to the roof, but the size of the solar panels with site lines up and down from the street. He said that solar panels are bright and shiny. The sun could, theoretically, hit off a panel and send beams of light in some direction. How high is the parapet?

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said parapet is four feet.

**Dr. Williams** said the solar panel is eight feet.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said the solar panel would be at an angle and, therefore, it would probably not be a chance of it hitting anybody on the street.



**Dr. Williams** said the Board does not know this. They need to see a section because solar panels are essentially a structural feature that is on the roof. Anything that is on the roof the Board needs to see how visible it would be. Obviously, it will not be seen from here, but MLK is a major corridor, with a very wide street with visibility site lines from a quarter mile away. They have to be sensitive to a much bigger environment.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said they will give the Board a section.

**Mr. Howington** said he wanted to elaborate on the front façade. It appears that the bay for the entrance to the hotel is projecting out. The plan does not do this, unless the petitioner's new plan does so.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said it does not project out.

**Mr. Howington** said, therefore, this is just one flat façade.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** confirmed that it is one flat façade, but they have bricks sticking out in some areas to make it look like some vertical separation.

**Dr. Williams** said this is not shown on the plan.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** stated that he believes it is shown on the plan.

**Mr. Howington** asked, what are those vertical lines representing in the three bay entrance to the hotel? Are the vertical lines actually there?

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said the vertical lines are there, but they only come out a few inches.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if they were only one brick wide.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** answered yes.

**Mr. Engle** asked if this is the new elevation.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said yes.

**Mr. Engle** said, therefore, the elevation that the Board reviewed is not that.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** stated correct.

**Mr. Engle** said he was troubled by the lack of masonry between the windows.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** explained that when they draw a section, they put a concrete sill. They can put a concrete line on top as there is enough room to put it there.

**Mr. Engle** said this is not his point. He can not think of an example on MLK historically that has twelve (12) inches between the upper one story and the header of another. There is such a lack of masonry mass there. There needs to be some sort of spandrels. Mr. Engle said the petitioner will have to put a grill on the interior or exterior. You can not have a six-story building with a double-hung sash where a child can fall out the window. There needs to be some 36 inch high something either on the inside or outside. The Board has to know what it is going to be.

**Mr. Lominack** said the heating and air conditioning units are behind the bricks.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** stated that they changed this. They decided to put the mechanical units over the door and put the compressor on the roof. The section has been revised as well.

**Mr. Engle** said the Board has not seen this.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the end result is this petition will have to be continued. The Board does not have the information before them and what they are doing now is only giving the petitioner their reaction to what they are seeing today.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** told Ms. Ramsay that he appreciates their comments. He is here to see what they need to do in order to get their request approved.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said in the beginning they had two windows and it makes the windows not as high. Therefore, he believes that something like this would be better and then they could get their spacing between the windows. Then they will look like something on MLK.

**Mr. Lominack** asked Mr. Waynecrocker if this section is between the first and second floor.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said [pointing to a section] that the bottom is right here on the first floor, which is the 14-6 and this would be the second floor. Therefore, it has eight (8) inches from the floor up; four inches at the top and the window will be between them.

**Mr. Lominack** asked the petitioner if he would have a code compliant guard rail on the inside of the window.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** answered yes. They will have tempered glass as well.

**Mr. Lominack** said tempered glass does not count for guard rail.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said it would lineup where the sash is.

**Mr. Engle** said not to change the subject, but the site plan shows a six foot wooden fence. Is this still in the plan?

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said it should not state wooden as it is brick. They will fix this.

**Mr. Lominack** said his concern is they have a building that had a piece of property that has two main street facades facing elevations. One is occupied by a parking lot. If the building was there, any parking would have to be set back thirty feet from the sidewalk in order to use it for ground level as parking under the ordinance. Yet, on a main street such as this, if there is no building it would be just a lot of parking. This is poor site planning.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** [pointing to a section] asked Mr. Lominack if he was talking about over here.

**Mr. Lominack** answered that the was talking about Oglethorpe Avenue.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** explained that a service station is here.

**Mr. Lominack** said this is a big parking lot right on what is one of the primary entrances into this city. It is a major gateway into this city and a parking lot would be there.

**Mr. Engle** said this is exactly what happened with Family Dollar. The Board did not want them to have a parking lot in front of the building.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said that the adjacent buildings are all commercial. Down the street on Ann Street he believes there are some apartments. The Greyhound Bus Station is over here on this side. Therefore, it is not very residential any longer.

**Dr. Williams** said the Board is talking about density.

**Mr. Engle** said it could be setback 20 feet and have a tree lawn adjacent to the sidewalk.

**Dr. Henry** said they need something to mitigate this.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** asked Mr. Engle if he was saying move it back 20 feet that the Board might be alright with it. They can put in some landscaping.

**Mr. Engle** said this is an option. However, he can not judge as he does not know which of the drawings are real. But, the little 12 foot wide tree lawn will certainly not screen anything. It is horrid to have a parking lot that big on Oglethorpe.

**Dr. Henry** said he is in agreement with Mr. Lominack about the entrance into the city. Maybe the petitioner needs to consider just letting the hotel front those two streets and put the parking lot on the back.

**Mr. Engle** said maybe the building ought to be on Oglethorpe Avenue.

**Dr. Henry** explained that when they look at photographs three through six, they actually have a little more detail than what Mr. Waynecrocker is talking about. He said Mr. Waynecrocker might want to reflect these a little more. He does not know what the petitioner can do with the chunk at the top, but something needs to be done.

**Mr. Anil Patel** came forward and stated that he is the owner. Mr. Patel explained that more than ten years ago an old hotel was here called the Economy Inn. The name was later changed to Econo Lodge. He said they did two hotel drawings. They spent a lot of money. The economy went down. Now, they want to come back and build a new hotel. Their goal today is to do one hotel now and then come back later and do a five-story garage back here and put in one more hotel. However, with today's financing, the economy is in a bad shape. Mr. Patel said he hears what the Board is saying, but unfortunately he cannot build the building right now.

**Mr. Patel** explained [pointing to an area] that their plan now is to do surface parking here and want to do what the Hampton Inn across the street has done. They have a parking lot at the corner and a railing. They want to come back to the Board. He asked the Board that with the windows can they do the "PTAC" under the windows as the other hotels have done. They will come back to the Board and make this work better for the Board and them. They do not have problems with changing the entrance. He said [pointing to a section] that they want to do the parking over here and will put a nice screen around it as the Hampton Inn has done. As he said, they will come back to the Board later with a 250 car parking garage back there. This is his plan.

**Mr. Merriman** asked, what is a PTAC?

**Mr. Patel** said the PTAC would go under the windows.

**Mr. Howington** explained that the Board saw them on the other hotel. Under the window is usually a grill. If it is executed correctly, he saw no reason why the petitioner could not do so. He said, personally, he likes the big windows.

**Ms. Ward** explained that for the petitioner to get the square foot numbers as they have set it back, they are going up. They are not doing it to meet the ordinance. To get the additional story they are using criteria four which is materials and the green roof criteria. This is not on the historic streets and lane map or in the Oglethorpe Plan area and they could not use that standard to get the additional story.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the solar panels qualify as a green roof.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes. It is like putting green technology on the roof.

**Dr. Williams** said that he did not know where this sits relative to what Ms. Ward said about the Oglethorpe plan and seating back a public street, but this area of town has very long blocks, restoring Alton Street, especially given the design that the petitioner is building, he thinks would be very beneficial. Dr. Williams believes this would actually improve the activity level and function of this hotel, having a real street.

**Dr. Williams** said there was one other small point on the north and south elevations. However, it is a design question and not an ownership question.

**Mr. Patel** said he will go back to his notes when they did the R and K hotel. There was a title for the Hotel Mindy. He had to go back and look at it because he knew they have paid over \$200,000 to the water department since 2007. They have already paid for the impact fee as they knew they were going to go back and do this project. As they are doing other projects downtown they can apply this fee to the new project they are doing on River Street, the Ryan Hotel. He will let Ms. Michalak and Ms. Ward know if they are going to keep this or whether they will finish it and return it back to City of Savannah.

**Dr. Williams** stated that the windows facing MLK are too close to the corner of the building.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said they had them on the edge of the wall.

**Dr. Williams** said on the front elevation there is about five (5) or six (6) feet. In other words, the petitioner is using a classical vocabulary throughout the building, but one of the key elements of grammar of classes is that corners get augmented. Where the windows are, you expect it to be solid. What the petitioner has done with that big wide band of solid on the other end is good.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said they can do the same thing on this side. They just went ahead and put in an extra window. He has seen buildings where the windows are almost on the corners. This is why he put the windows there as he thought it would be a nice feature. However, if the Board does not like it, they will move it.

**Mr. Engle** said he suggests that the tie rods for the canopies are nonfunctional. They will not work.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said they will put in bigger one. They just did one in downtown Atlanta.

**Mr. Engle** said he was not saying bigger, but if the petitioner is going to have them, they should be about three feet or four feet up the building.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said they will have them go up the building when they do them. They have not gotten to this yet.

**Mr. Howington** asked, how tall are the doors on the first floor?

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said they are seven (7) feet.

**Mr. Howington** said if the doors are seven (7) feet, the petitioner needs to restudy the height of the first floor for delineation. It does not look like fourteen (14) in that drawing.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** stated that he believes they have a transom on top of it.

**Dr. Williams** said the door would only be halfway up the fourteen feet.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said they will check this.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said some of their comments might be Part II. But, they would like to see some framing or differentiation around the signs. They would like to see more substantial cornices as they are very narrow now. They believe the cornices should be bigger. She believes that the Alton Street façade is shown better on the new drawings, but she wanted to confirm with the petitioner the parapet and is this why the windows are being cut off.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** said that it is a glitch.

**Ms. Meunier** stated that she realized that it is a glitch, but, she said [pointing to an area] right here the windows are actually cut off. She asked if it is because this is where it steps back.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** explained that it does step back here and the parapet cover it. The windows are the same size, but cuts off because the parapet.

**Ms. Meunier** asked if a different material is up there.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** answered yes.

**Ms. Meunier** realized that the Board has already talked about parking and vehicle accessibility on Oglethorpe Avenue, but she just wanted to state it again. The HSF would like to see more definition on MLK because it is the primary façade to something that differentiates it from all of the others.

**Mr. Daniel Carey** came forward as a private citizen. He asked staff that pertaining to the green roof being presented to the City Manager for her decision, does the Board or staff in some form send a memo to her and she reviews it. Does it go to her with a recommendation or does the City Manager make a decision based on whatever is in the packet? Mr. Carey said he believes that whatever is proposed and what the Board and staff think meets the criteria to qualify for the extra story is made known to the City Manager. Since this is the City Manager's decision, he was trying to understand in what context or how she makes that decision.

**Mr. Lominack** said he has had a problem with this personally because he does not have the expertise to determine whether it meets all of the requirements. The City Manager is a very nice person, but he does not believe that she has the expertise to determine whether something is in fact working as a functional green roof. There should be some kind of technical review that takes place.

**Ms. Ward** explained that the actual process is that she writes a memo and takes it to the City Manager it is not said that this has not been established in her mind. The burden is on the petitioner to go and seek that approval. Of course, staff will help the petitioner make the connects as they have been doing with other petitioners. The City has adopted a green roof ordinance, but it's more for vegetative roofs, but it is up to the City Manager's discretion to determine whether the standard is met and it is specifically written to be open like this because each case is different. But, the approval or certification would have to be submitted to this Board in some form of writing before Part II so that the petitioner can get the additional floor.

**Mr. Carey** thanked Ms. Ward for the explanation. He said also he believes that Mr. Lominack makes a good point. They might want to look more carefully at this portion of the ordinance and perhaps be a little more prescriptive, only to assist the City Manager. He was not saying that this should be taken out of her purview, but they ought to frame this up nice and tight so that it is a simple thing. Perhaps, a checklist could be used.

**Ms. Michalak** said the staff recommends that the elevation and information that was brought before the Board today to address staff's comments not be accepted as the current elevations. A lot of good things that were in the previous submittal have been lost in the ones presented today. This is the first time that the staff has seen them. She also believes there are some misunderstandings in the staff's recommendation and what resulted from them today.

**Mr. Waynecrocker** requested a continuance.

**Board Action:**

Continue the petition for Part I, Height and Mass of the proposed hotel to consider the following items:

1. Increase the width of each of the two central architectural segments along the MLK, Jr. Blvd. to meet the 15 foot minimum bay width standard
2. Enlarge the southernmost bank of storefront along

- MLK to match that of the other storefront banks on the MLK façade.
3. Increase the width of the narrow storefront windows on the Oglethorpe, Ann, and Alton Street facades to be at least as wide or wider than the punched openings above.
  4. Create two bays at the easternmost bay of the Oglethorpe façade to match the southernmost bay on the MLK façade and adjust the westernmost bay to have the three window grouping. - PASS
  5. Redesign the windows on the easternmost bay of the Alton Street façade to meet the “distance between windows” standard.
  6. Clarify the location of the storefront window in to the “Office” on the Alton Street façade. The elevation drawing and the plan drawing do not match.
  7. Provide a consistent cornice height along the main architectural segments fronting MLK.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Ebony Simpson  
Second: Keith Howington

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

22. [Petition of Holly Metts Pace | 513 Whitaker Street | 13-000332-COA | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Description and Plans.pdf](#)

**Mr. & Mrs. Pace** were present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to replace the fence surrounding the property at 513 Whitaker Street and install an additional fence on the west side of the property were none currently exists. Staff went to the site and conducted a physical inspection. This is a difficult case. Staff spent a lot of time with the petitioners working with them trying to see what they could uncover about the piers as they did not want to lose any fabric that maybe historic. The design and gauge of the iron work (hollow core), between the piers is not consistent with the more decorative iron work on the balconies and vehicular drive, and as such, does not appear to be historic.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval of the new brick and iron fence with the

condition that the height of the fence not exceed the height of front yard fencing within the block face to form a consistent wall of enclosure and be visually compatible.

**Mr. Engle** said photo 52 on page 19 matches the fence that is on the house.

**Ms. Ward** explained that as she covered in her presentation, some iron work on the house is consistent with the metal work on the fence. She believes it was replaced the same time that the fencing was installed. The petitioner has talked with metal workers who agree the gauge of this metal work, that it is a hollow core metal, is not consistent with the period of construction or the decorative metal on the building. Ms. Ward said that the petitioner can speak to this, however, better than she.

**Dr. Williams** asked if all the members are hollow core.

**Ms. Ward** answered that this is what the petitioner is testifying to.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the members have been cut through and sectional views have been done.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the sectional view question should be addressed to the petitioner.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the gates on Whitaker Street side would be kept. Do they have this design?

**Ms. Ward** answered that the gate would remain and it does not have the design. They are much more decorative. She showed the Board a picture of the gate.

**Dr. Williams** asked, what is at the bottom of the gate?

**Ms. Ward** explained that there are little hooks on the bottom of the gate.

**Dr. Williams** said it is the same design, but a more elaborate version.

**Ms. Ward** said she noticed in the last photo and if the Board remembers, these piers were added around 1968 as evidenced in later photographs. She said [pointing to a section on the photo] that they know this was new and was added when they were put in. She does not know whether they were trying to be compatible with the gate. Maybe this is conjecture, but it is also a probability.

**Dr. Williams** said a photo with a 1979 date, the weathering pattern of the piers that are there looks old. Therefore, his guess is that these piers are not as young as they are being asserted.

**Ms. Ward** said the first edition of the Historic Savannah Foundation publication; the photo shows a similar configuration. This was 1968. She believes they probably are at least 50 years or more old. She does not believe that the petitioner denies this. The staff report says that at least along Whitaker Street, a fence was here from 1948 to 1955. However, it is whether or not they have gained historic significance and whether they are historic character defining features and should be preserved.

**Mr. Lominack** said it sounds as if at least some of them are 50 years old. His personally feeling is that they are much more comfortable with the building than what is being proposed. He believes that the walls, pilasters, etc. are taller than 6.01 inch. They are probably six (6) feet. He believes the ones that are here should be restored. He believes also that they have been here long enough that they are a part of the building as much as anything else.

**Ms. Ward** said she would like for the petitioner and the public to make their comments and then the Board could discuss what they want to in their Board Discussion segment.

**Mr. Engle** said there is a process for determining eligibility. Isn't this registered as being listed?

**Ms. Ward** answered yes.

**Mr. Engle** asked don't they ask the state to give a DOA.

**Ms. Ward** said they have never done that before.

**Mr. Engle** said it might be appropriate to do so.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Pace** came forward and entertained questions from the Board.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Pace if she had any difficulties with the staff's recommendation.

**Ms. Pace** said the concern was keeping the concrete pillars. All of the pillars are off their bases. She would have to talk with the people who will do the repairs to know whether the cost is feasible. Plus, the logistics of picking up the concrete pillars to install whatever is needed to hold them in place. Ms. Pace explained that the fencing is a very short and the main reason she wants to do the work is that she has a four year old daughter and she wants to have a place for her to play. She was reared in this house and was unable to play outside because the fencing was not adequate; it was not enclosed. Ms. Pace said safety is her main concern. Unfortunately, in historic Savannah safety is a huge problem. There was a shooting just the other day in Forsyth Park. Consequently, she wants to ensure that when her daughter is outside playing in the yard, she is not so visible to the public. Presently, they have a bad problem with people undoing their gate and coming into their yard. They also have a problem with people putting things in their yard. Ms. Pace said she also wants to secure this for her pets.

**Dr. Henry** told Ms. Pace that the staff's recommendation only concerned the height of the fence. Are you okay with that?

**Ms. Pace** asked Dr. Henry if he was saying to keep the fence in line with Whitaker Street.

**Dr. Henry** answered yes.

**Ms. Pace** said she was in agreement with that. She thought he was asking about the concrete piers.

**Mr. Robert Pace** said the question that was asked earlier about the iron work matching the fencing could be elaborated on by his wife.

**Ms. Pace** said she thought she submitted a picture of the staircase. She explained that the fencing that was pointed out as matching the fencing on the outside of the perimeter of the fencing used to be the main entrance to the house. The carriage horses use to pull through this portico. Over the years, it has been repaired. When she was young, there was no fencing along the north side; but the fencing that is there now matches the other fencing.

**Dr. Williams** said that the presence of this fencing along the side being the same design does not mean that the fencing on Whitaker and Huntingdon Streets are all from the same vintage. It could mean that the ones that are on the two street fronts are historic fencing; and this is a later reproduction that matches it very closely. He explained that Board's responsibility is being stewards of historic fabric. He said that Ms. Pace is the owner, but the Board has to counsel her on how best to be a steward of her property. They had a big debate a year ago with an owner who wanted to remove historic fencing with a wall. Dr. Williams advised Ms. Pace that she is in a more prominent urban location. It is unfortunate that it will impact how she uses her property, but just as Mr. Lominack said, the existing fence is of low height; and it has a very low wall and its permeability is a quality that they find very positive in this pedestrian corridor. The walls are supposed to be perfect for rear of the property. In his opinion, this would send a very unwelcome message to the city to have such a wall.

**Ms. Pace** asked Dr. Williams if he was talking about along Whitaker Street or Huntingdon Street.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Pace if his understanding is correct that she is proposing to remove all the fencing along Huntington and Whitaker Streets.

**Ms. Pace** said yes; the fencing on Huntington Street was not there in 1990 because when she was in high school she parked her car in the parking lot and drove out onto Huntington Street.

**Dr. Williams** asked staff if they had a photo of Huntington Street.

**Mr. Howington** said picture 52 shows Huntington Street.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Pace where she said she parked her.

**Ms. Pace** explained that she parked her car where the dumpster is located. In front of the dumpster now is grass with trees which was done by her stepmother in 2000.



**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Pace if she was saying that the fence and piers are less than 12 years old.

**Ms. Pace** said yes and explained that when she was driving at 15, 16 years old, she washed her car here. The trees that are against the house were not there. She drove her car along here and out onto Huntingdon Street.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Pace if she said the grass was planted in 2000.

**Ms. Pace** answered yes; her stepmother put the grass and courtyard area in around 2000 which is where the trees are planted.

**Mr. Engle** said look at photo 18 in the upper court. It is unequivocally bar stock. Compare this with the one on the north which is photo 15. The ones between the two properties as Ms. Pace said was not there 30 years ago; it is two buildings. But, look at the other stuff it is bar stock and they do not match. They are not even close. They all agree that this is modern, but the other is not.

**Mr. Pace** said they might have been off on the terminology. Someone said hollow core and he is not a wrought iron person. They think the gate is as original as possible and is much older. This is why they agree that it is something that they will keep and restore. However, it is deteriorated and, therefore, they will have to do some work to stabilize the large gate.

**Mr. Engle** said, therefore, the Secretary of Interior's Standards would then come in as "something is being created that never existed." The gate was there with piers.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Engle which gate was he speaking of.

**Mr. Engle** explained that the gate was put back on yellow brick piers. This created something that was never there. There is no evidence that there ever were yellow brick piers.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Pace if they are proposing to replace the big piers that hold the main driveway gates.

**Mr. Engle** said they are proposing to replace all of them.

**Mr. Pace** said they are proposing for them to be uniform. However, they are here for suggestions. If the Board tells them that they like the big ones and want to keep them that is no problem. But, they feel they are the same age as the others. But, he cannot speak for certain, but they just want them to be uniform. What is here could be historical, but it is not aesthetically pleasing; therefore, what they are looking to replace would obviously look much better than what is here now. He guessed the question they have when they talk about preserving the history, they have a 110 year span and they do not know if they are trying to preserve something that is 100, 60, or 50 years old. Therefore, they look to the Board for this.

**Dr. Williams** said if it is a 75 year old element that is clearly incompatible and significantly detracts.

**Mr. Pace** said in their opinion compared to what the house looks like and what fence looks like, it detracts.

**Ms. Pace** said it detracts from the neighboring fence.

**Mr. Pace** said they are the low fence on the block when it comes to aesthetically pleasing.

**Mr. Engle** said he does not agree.

**Dr. Williams** said looking at photo 16, which Mr. Pace just referred to as looking better, is exactly the same height, with exactly the same low wall as his existing fence. This is a part of the aesthetic appeal of the Paces' existing fences. Are these those kinds of proportions?

**Mr. Pace** answered not necessarily. If you go over to the Magnolia Inn, it is over six foot. The Historical Site is in-between those two. Therefore, none are uniform on this block, except their two.

**Ms. Pace** said she submitted pictures of the various addresses showing her neighbors' fences.

**Mr. Engle** said he does not believe that this is the issue. The issue of significance it not questionable of what the neighbors have. In ten years, the Paces daughter will be 14 years old and she will not want to play in the front yard anymore and they could have taken out a significant fence to get her a play area for a few years.

**Ms. Pace** said it is also for her personal safety. She said they are on the corner of Huntingdon and Whitaker Streets. They have people that are not always nice. She was walking her dogs a month ago and a guy pointed a gun at someone and sent them to the ground. As she was walking her dogs in her back yard, he ran right up on her. She has a serious issue here. Having grown up in the house she knows how many times she has been approached in this yard. Just this month they had two people come up on their porch that her husband had to chase them off. Therefore, as she has said, safety is her number one issue.

**Mr. Pace** said if they had an original fence, they probably would not be having this discussion, but since they do not feel that this is a historically significant fence, it is definitely not an aesthetically pleasing fence, is why they are here.

**Mr. Howington** asked the Paces if they would consider just a portion of the side and back fencing it in with some different for their daughter to play in. He understood that there is no fence in the back and this is a security issue.

**Mr. Pace** said originally, they thought about this first because they believed this might be an issue. But, honestly when they looked at drawings and the gentleman they consulted with about designing it, did not look good. They will put whatever the Board lets them put, but they do want to keep it uniform. This is why they went to the effort of trying to find a brick that matches the house. In 100 years, it will be a historical fence, but right now they need a fence.

**Dr. Williams** said he, too, was thinking as Mr. Howington. Maybe one of the ways that the transaction could be made would be to take a cue from the main big gate post. They have a smaller sloping section. If they want an enclosed yard, especially if the Huntingdon side fence has the bar stock and is not historic. Even if the fence in the front dates to 1968 and they have a photo of its presence and does, yet, technically qualify as an historic element because it is a few years short, there are design concerns and considerations that the Board has to be mindful of that exist here. Dr. Williams said he believes that as they get towards the more private part of the property on the back, he believes that Mr. Howington's suggestion is good. Frankly, he was thinking the same thing just as he was saying it. Certainly, there could be room along the Huntingdon Street side to say "okay" at what point you stop the high wall and then transition to the more visible permeable lower wall.

**Mr. Pace** asked that when they look at this idea, would they rather see it with brick continuum or would they rather concrete? Either way, the pillars would need to be repaired or restored. Presently, they are nonfunctional. They cannot open the gates and just as his wife said, the pillars are off their bases due to years of deterioration.

**Mr. Engle** said the pillars could be restored. Maybe SCAD's masonry class could do it. They do a Posey injection into decayed concrete.

**Mr. Pace** said if they are unable to do the front, they will try to do the side and the back.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes the street sides are very successful as well. There are many ways to do it, but perhaps one way to do it is to set a fence inside the existing fence. He is not sure what the design would look like.

**Ms. Ramsay** said they have seen designs as this on Taylor Street, Reed Delaney's property, and there is another.

**Mr. Engle** said they could look at what was done on Gaston and Whitaker Streets.

**Ms. Ramsay** said they could look at what was done on the corner of Taylor and Bull Streets, two houses in on the east.

**Mr. Merriman** said this might not be appropriate here.

**Mr. Howington** said this may not work here and maybe they need to keep studying this.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Pace if they want to repeat the pillars and gate all the way around the house as opposed to brick pillars.

**Dr. Williams** said the petitioners want to replace everything that is there with new construction and different materials.

**Dr. Henry** asked the petitioner if he was saying restore the pillars.

**Dr. Williams** said he'd rather that the fence be retained, but to a certain point on Huntingdon Street.

**Mr. Howington** suggested, either replace a part of it or have some kind of privacy solution behind the existing that comes up to a certain point.

**Mr. Pace** said this is why he asked the Board if they want them to look at brick or concrete.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Pace if he was still concerned about the height of the fence.

**Ms. Pace** said she is concerned about the height of the fence because if people can step over it, they will do so.

**Dr. Henry** said he believes the fence should be higher.

**Mr. Howington** said an opportunity may be to set the fence back in line with the house. He was not trying to design the back yard, but if they took it back that far it might soften up the edge. They may want to put shrubbery or something so someone would not be able step into the yard.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Howington if he was talking about the front or the back.

**Mr. Howington** said definitely not the front. He was talking about the back and the side of the house.

**Mr. Pace** said he was still not sure what the Board wants them to look at. Does the Board want the brick or concrete? Mr. Pace said the problem is not carrying it in the back; they are on the corner and have a large frontage on Whitaker Street which is the main artery.

**Mr. Lominack** said at some point he believes that if they turned the corner, they could deviate. He was not sure where it is as they are not here to design the solution, but he believes that it will be very unlikely that this Board will approve removing the concrete piers and putting in brick.

**Ms. Ward** asked if there was an equal amount of concern for Whitaker Street as there is Huntingdon Street. Will the Board be open to some modification on Huntingdon or is the concern for both fences?

**Mr. Merriman** said it seems as if the petitioners want to have everything look the same.

**Mr. Pace** said yes. This would look better. They want to improve the iron work.

**Mr. Engle** said the Board is here to preserve not to improve.

**Dr. Williams** said this is a rather unique house. It has a monumental portico that addresses both Whitaker Street and Huntingdon Street; wraps around as shown in photo 4. He said in Mr. Pace's opinion the fence detracts from it and does not relate to it, but, nonetheless, to change the Huntington side and not the Whitaker side would be like, in a sense, changing half of the portico. Just as Mr. Lominack said, they are not a design committee. The house fronts Whitaker Street, the secondary façade is on Huntingdon Street. They have this monumental curving portico that wraps around. The point at which the portico ends, the house begins to turn into a less formal house. That junction point somewhere in there, either that is where may be you have a wall that goes from your house up to the property line or inside the fence. One solution could be to have that wall carry inside because of the longer term situation; some future owner may absolutely want to keep this fence all the way around.

**Dr. Williams** explained that it is not inconceivable where the house goes back at the downspout or maybe, even better, at the end of dumpster marks a significant turning point in the property from public to private. If a wall was run from the corner of the house out to the inside of the fence and across the back, they would have a private yard.

**Ms. Pace** said the only grassed areas for her pets as well as her child are where these streets are.

**Mr. Pace** said the zoning for them to have the vet clinic requires having a garden area for the patients and this is the only area.

**Dr. Williams** said he was not saying fence this off. He said a commercial function is all the more reason to keep the fence because if you have a high privacy wall, it will send a message.

**Mr. Pace** said they should have done a site line drawing. They were very specific when they looked at the heights. They came up with the idea to go to the highest possible point without obstructing the view of the house. As the Board can see, there is nothing down here except bricks, other than some stairs. All of the gates will remain where they are along with the new iron gate except the large ones. But from a line of site, which they should have done, none of the house will be obstructed by the new fence just because of the height of the house off of the ground.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Pace if the vet clinic is in the basement.

**Ms. Pace** answered yes, but there is a huge gated area which is the entrance to the clinic and the fence will not cover this.

**Mr. Lominack** asked how the yard will relate to the vet clinic.

**Mr. & Mrs. Pace** answered a fenced in walking area that they own, not Forsyth Park.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if the property is zoned to allow this.

**Ms. Pace** answered yes. They have already taken care of this. But, there are specific zoning requirements that required them to have this grass area.

**Dr. Williams** asked the Paces why they were not keeping it.

**The Paces** answered that they are keeping it.

**Dr. Williams** said what he is proposing would not impact this at all.

**Ms. Pace** said the problem is that her dogs can get through this fence and her child can put her head through this fence.

**Mr. Pace** asked Dr. Williams where was he saying to put the wall.

**Dr. Williams** stated he was saying further to the west.

**Mr. Pace** said if they did put a wall there, then it would obstruct.

**Dr. Williams** asked if this is accessible from the vet clinic at the front.

**Mr. Pace** answered no.

**Ms. Pace** said it would be accessible for the technicians in the back of the clinic.

**Mr. Lominack** said there is a large area behind the carriage house and the garage sits here. There is a large paved area back there.

**Ms. Pace** said that is the parking lot.

**Dr. Williams** asked if some of this could be made into a green area.

**Ms. Pace** explained that they need parking and a separate parking lot for their clients.

**Mr. Engle** said he has studied a lot of landscape concrete and to him this is some of the nicest detailed concrete that he has seen. He believes it has significance in its own right.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Lominack** said he would hate to see something historic come down and something less desirable take its place.

**Mr. Merriman** said this is not original to the house. How does the Board determine whether or not it has achieved historical significance or not?

**Mr. Howington** said they know that it is at least 50 years old or some portions of it. This in itself creates historic significance and actually when it comes to visual compatibility for him, this fence is much more successful and elegant than the proposed fence. He said he appreciates the petitioner looking at the brick and matching it, but the newer brick is a more modern wire cut brick. He is sure the brick on the house is flat and clean. It is almost too much like the house. The fencing as high as it is almost sets up a language that you are not invited, although he understands that it is private property, but it is very public, Whitaker Street and Huntingdon Street side.

**Mr. Howington** said he empathizes with the petitioner; they have done a lot of work and he appreciates all the pictures and write ups, but there is too much significances. He will be willing to compromise a fence in the back yard.

**Dr. Henry** said it would behoove them to take a longer term view of this.

**Ms. McClain** said this is not their job.

**Dr. Henry** said he knows it is not their job, but sometimes common sense should rule.

**Mr. Engle** asked how many historic fences are in Savannah. Will they allow everybody to take them down?

**Ms. Ramsay** asked the Board if they want to ask the petitioners if they want a continuance.

**Dr. Williams** said they certainly could give the petitioners that opportunity.

**Mr. Engle** said he does not believe that the Board will approve of removing the historic fence. He thinks this should be voted on. The question of what happens in the back is another issue. The petitioner can bring this again.

**Ms. Simpson** said the staff recommends approval of the new brick fence and iron fence with the condition that the height does not exceed the front yard. What is that height?

**Ms. Ward** answered that staff would have to work with the petitioner and go out and measure the fence.

**Mr. Pace** said the highest fence on their block, not next door, but the Magnolia building which is SCAD's building, is about six (6) foot actually to the top of the pillars. Then they have the two foot section of iron which is obviously clear to see through.

**Mr. Pace** said their question is the Board is trying to preserve the historic significance of the fence, but nobody can tell them if it is historic significant because of the material used. They have already confirmed that they were probably used in the mid 1900s. The house was built in 1903. Should they explore the historical significance are not? He is actually talking about the iron and not the concrete.

**Dr. Williams** said at a minimum, the piers may well date from the same time as the house.

**Mr. Pace** said they could, but if the Board looks at the photo, the iron is wedged into the concrete.

**Dr. Williams** said the Board does not have a section-by-section documentation of what the fence is. Maybe some other parts of the fence have the bar stock that goes back to the age of the gate.

**Mr. Pace** said this is obviously an addition. The only bar stock is that gate. The rest of it is exactly the same.

**Dr. Williams** stated that it could be considering that the design details in the new portions are clearly evoking design details in the original gate, may be all the replacement fabric, regardless of

how old it is, is mimicking what might have been there from the construction of the house. Even the gates have a lot of the same design features, with the little hook at the bottom that is in the adjacent panels was clearly a design motif, granted, the iron work on the balconies is different because it is on the outside. The balcony railings do not have to match the fence railing. Do you agree that this gate is probably original?

**Mr. Pace** stated that he could not say whether it is original or not. They may not have even had any gates. They could have just had the pillars.

**Dr. Williams** said the important thing about history in this case if you want to modernize it, history is not just a finite moment of what existed when the building was built is all of this considered historical, but rather a process of evolution. Sometimes buildings change and the change becomes more significant than the original building. This property may have changed and required a fence, but the fence in a sense behaves from an urbanistic point of view the fence is a real amenity.

**Ms. Simpson** asked Mr. Pace if they are going to use the existing fence.

**Mr. Pace** said they are keeping the gate and the one on the left. They just want to repair them. They agree that the gates have historic significant to the home, therefore, they will maintain those. He said [pointing to a section], these here are not original, they may have been made to look like the original fencing, but they have no way of knowing.

**Dr. Williams** said all they have is the existence of these piers and fencing that actually follow historic norms of scale and presence as the Paces' neighbors. This matches exactly with the neighbor fencing.

**Mr. Pace** said the neighbor's fencing was actually put up in the 1980s.

**Dr. Williams** said the Board's concern is compatibility and historic significance.

**Dr. Henry** said it really sounds as if they really don't know much about the fence.

**Mr. Pace** stated other than that it is not original.

**Dr. Henry** said a continuance might further the idea of looking into this and get a better handle on it.

**Mr. Pace** explained that they started this project a year and a half ago trying to find pictures and documentation. The Historical Society has tried to assist them and the Historic Savannah Foundation has worked with them. They can not find anything.

**Dr. Henry** said he does not have a clue beyond the gate.

**Mr. Engle** said they know that it is more than 50 years old. By the Secretary's Standards, you would need to determine the eligibility for the National Register of that fence if you are proposing to demolish it, which is what they are proposing. They would be taking down all the piers and all of the iron work except one gate.

**Mr. Pace** asked Mr. Engle if they are trying to protect the pillars or the fence.

**Mr. Engle** answered both. The pillars are a part of the fence. He apologized if the fence is built as an open fence to view the garden and it will become a closed fence and essentially a wall.

**Ms. Simpson** stated that she believes if you work with the height, that is not necessarily true. She explained that if staff works to compromise on the height and make it comfortable to the surrounding properties, should be okay as you would still be able to see inside the property.

**Mr. Merriman** agreed with Ms. Simpson. He does not believe that it has historic significance or that it can be proven that it does.

**Mr. Howington** said it more than 50 years old.

**Ms. Simpson** asked what year was the property declared significant.

**Mr. Engle** said the fence was included when the property was declared significant.

**Mr. Pace** said this would almost make him believe that they could not tear down and build anything over 50 years old.

**Dr. Williams** said the age issue is just one way of highlighting that significant portions of this are not brand new. The fact that it has aged the way it has might suggest that it is actually other than you think. The fact that the pier on the left has shifted out of alignment.

**Mr. Pace** explained that the pillars that are further west are roughly the same deterioration of these. They know for a fact that they are 23 to 24 years old.

**Ms. Ramsay** informed Mr. Pace and he has heard the Board's discussion. She asked him if he wanted to ask for a continuance.

**Mr. Pace** asked for a continuance.

**Mr. Engle**, for clarification, asked, what is the continuance for?

**Mr. Merriman** asked Mr. Pace, what does he intend to come back with?

**Mr. Pace** said if they can go back and look further and try to find something that shows that this is not of historical significance.

**Mr. Merriman** said he believes that the petitioner has two things that he can come back to the Board saying that the fence does not have historical significance and explain why or he needs to come back and say he has a new plan, it is to restore everything here because it has historical significance.

**Mr. Pace** asked the Board to give this a timeline for the historical significance. Is it 60 or 50 years?

**Mr. Engle** said 50 years is the Secretary's Standards. They know that this is already 50 years old. The Board has told persons in the past that if it is more than 50 years old, then they must judge it as significant unless you can prove else wise. Mr. Engle informed the petitioner that it is on him to prove why it is not significant.

**Mr. Merriman** asked, for clarification, that the house they talked about on the corner of Drayton and Liberty Street [it is a big house on the corner] that had a kitchen on the back and was built in the 1890s and the house was built in 1850s. The kitchen was in a deteriorated state and the Board decided that it was not significant to the house and they approved to demolish the house. How is that different than this?

**Mr. Howington** answered that it was different because there was less than probably ten percent (10%) of that historical material that was there. Most of it had been removed.

**Mr. Merriman** said, however, the Board said that it was not significant.

**Mr. Howington** said it was because it was less than ten percent (10%).

**Ms. Simpson** said maybe the petitioner is saying that the iron work isn't 50 years old, but the pillars may be.

**Mr. Pace** said he has no problem coming back with a plan that restores the pillars and enhances the ironwork. In all honesty, they are trying to do something that is a lot more aesthetically pleasing.

**Mr. Engle** said there was no integrity to the kitchen. But, there is a lot of integrity to this and this is the issue.

**Mr. Merriman** said the petitioner will have to come back to the Board with a restoration plan, put the iron work back and keep the pillars as they are.

**Mr. Engle** said if the petitioner is going to restore it, he would not need to come to the Board. This is staff level.

**Mr. Pace** said the problem is he can not restore originals as he does not know what they look like.

**Dr. Williams** said if the petitioner is agreeing to restore the piers, which obviously will necessitate a fence that is no taller than the existing fence, but a part of the rationale for the proposal is that the

petitioner wants more privacy and more security. However, if they keep the pillars, they will be constrained. Even if they get rid of all of the ironwork up to the gate, a part from maybe the spacing on the iron, they will still have a fence that will function as this fence does. Besides age, there is a design compatibility issue. The wall at the Magnolia Inn may be three feet.

**Mr. Pace** said the Magnolia fence is three and one-half (3 1/2 feet) and their fence is four (4) feet to the center and they have the pillars. However, they don't have to have the pillars. They were just putting the pillars in to match the large pillar at the driveway. The pillars means absolutely nothing to them. They did not have an architect to do this. They did this on their own with an ironworker.

**Dr. Williams** said he does not know how old the fence is. There is a fence a couple of doors down the street from the petitioner that is in a more immediate contact. It is a low fence just as the petitioners' fence.

**Mr. Pace** said the Historical Society is here.

**Dr. Williams** said the majority of fences in this block are quite low and visibly permeable. From his point of view if the petitioner would ask for a continuance, mainly what the Board could do to the back of the petitioner's property. Will there be a fence on the back?

**Mr. Pace** said there will be a fence, but they are moving it forward by a portion of the carriage house to make the parking lot there. They are required to have the parking lot for the vet clinic.

**Mr. Judson** said all they can say is the fence was here prior to 1968. This does not make it 50 years old.

**Mr. Engle** said this does not change the real issue of aesthetics or integrity.

**Mr. Judson** said it adjusts the question of historical significance.

**Mr. Engle** said that it does not.

**Mr. Judson** explained that Mr. Engle cited that the standard is 50 years and you are telling me that the only thing that can be verified is 1968, then this would make it 45 years.

**Mr. Engle** said they don't know this.

**Mr. Judson** said this is his point.

**Dr. Williams** said it could be older than 45 years old.

**Mr. Judson** stated that he was not saying that it isn't. But, if all they can verify is 45 years, then the Board can not cite that evidence as making it historically significant.

**Dr. Henry** said he understands that there is an aesthetic problem here, but potentially possibly not. Would it be possible to run another fence along the top of these pillars?

**Mr. Pace** explained that as he has said, they originally looked at restoring the pillars. They still do not have a problem doing this. Now, it isn't their ideal situation because they do not believe that it would look as good. They had a plan that addressed exactly what Dr. Henry said.

**Dr. Henry** said this way, they would not move the fence and the petitioners would still have some protection.

**Mr. Pace** said they would be happy to make a compromise of some sort of the way they redo the pillars and be also complimentary to the house. This was one of their original ideas. They way they restored the pillars, they went back with some decorative.

**Dr. Williams** said this gets rid of the ironwork.

**Mr. Pace** said it does.

**Dr. Henry** said they could leave the ironwork and have something more complimentary as the same style as that.

**Mr. Pace** asked if this would be on top of the current.



**Mr. Engle** said a six foot iron fence would be put behind, three feet into the yard and put shrubs in front of it.

**Mr. Pace** asked Mr. Engle to clarify what he said.

**Mr. Engle** explained put a six foot iron fence three feet behind this on the interior into the yard and then run hedges in front of the new one. This is essentially what was done at Drayton and Gaston Streets.

**Board Action:**

Continue at the petitioner's request. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle - Nay

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

23. [Petition of Parker Morgan for Hunter Maclean | 554 East Taylor Street | 13-000388-COA | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Attorney Parker Morgan of Hunter Maclean Law Firm** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval of a 30 to 32 inch tall wooden picket fence around the tree lawn adjacent to the property at 554 East Taylor Street. The tree lawn is adjacent to East Broad Street, within the public right-of-way, east of the private property. The fence is made of two and one-half inch wide kiln dried pressure treated pine pickets with a pointed top supported by horizontal rails spaced two inches apart. A gate is located adjacent to and swings out onto the sidewalk. A stain is applied to the wood.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends denial of the after-the-fact application for the wooden picket fence on the tree lawn adjacent to the property at 554 East Taylor street because it is not visually compatible with the surrounding environment, and alters the spatial relationship of the open space adjacent to the sidewalk. Structures, including fencing, in the tree lawn should be kept to a minimum to allow the landscaping to dominate the area and should be compatible with other fencing types present in tree lawns in the historic district.

**Dr. Henry** asked if this was just in front of carriage house.

**Mr. Judson** stated that this is on East Broad Street.

**Dr. Henry** said it is on the side of the carriage house.

**Ms. Ward** said this is a lush landscaped area. They take good care of their tree lawns. The petitioner

can speak to the part of the reason for the fence was to protect the landscaping within. The petitioner did suggest an alternative which they have shown here, which is to create a vegetative screen around the fence and grow vines here; this would be the "after." Ms. Ward said her only concern over this is that we don't have any control over the vegetation as all we look at is the structure. They can do a similar treatment on a chain and post type fence as well.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Attorney Morgan** came forward and stated that he was present on behalf of William and Monique Armstrong who were present also. He said he wanted to comment on a point Ms. Ward brought up. Not only is the goal here is to protect landscaping, but the Armstrongs are hoping to compliment the landscaping that they have installed here. Attorney Morgan said he there were a few brief points he wanted to touch on and also show the Board a few pictures.

**Attorney Morgan** said this is not intended to be a barrier. There is still plenty of pedestrian access [looking at the picture on the right]; there is actually sidewalk where people would walk. He said he does not know who necessary it is, but there is space between East Broad Street and the fence where it extends as constructed. This is an after-the-fact application, but it was not done with any malicious intent to circumvent the Historic District Ordinance. It was just that Ms. Armstrong did do some research and the size of this is only about two and one half (2 1/2) feet high around the tree lawn. Ms. Armstrong thought this really applies but obviously they are here not trying to make all rights.

**Attorney Morgan** said Ms. Armstrong has found that this fence helps to draw people into her garden. If you have walked on East Broad Street near this street, Ms. Armstrong has really developed some great gardens and kind of keeping in line with a city policy to essentially seed, landscaping and maintenance of tree lawns on individual residence as stewards of them. Consequently, this is the mindset she was coming from, which was to develop the fence. Attorney Morgan said that he believes it is important to note that under the ownership of this building prior to Mr. & Mrs. Armstrong owning it about 1990, the property was boarded up and abandoned. As a matter of fact, this entire area along East Broad Street and the entire Beach Institute was not something like the rest of the Historic District that was lost to the tourists, earning city money or attention. Ms. Armstrong found out that in talking with the residents of the Beach Institute many of whom have lived here for many years, told her that at one point this property use to have a garden here such as Willow Farmer's Market. There has been a long continuous use of this garden and she is merely trying to continue that. In that same vein with the framework and the sidewalk, Mr. & Mrs. Armstrong coordinated with the City many years ago and tore up the old sidewalk and installed the nice Savannah Brick and maintained it very well. Now, this is just an extension of their efforts to beautify this corner and really beautify this corner that honestly has not seen the kind of attention that the other parts of Historic District have.

**Attorney Morgan** said he believes it is important to note that this picket fence is different from other structures and other tree lawn fences. He showed the Board a picture and said that the gentleman standing next to it, you can still see into this garden and landscaping just as easily as if it was a structure with a post and wires connecting it. He knows that aesthetic is in the eyes of the beholder. Attorney Morgan showed the Board some pictures of fences in the area between East Taylor Street and East Broad Street. He said the leap from permitting an actual enclosed fence, he does not see this as a large leap for them to make. This is essentially the same thing that has been permitted and allowed in the other parts of the Historic District. Another point he wanted to raise is the vine issue that this Board cannot regulate, Mr. & Mrs. Armstrong's stewardship. It is actually not an alternative, but it is growing on there. Therefore, the intent is for the vine to grow on the fence. He showed the Board another picture as the vine is currently on it and said this is what it should look like with the vegetation growing on it. He showed the Board a view of the fence looking from the corner of East Taylor Street looking down East Broad Street.

**Attorney Morgan** said on the corner of East Taylor and East Broad Street looking south there is a chain link fence around property to the south. The elementary school to the south is just outside the boundary of the Historic District, but there is a very high large chain link fence in view of the property. A carriage house is located here and ties into this. Her business is operating a bed and breakfast here. A part of the overall goal was to create an aesthetically please design for her guests and also for the people in the neighborhood.

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
February 13, 2013 2:00 p.m.  
Meeting Minutes

**Attorney Parker** said that Mr. & Mrs. Armstrong have shown their commitment to doing right by the tree lawn and their stewardship. He said, therefore, what they are asking for today is a little different, but they want to continue to improve this landscape that really before they became involved in the strip was not something that you wanted to walk by. He entertained questions from the Board.

**Dr. Williams** said this is just an observation, but the example that Attorney Morgan gave is a fence on a private property line. Therefore, this is not a compatible comparison.

**Attorney Morgan** said the reason he presented that is because of knee fence ordinance and design standards say "there shall not be any chain link." Therefore, he just presented this to show what it says that there is a practice of the things that exist.

**Dr. Williams** said this predates the ordinance; they are probably grandfathered in.

**Attorney Morgan** said he believes that it does and even if it is, the entire visual compatibility of this block is just the one side fronting East Broad Street. There are not any properties on the other side. Therefore, what you view is new chain link. Even if it is grandfathered in, it is still what the aesthetic of this particular part of the Historic District is.

**Mr. Engle** said the applicable design standards clearly state that "fences shall not extend beyond the façade of the front elevation of the building." It also says that they should be the same material as the building itself. This violates two of the design standards and as the Board said earlier in the meeting, he does not believe that the Board has the right to override the design standards.

**Attorney Morgan** said that he does not believe that this ordinance is talking about fences like the last petition. Obviously, this is city property and it is not an uncommon thing to have a fence in the right of way. That is why contemporaneous with this is also an application pending to get an encroachment permit because this obviously will be necessary, too. But, this is somewhat step 2. Even with the comments noted by staff, he does not know what you call it, but it is not a fence. The ordinance is being applied, non-uniformly and they are not here to try to get every fence shut down in the City of Savannah, but these do exist and he would argue the color issue.

**Dr. Williams** said these also may predate the ordinance. The Board turned down a similar fence at the Catholic School three months ago. The petitioner wanted to put up a wooden post and had already put up the wooden post and chain and the Board turned it down. This was after -the- fact as well. Now, talking about consistency, that was far less intrusive than this fence.

**Mr. Lominack** said since this is the tree lawn of public property; this should be a Park & Tree issue rather than the Historic District Board of Review.

**Mr. Morgan** said they have to get two approvals. This Board would be the structure, but the City also has to grant permission for the encroachment.

**Mr. Merriman** said even if the petitioner had the encroachment, this does not meet the design criteria.

**Mr. Engle** said could you imagine Oglethorpe Avenue if every single homeowner decided that they wanted to put a thirty (30) inch fence out front on the tree lawn on Oglethorpe Avenue, they would end up with 200 different fences.

**Dr. Williams** said he does not know how old those existing fences on tree lawns are which are much more transparent, but some of those wooden posts and chains very likely predate the ordinance. The ordinance was in effect in 1973; therefore, they may be older. But, on a fundamental level, tree lawns are public property. Fencing it turns it into private property; and fundamentally, philosophically opposes to that concept of privatizing. The screening mitigates it and there is no guarantee that 100 percent of that wood fence is going to be covered by foliage; there are a lot of variables there.

**Dr. Williams** stated again that tree lawns are public property. Attorney Morgan was right when he said that the City expects the private homeowner or building owner to care for the tree lawn, but the fundamental point of it is that the tree lawn is public property and all of it belongs to the City and 99.9% of them are not fenced. He would also be troubled that they would be setting this as a precedent, coupled with the fact of going to the City and asking for an encroachment. This is an extraordinary wide tree lawn, but it is also a grand street; that picket fence might be appropriate on a small residential street that has an intimate scale. On some wooden residential buildings you can find some picket fences, but not on East Broad Street. This is another issue from a design point of view.

**Dr. Williams** said for him it is philosophical, it is historical that these things don't get fenced in and then you have the design aesthetics, a picket fence.

**Attorney Morgan** showed the Board another picture of a picket fence.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the fence was in this block.

**Attorney Morgan** said it just passed Jones Street, across from the elementary school.

**Dr. Williams** said look at the house.

**Mr. Merriman** said the fence matches the house.

**Attorney Morgan** said he understood the private property issue; and he also understood that this is the City and they would have to grant that, but this is strictly the fence as is. He just used this as a distinctive decision on private property that they can grant a permit to encroach there versus the fence design. He knows also that this is also on private property and may be grandfathered in, but this does extend beyond the front of the house. This is approximately close.

**Mr. Engle** said the fence does not meet the ordinance.

**Dr. Henry** said he is familiar with the property as it was in the late 1980s and the 1990s. He told Attorney Morgan that his clients have done a superlative job in restoring the property, but he cannot agree with the fence.

**Attorney Morgan** said it was alluded to a school fence that the Board did not approve. He said the staff recommended something similar to them as what was on Jones Street with having a chain with the link fence. He said it sounds to him that this is what they did not approve. Is this accurate or not?

**Mr. Engle** answered that the school had wood squares with chains in them and what the Board told the petitioner was that they had to be rounds and iron.

**Dr. Williams** said the school was on private property. He does not believe that the Board can approve anything on public property.

**Attorney Morgan** it could be approved for the purpose of the design. The City still has to approve it as far as infringing on the City's right-of-way.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes the petitioner should have gotten the City's approval before coming to the Historic Board of Review.

**Attorney Morgan** said they submitted the petitions simultaneously. The City told them that they would hold the petition pending this Board's decision.

**Mr. Engle** said a beautiful job was done on the garden. He watched them putting them in and they are gorgeous.

**Mr. Lominack** said the tree lawns belong to the City.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Jonathan Maire** said that his wife and he lives at 409 East Jones Street. They frequently walk down the lane as what has been demonstrated in the photograph as the tree lawn that they are speaking of. Mr. Maire said he noticed that the tree lawn was remarkably attractive. He as always been impressed with the way Mr. & Mrs. Armstrong take care of their properties and in particular the tree lawns that are in front of their house. Mr. Maire said he does not believe that it is a necessary incompatibility between the wood fence and the other structures. There are tree lawns within their block that have nothing but dirt in them. What Mr. & Mrs. Armstrong have done is so much more attractive than what is happening in other tree lawns.

**Mr. Maire** urged the Board to consider the fact that the tree lawn is remarkably attractive and that Mr. & Mrs. Armstrong have done an outstanding job as the Board has pointed out in maintaining their properties. In terms of enclosure, they have already enclosed it by chain link fences, posts and so forth. Mr. Maire said he does not see this as an impediment to granting their request. All the

neighbors that he has talked with this are not opposed to this. They wish the Board would give this some favorable consideration.

**Ms. Amanda Whitford** came forward and said that she lives at 408-410 Price Street in the pink cottage. She has lived here approximately 15 years and has watched the progress. She walks or drives by the tree lawn continuously. Mr. & Mrs. Armstrong have beautified the neighborhood. She would consider this a shame for the Board not to consider this. This is a fabulously inviting area for the neighborhood. She considers it the "garden of the month."

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Judson** said he did not want to diminish the compliments for Mr. & Mrs. Armstrong's stewardship. He has not lived in Savannah long enough to remember when the building was in disrepair, but he knows that the garden is beautiful. He said he does not have the qualifications to dispute Attorney Morgan's comments about one movie being better than the other. However, he did want to address the comments as far as the step from this [looking at the photograph] this not only has the transparency that the Board described the one with the wooden pillars. It also showed some workmanship, it is not in great repair and is not nearly as attractive garden. So, it obviously does not show well as the picture, but it is only a matter of record that should this be appealed, he would like to say how significantly different between a fence like this with some quality of workmanship with some tooling of the wires between it and what the Board is being asked to approve. He wanted to say that the material along the simplicity of the design he finds the fence not compatibility with the Historic District.

**Ms. McClain** said she was looking at photograph eleven (11) and there is a little white plastic element. Did this come before this Board?

**Dr. Williams** said these are just little things that were stuck in the ground.

**Ms. McClain** said in her opinion, the fence is not visually compatible. The garden is beautiful and she believes the fence takes away from the garden. Without the fence, the garden would be even more beautiful.

**Mr. Engle** said if the vine grows all over the fence, it will block the entire view of the fence. Therefore, that argument is self-defeating.

#### **Board Action:**

Denial of the after-the-fact application for the wooden picket fence on the tree lawn adjacent to the property at 554 East Taylor Street because it is not visually compatible with the surrounding environment, and alters the spatial relationship of the open space adjacent to the sidewalk. Structures, - PASS  
including fencing, in the tree lawn should be kept to a minimum to allow the landscaping to dominate the area and should be compatible with other fencing types present in tree lawns in the historic district.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle  
Second: Robin Williams  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Aye  
Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present  
Brian Judson - Aye  
T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

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

24. Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 13-000389-COA | 531-535 East Liberty Street | Amended Alterations

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval to amend a previous Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition, exterior rehabilitation/alterations, and fencing at 531-535 East liberty Street. Construction is not complete and they have not requested a final inspection. This project was initially approved by the Board on May 11, 2011 and the COA was amended on August 10, 2011.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends after-the-fact approval for the following proposed amendments to the exterior rehabilitation/alterations for 531-535 East Liberty Street:

1. Height change for the screen wall as requested.
2. Remove awnings from the scope of the project.
3. Relocated door on west elevation.

With the following conditions:

- a. Install all gooseneck light fixtures as previously approved.
- b. Add awnings as each new tenant space is leased, and submit to staff for review and approval.
- c. Signage to be submitted to the Historic Board of Review for review and approval.

**Ms. Michalak** said the staff further recommends denial for the following proposed amendments to the exterior rehabilitation/alterations for 531-535 East liberty Street:

1. The aluminum coping. Remove the aluminum coping and install the clay tile coping (and to match the existing clay tiles that were there) as previously approved.
2. The stucco below each storefront opening. Remove and replace the stucco below each storefront with the aluminum panels as previously approved or another material submitted to staff for review and approval.
3. Removal of the black metal picket gate at the east end of the fence from the project. The gate is to be installed as previously approved to form a consistent wall of enclosure along Liberty Street.

**Mr. Judson** asked if it is possible to stipulate that the original approval drawings be maintained and request that they be used as guidelines. He understood that the awnings will only be done as each tenant moves in and that they will have their own graphics and so forth. But what he is trying to address is that there be some sense of uniformity or a policy for the building so that they do not end up with a hodge-podge coming before the Board; or worse, yet, that the first one be somewhat substandard and every one else thereafter use that as a point of reference.

**Ms. Michalak** believed that the Board could stipulate that they match the design of the awning as previously approved, but if each tenant wants a different logo that this come before the Board.

**Mr. Engle** said looking at the west elevation [he guessed the parking lot side] the control joints below the windows are already in place. He said if they look at photograph six (6), the control joints are already there. This is not a proposal as they are completed already.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that in addition to that, they are proposing to recolor the stucco between the

control joints. Staff is recommending a different material.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Dawson** said he was the architect for the project, but not the contractor. They agree with all the staff's recommendations, but it is not his decision.

**Dr. Henry** asked, did you ask the client's permission to do all that stuff?

**Mr. Dawson** stated that the project has been under construction for almost two years. Their agreement does not include construction review, but the client. Therefore, it was only when the certificate of occupancy came to light that there were these deviations.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the aluminum panels will go back under the windows.

**Mr. Dawson** answered yes.

**Mr. Engle** asked Ms. Michalak for the record the purpose of the holes that are drilled for the lights. Maybe they have not pulled the wires, but the holes are there.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that the lights were not proposed to be removed, she just wanted to ensure that this was covered. This will still have to go in.

**Mr. Merriman** asked Ms. Michalak if the petitioner does not get the certificate of occupancy until after staff has inspected it and says that it meets the way the Board approved it.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes. The Inspector waits for confirmation from the staff. Then he does his inspection.

**Mr. Merriman** said this ensures the things that the Board approved along with staff recommendations will be followed.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** reported that they basically agree with staff recommendations. She wanted to point out just as Mr. Judson has done that they are in agreement with removing the awnings from the scope of approval, but they want to be sure that moving forward even if they are approved on a case-by-case basis that the design remain the same and that they do not have different awnings as well as the signage. Ms. Meunier explained that she meant the treatment of the signage. Obviously, the awnings can be different, but the concern is where they are placed on each unit and so forth.

**Ms. Meunier** said the HSF does not believe that the new changes should be approved. The clay tile coping, the aluminum around the storefront and the gate should remain.

**Board Action:**

Approve the after-the-fact petition for the following proposed amendments to the exterior rehabilitation/alterations for 531-535 East Liberty Street:

1. Height change for the screen wall as requested.
2. Remove awnings from the scope of the project.
3. Relocated door on west elevation.

With the following conditions:

- a. Install all gooseneck light fixtures as previously approved.
  - b. Add awnings as each new tenant space is leased that are consistent with the design of the previously approved awnings, and submit to staff for review and approval.
  - c. Signage to be submitted to the Historic Board of Review for review and approval. Deny the after-the-fact petition for the following proposed amendments to the exterior rehabilitation/alterations for 531-535 East Liberty Street: - PASS
    - 1. The aluminum coping. Remove the aluminum coping and install the clay tile coping (and to match the existing clay tiles that were there) as previously approved.
    - 2. The stucco below each storefront opening. Remove and replace the stucco below each storefront with the aluminum panels as previously approved or another material submitted to staff for review and approval.
    - 3. Removal of the black metal picket gate at the east end of the fence from the project. The gate is to be installed as previously approved to form a consistent wall of enclosure along Liberty Street.
- Vote Results**  
Motion: Robin Williams  
Second: Ebony Simpson
- |                             |               |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Reed Engle                  | - Aye         |
| Nicholas Henry              | - Aye         |
| Keith Howington             | - Not Present |
| Sidney J. Johnson           | - Not Present |
| Brian Judson                | - Aye         |
| T. Jerry Lominack           | - Aye         |
| Zena McClain, Esq.          | - Aye         |
| Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. | - Aye         |
| Linda Ramsay                | - Abstain     |
| Ebony Simpson               | - Aye         |
| Robin Williams              | - Aye         |

25. [Petition of Francis X. Hayes | 13-000391-COA | 224 West Charlton Street | Addition and Exterior Alterations](#)

- Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Preservation Brief 14-New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photos.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Plans and Elevations.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Window and Door Specifications.pdf](#)

**Mr. Francis X. Hayes** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations and a rooftop addition to the property at 224 West Charlton Street. A prior submittal in 2004 for a rooftop addition was approved by the Board for this property. Since 2004, the historic district ordinance was amended twice to include new provisions for demolition of historic structures, preservation standards for rehabilitation, design standards for large-scale development, and other modifications. This building was designated as contributing to the local district by the Mayor and Aldermen in 2010. Ms. Ward explained that those things will result at least in a different staff recommendation today because there are certain design criteria that it does not meet, but may have met in that prior submittal.



**Ms. Ward** explained that after the staff report was released, they met with the petitioner and covered each item where they did not believe that the standard was met. She believes that the petitioner makes a good argument. Staff said that the change was not reversible, but by retaining a portion of the hip roof around the perimeter, you could potentially restore the roof because you know the exact pitch that was there before and they are retaining the chimneys on the outside of the building. Therefore, this part could be up for discussion.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends denial of the rooftop addition as submitted because it does not meet the preservation standards, design standards, and is not visually compatible as provided in the findings in the staff report.

**Ms. Ward** further reported that staff recommends approval for the balcony addition and exterior alterations upon clarification of whether or not a curb cut and structured parking are requested with the condition that colors and specifications for doors and windows be submitted to staff for final approval. The balcony addition may be subject to new building codes and an encroachment agreement. Any modification to the design to meet other requirements is subject to review and approval by the Historic District Board of Review.

**Mr. Engle** said that he does not exactly agree with staff's statement about the roof because he was assuming that under the original sheathing that the original rafters are still in place.

**Ms. Ward** said their purview is normally limited to what is visible on the exterior. Therefore, she usually concerns herself with the roof covering and not the roof structure.

#### PETITIONER COMMENTS

**Mr. Hayes** stated that staff asked him to bring the original plans for the building with him today. This project went through considerable review the first time and was approved particularly with respect to the visibility standards.

**Mr. Hayes** explained that this was a concerted effort at the time. Mansford Toms was in charge of the Building Arts program at the Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD) and Al Lindsey was involved in developing the concept over some considerable period of time. They did not go forward at that time due to a partner becoming ill and later died. Mr. Hayes said he had an accident that caused him to be bedridden for one and one-half (1 1/2) years and he was left crippled.

**Mr. Hayes** said in the area a lot of construction was going on and a couple of times that they made overtures to try to move, there was too much construction going on to allow for the placement for a trash receptacle on the street. In talking about the influences on the property, what prevailed then certainly prevails now, which is immediately coming out of the door of Jefferson and West Charlton Streets, one looks at the influences in this neighborhood. They are the Liberty Street garage; up the street is the garden on Jones Street; and immediately across the street are a couple of garden walls and industrial buildings. The principal residential structure at this intersection is this property. It was originally built as the Crystal Confectionary and adjacent to it was a barber shop. They believe that in the back was a cobbler under the stairs. The second and third floors were what was known as light housekeeping rooms. This was close to the railroad and if you took a train at six o'clock in the morning, you could come here and stay overnight. A shared bathroom was on each floor; a trunk room and a laundry room. These basic elements in the building, in terms of its internal and external structure, all remain.

**Mr. Hayes** explained that they have already begun dealing with the building and maybe it was naïve thinking that it was just a matter of begin and come back in and renew what was already approved and go forward. He knows now that this is not the case. However, in the interim what they did do was following the National Trust Historic Preservation window program, beset with the problem of wanting to begin and replace the windows with new windows, they were told that if they could repair them, then they could do so. A mill was setup in the house and they fabricated all of the parts and restored all the windows to a pristine condition they were when they were initially installed; including the copper chains and all of the original weights. This has been done as far as they can go.

They did make some initial moves to remove the plaster so that they can go back in and replace the ones that are in poor condition.

**Mr. Hayes** said as staff has pointed out with respect to the contributing structures in the neighborhood, principally there are two, 333 and 325 Tattnell Street. Now, the only way that you see this addition with respect to this property is if you go across the street to the east side of Tattnell Street. Otherwise, the view is blocked. The immediate property across the street is industrial and on the other side what shows as a house is actually half a garden. A garden wall is on the opposite corner and another garden wall surrounding a new swimming pool that is being constructed. As you can visualize, this house sits in what has become a service corridor. He says this because Jefferson Street beginning from Liberty Street all the way to Jones Street and beyond is one mass of rear entrance, garage doors and garbage cans. This is the way that it has evolved and this is a major living influence along with the recent addition of approved tourist activities of some mobile nature where the neighborhood is toured. This has become the new life at street level and reflects on one's desire to have options to get away from that.

**Mr. Hayes** said likewise the adjoining property based on what is now thought of as a mistake in the past was allowed to build. The property immediately to the left was a coach house that was built by the owners of the property at 333-335 and at the time, it was supposed to be built to the lot line on Tattnell Street. An exception was given that the house was supposed to be built back and a garden was placed in the front. Immediately, to the left of that building, going further this is all new construction. It was an "L" added to historic structures and garage doors placed on the back of those buildings, which further isolated the properties with respect to green space. The other factor from wanting to have a terrace and wanting a little bit of nature is at the time that the City approved the construction of the Liberty Street garage, the City Manager at that time indicated that the vast area that would in fact be decided on where the garage would be built, had up to that point as many persons know, was forest with all kinds of plantings. Therefore, the perimeter had gardens and shrubs along the edge, all of which were supposed to be retained. The final plan did not replant any of the trees nor build to the lot line. At that time he came before the Historic District Board of Review and asked for consideration of an alternative approach, perhaps putting a park on top of the garage or in the case of the first story that garage structure not to make it dead space for the most of the day, but perhaps commercialize it to give the area some street life.

**Mr. Hayes** said he believes that the Jefferson Street corridor has become a service corridor. The investment in this property as proposed will be a positive asset to both the neighborhood and the area. Certainly, he is familiar with the process that is involved here, perhaps being naïve to some of the changes, but he wants to work with the Board and staff to accomplish what was started earlier.

**Mr. Hayes** stated that as Ms. Ward has noted that the way the building is now being proposed, the additional space, the build-out of the attic is reversible. The hip roof structure at that level is not complicated. It has also been noted that an existing curb cut is here. While it was filled in at one time, the garage door was in existence some time between 1935 and 1972. They believe it was filled in during some renovations that were done under the City's 312 program. The property as was most recently used, was a photography studio on the first floor, the second floor was a real estate office and a watchman lived on the third floor. He said in its totality, the renovation and the proposed addition will make it new to a property that has long been in need of an infusion of care and he needs a place to live. He found it rather enlightening talking about when the ordinance was established. While he was in college, he was consulted because of the work he was doing in Cambridge to assist Savannah in how to structure its ordinance. There was a comprehensive city demonstration act program known as "Model Cities" that was underway in Savannah in the 1960s and early into the 1970s before the Community Development legislation came into being. Mr. Hayes entertained questions from the Board.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier** of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) reported that they agree with staff's recommendations for denial of the rooftop addition. They believe that it destroys the historic material of the roof in addition to the appearance. It will be clearly visible from the front of the building as well as from Jefferson Street as well as from other viewpoints. As pointed out in

Preservation Brief 14, the guidelines for additions, they do not feel that this addition is subordinate in scale and massing to the main building. Ms. Meunier said the HSF believes that the addition would be taller than everything else in the immediate area, at least this is what is shown. Consequently, they do not believe that the rooftop addition is visually compatible.

**Mr. Lominack** asked, how tall is the addition?

**Ms. Ward** explained that exterior is 11 feet to the top of the parapet. Then there is a three foot tall railing.

**Dr. Williams** asked, beyond that?

**Ms. Ward** answered yes.

**Mr. Lominack** said he was wondering what would happen if that hip roof was taken off and picked up and put on top.

**Mr. Hayes** said he failed to mention that there were several discussions with staff and the latest one was that there are certain things that you can do and would be willing to do to lighten the presence of the structure on the roof. He said he told the staff that certainly, for example, to eliminate the stair and the heavy grill work around the perimeter that they would lighten this as well so that it would not be as visible. There is a question of where you stand to see the visibility of it. Given the exposure of the building, you can stand away from it and will see this, but from a significant structure side at Tattall Street looking up at this, you will not see it.

**Mr. Hayes** asked for a continuance for the rooftop addition.

**Board Action:**

Continue the petition for rooftop addition at the petitioner's request.

Approval for the balcony addition and exterior alterations upon clarification of whether or not a curb cut and structured parking are requested with the condition that colors and specifications for doors and windows be submitted to staff - PASS for final approval.

The balcony addition may be subject to new building codes and an encroachment agreement. Any modification to the design to meet other requirements is subject to review and approval by the Historic District Board of Review.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Robin Williams

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

## VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

## IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

26. [Petition of Jason Varnadoe for Rives E. Worrell Co. | 12-002267-COA | 222 E. Harris St. | Staff Review - Stucco Repair/Repointing](#)

Attachment: [222 East Harris St. 12-002267-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 222 East Harris St. 12-002267-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Bethany A. Ralph | 424 Habersham St. | 12-002290-COA | Staff Review - Roof Repair/Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 424 Habersham St. 12-002290-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 424 Habersham St. 12-002290-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of David Bloomquist for Bloomquist Construction | 13-000032-COA | 424 E. Charlton Lane | Staff Review - Privacy Wall](#)

Attachment: [COA - 424 East Charlton Lane 13-000032-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 424 East Charlton Lane 12-000032-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Brittany Ramage for Ace Roofing & Remodeling, Inc. | 13-000072- COA | 429 Tattnall Street | Staff Review - Replace Roof](#)

Attachment: [COA - 429 Tattnall Street 13-000072-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 429 Tattnall Street 13-000072-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Amy Howell for Coastal Canvas | 13-000079-COA | 7 Drayton St. | Staff Review Awning Recover |](#)

Attachment: [COA - 7 Drayton St. 13-000079-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 7 Drayton St. 13-000079-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Bobbie D. Stephens for AAA Sign Co., Inc. | 13-000142-COA | 33 Bull Street | Staff Review - Relocate Existing Sign](#)

Attachment: [COA - 33 Bull Street 13-000142-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 33 Bull St. 13-000142-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Amy Howell for Coastal Canvas | 13-000188-COA | 4 West Broughton St. | Staff Review - Awning Recover](#)

Attachment: [COA - 4 West Broughton St. 13-000188-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 4 West Broughton St. 13-000188-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Laura Potts-Wirht | 13-000190-COA | 107 W. Liberty St. | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 107 West Liberty Street - 13-000190-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 107 West Liberty Street 13-000190-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Sandy Portis for Coldwell Banker Platinum Partners | 13-000192-COA | 311A West Taylor Street | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 311A W. Taylor Street 13-000192-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 311A W. Taylor Street 13-000192-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of G. Bart Redmond for Redmond Construction, Inc. | 13-000196-COA | 521 East Broughton St. | Staff Review - Existing Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 521 East Broughton St. 13-000196-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 521 East Broughton St. 13-000196-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Pineland Custom Homes, Inc. | 13-000199-COA | 511 Price St. | Gutter/Siding](#)

Attachment: [COA - 511 Price Street 13-000199-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 511 Price Street 13-000199-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Holly Metts Pace | 13-000261-COA | 513 Whitaker St. | Staff Review - Window/Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 513 Whitaker Street 13-000261-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 513 Whitaker Street 13-000261-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Sam Carroll | 13-000264-COA | 220 East Gordon St. | Staff Review - Brick Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 220 East Gordon Lane 13-000264-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 220 East Gordon Lane 13-000264-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of Todd Huntingdon for GPD Group | 13-000274-COA | 504 E. River St. | Staff Review - Windows/Doors/Rail Detail Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 504 E. River St. 13--000274-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 504 E. River St. 13-000274-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Petition of Roberta Barnes | 13-000334-COA | 517 E. Perry St. | Staff Review - Existing Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 517 E. Perry Street 13-000334-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 517 East Perry Street 13-000334-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 13-000336-COA | 115 E. Bay St. | Mechanical Screen and Ducts](#)

Attachment: [COA - 115 East Bay Street 13-000336-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 115 East Bay Street 13-000336-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. [Petition of Trey & Deanne Skinner | 13-000344-COA | 318 E. Broughton St. | Staff Review - Exterior Alterations and Additions](#)

Attachment: [COA - 318 E. Broughton St. 13-000344-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 318 East Broughton St. 13-000344-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. [Petition of TM4, LLC | 13-000347-COA | 504 E. River St. | Staff Review - Fence](#)

Attachment: [COA - 504 East River Street - 13-000347-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 504 E. River St. 13-000347-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. [Petition of Mia Viani for the Walking Company | 13-000369-COA | 229 W. Broughton St. | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 229 West Broughton St. 13-000369-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 229 West Broughton St. 13-000369-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

45. [Petition of Mike Kenny Roofing | 13-000407-COA | 406 E. Huntingdon St. | Staff Review - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 406 E. HUNTINGDON ST. 13-000407-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 406 E. Huntingdon St. 13-000407-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

**X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

**XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF**

**XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

**Notices**

46. [Next Meeting - Wednesday March 13, 2013 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

47. [Georgia State Historic Preservation Conference | April 26-27, 2013 in Milledgeville, Georgia](#)

48. [US/ICOMOS 16th Annual International Scientific Symposium | May 2-4, 2013 in Savannah, Georgia](#)

49. [HSF Savannah Preservation Festival, May 2013](#)

Attachment: [Historic Savannah Foundation, Re; 2013 Savannah Preservation Festival 021113.pdf](#)

**XIII. OTHER BUSINESS**

**XIV. ADJOURNMENT**

50. Adjourned

There being no further business to come before the Board, Ms. Ramsay adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah P. Ward  
Historic Preservation Director

SPW:mem

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