



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
June 12, 2013 1:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

JUNE 12, 2013 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Linda Ramsay, Chair
Ebony Simpson, Vice Chair
Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian
Reed Engle
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Keith Howington
T. Jerry Lominack
Stephen Merriman, Jr.
Marjorie Weibe-Reed

HDRB Member Not Present: Robin Williams, Ph.D

MPC Staff Present: Tom Thomson, Executive Director
Ellen Harris, Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation
Leah G. Michalak, Historic Preservation Planner
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Approval of Agenda](#)

Board Action:

Approve Agenda for the Meeting of May 8, 2013. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. [Approve Minutes of May 8, 2013](#)

Attachment: [05-08-2013 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve May 8, 2013 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

III. SIGN POSTING

IV. CONTINUED AGENDA

3. [Petition of Ameir Mustafa for Signs for Minds | 13-001723-COA | 102 East Broughton Street | Fascia Sign](#)

Board Action:

Continue to July 10, 2013 due to an incomplete application. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

4. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 13-002615-COA | 135 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. \(508/512 West Oglethorpe Avenue\) | New Construction Hotel: Part II, Design Details](#)

Board Action:

Continued to July 10, 2013 for an incomplete application. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

V. CONSENT AGENDA

5. [Petition of Stratton Leopold | 13-002078-COA | 720-722 Habersham Street | Projecting Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval to reinstall the original projecting principal use sign as requested because it meets the preservation standards, sign standards, and is visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

6. [Petition of Paul Miller | 13-002256-COA | 224 Houston Street | Porch Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval for the addition of a recessed porch on the east (rear) elevation of the property located at 224 Houston Street. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

7. [Petition of Trey and Deanne Skinner | 13-002547-COA | 318 East Broughton Street | Sign/Fence/Awning/Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the petition to modify the trellis material and height, extend the screen wall, and install the fascia sign as requested because it meets the design and sign standards, and is visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed	
Second: Keith Howington	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

8. [Petition of John and Gabriella DeBeer | 13-002576-COA | 9 Drayton Street | Sign](#)

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed	
Second: Keith Howington	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

9. [Petition of James Nutt, AIA for Free People | 13-002590-COA | 217 West Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

10. [Petition of Greenline Architecture | 13-002601-COA | 601 East Bay Street | Rehabilitation/Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval with the condition that the awnings above the public right-of-way have a minimum vertical clearance of eight feet above the sidewalk, because it meets the preservation standards, sign standards, and is visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

11. [Petition of Walter J. Freeman | 13-002607-COA | 331 Tattnell Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the proposed fence as requested because it meets the preservation standards, sign - PASS

standards, and is visually compatible.

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

12. [Petition of Monica Mastrianni | 13-002611-COA | 219 East Gaston Street | Fence and Stair Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

Approval for a stair addition, a fence at the lane, exterior paint color changes, and a mechanical screen for the new roof units with the following conditions:

1. Submit specifications and color selections for the light fixtures shown on the rear elevation drawing to staff for review and approval. (This item - PASS was a condition of the previous approval.)
2. Submit the proposed paint color selection for the fence to staff for final review and approval.
3. Screen the proposed trash/recycling and service panel area at the lane side of the proposed fence and submit to staff for final review and approval.

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain

Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

13. [Petition of Penelope Johnson | 13-002731-COA | 417 East Taylor Street | Fence](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval to construct a concrete block/stucco privacy wall for the property located at 417 East Taylor Street because it matches the existing wall, meets the standards, and is visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed
Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

14. [Petition of Coastal Heritage Society | 13-002733-COA | 604 West Jones Street | Fence](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval of the proposed fence as requested because it meets the preservation standards, sign standards, and is visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed
Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye

Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

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

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

15. Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | H-12-4727-2 | 600 East Bay Street | New Construction, Hotel 1: Part I, Height and Mass Amendments and Part II, Design Details

Attachment: [Aerial Views.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Green Roof Certification letter 061013.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report REVISED.pdf](#)

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

Mr. Patrick Shay and Mr. Saad Al Jasaar were present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction, Part II, of Hotel 1 on the property at 611 east River Street or 610 East Bay Street (originally filed as 600 East Bay Street. Only Hotel 1 is under consideration for Part II review and approval at this time and any related signage or appurtenances not depicted in this review will be required to be submitted for approval. Part I, Height and Mass was approved on February 13, 2013 with the material standard to be met and the sustainable roof Certified by the City Manager. This was to be 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 and with conditions. Ms. Harris stated that all the design conditions have been met, including the Certification letter from the City Manager, and are included in the new submittal. However, the building mass has been revised and this revision must be reviewed and approved by the Board.

Ms. Harris reported that pertaining to Part I, Height and Mass, Amendments: staff recommends approval of the revised Part I, Height and Mass proposal to extend the floor area of the upper floors to the south and east. Staff further recommends approval of the request to extend the western façade over the stairway with the condition that the solid-to-void relationship in the entrance tower is more balanced.

Ms. Harris reported, additionally, that for Part II, Design Details, staff recommends approval of the Part II, Design Details with the following conditions: 1. Incorporate paired sashes within the proposed window openings to be more compatible with windows in contributing structures in the Factors Walk character areas; 2. Indicate any potential lighting on rooftop element. 3. Provide information on trash collection or any on-site storage; and 4. Construct a sample panel on-site to be reviewed by the Board and approved by staff prior to installation of materials in accordance with the HDBR Sample Panel Guidelines.

Mr. Lominack asked Ms. Harris to explain further the glass and granite in the southwest corner.

Ms. Harris explained that this element here [pointing to a section], as the Board sees, the glass element continues the full height of the building and is framed with granite. All the other phases of the proposed hotel, while the hotel itself is not necessarily symmetrical, the windows within each bay are centered and symmetrical. Therefore, staff is requesting more symmetry in the relationship between the granite and the glass wall in order to be more compatible with the proposed building façade.

Dr. Henry asked, "what is the purpose of the cantilever?"

Ms. Harris explained that as the Board sees the third floor plan the wall on the western façade centrally maintains the same width; but when they look at the fourth through the seventh floor the wall extends out three feet above the start of the walkway. They are descending down through the walkway; therefore, the height above becomes higher and higher as you go down. When you start descending the stairs, it is at one floor above and it continues as you go down the walkway.

Dr. Henry stated, therefore, it is roughly the same height level regardless where you are on the stairs.

Ms. Harris explained that it increases as you go further. Stairs are dropping and the building height stays the same.

Dr. Henry said he was wondering about the compatibility of the windows and lantern. Why are the windows that way?

Ms. Harris explained that staff recommends using paired sashes to make the windows more compatible as opposed to the one-over-one with the side lights. She said during the Part I phase, the staff recommended approval and the Board asked for a reconsideration and restudy of the design as a condition of the Part I approval. The petitioner has restudied the design and staff recommends approval.

Mr. Engle asked if coloring on the rendering is accurate.

Ms. Harris answered that staff had a similar question. The rendering appears brighter than the actual colors. This is a question that may be asked of the petitioner.

Mr. Engle believes that aluminum grills are underneath the windows. However, the sample only shows the aluminum and not as being green. Is this just unfinished aluminum?

Ms. McClain said it appears to be pea-green.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay came forward and stated that other than the paired windows, they concur with everything that has been requested. He stated that he has with him the drawings that will show the glazing more balanced in the southwest corner. Mr. Shay said he also has a drawing that will show what the paired windows would look like in the overall large mass. Mr. Shay entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Lominack said he likes the green color on the renderings better than the green on the

board. He asked if there is a brighter green than the one showing on the board.

Mr. Shay explained that the pattern was the unfinished aluminum and the color was depicted with another piece of metal sample. If the Board wants the pattern color brightened, they can surely do so.

Mr. Lominack said he knows there are some limits to what is available.

Mr. Shay explained that this is not a stock color; this will be the color specifically for this project.

Mr. Lominack asked Mr. Shay if he had the elevation requirement.

Mr. Shay stated [pointing to a section] said this is the area that the staff has recommended that instead of having the glass between unbalanced piers that it be balanced.

Mr. Lominack asked Mr. Shay if he would be willing to do it the original way.

Mr. Shay stated that they presented it as they did because they like that best.

Mr. Engle stated he disagrees with staff. He believes the original looks better than the revised.

Ms. Ramsay said she believes she hears that the majority of the Board members like the original.

Mr. Shay showed the Board an illustration of paired windows as opposed to the pattern. He said he differs somewhat with the staff's interpretation. He said he walked the area from the Hyatt Hotel to this site and back and this is not something that is frequently seen on the River Front. The only building that has it is the Byck Building range which is a low range and the windows that are paired are aluminum jalousie windows which are noncontributing to the building. There is one place where there are two windows, although they are not paired; but, are close together on the Cotton Exchange. Therefore, there is one place where these would look similar to this, although it would be a heavy mullion in-between it.

Mr. Shay said they looked at it over the entire building; they studied it both ways and frankly, they feel that this is the definite ambiguities that they do not like. It is ambiguous in terms of this is a modern building located immediately adjacent to a modern building, a mid-Century modern building to be more specific. It is also ambiguous in a sense that it tends to reduce the verticality. Mr. Shay said they think these windows are a better pattern because they, like a great architect in the past, Louis Sullivan, makes the building rise.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Shay to address the question pertaining to lighting of the lantern.

Mr. Shay explained that the rendering that the Board saw that has the exorbitant colors, what they would like to do is to have a metal here that would be neutral and then use lighting to make the color. When they presented a relatively traditional design to the Board at the adoption of Part I, they were asked to try something that was a lot more "fun," he

believes was the term that was used. Therefore, they did this design and actually submitted this as a follow up to the conditions of Part I, Height and Mass. He believes this was approved; although he guesses not by this Board, but was approved as being consistent with the conditions of the Part I approval.

Mr. Shay said with regards to the lighting issue, if they can agree that this is the right design, then they would like to have the opportunity to do a model of it and light it so that the Board could actually see what the light looks like. He stated that a question was asked about where the light would be seen from. He explained that it would be very difficult to see from River Street. The point of it is to be a beacon that you could see as you approach from anywhere coming from the Island Expressway. It will also be highly visible from the Riverfront and Hutchinson Island. They believe it is an elegant blossom that is a lot more interesting and positive to put up. The massing has been approved. They also have a tower element that is intended for Hotel 2 to follow. Therefore, the building that they have presented in the past will also have an element that is up there so that these two will be seen in context of each other and form a gateway framing whether you are coming or going on River Street and signal that you are about to enter the Historic District and River Street in particular.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Shay about this statement regarding the tower.

Mr. Shay explained that this is the tower that has been recommended on Hotel II and that at least Part IA has been approved. He said this is the tower they are talking about today.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked, "what is the elevation height of Hotel II and Hotel I?"

Mr. Shay answered that they are approximately the same height.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she likes the way Hotel I compliments the modern building next door.

Mr. Shay explained that what they have tried to do is to be very respectable in materiality. But, then lean towards the Mid-Century in terms of the actual architectural form.

Ms. Simpson asked if the two hotels would mirror each other.

Mr. Shay answered "no" they will not be identical. He explained that the tower they have proposed so far is something that is eight-sided octagonal for Hotel II and something that is organic and round for Hotel I. Hotel II will be developed depending on what Hotel I is allowed to be. If the Board allows them to go forward, they want to do something that is complimentary but not mirrored.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Shay if he would be willing to look at the design of the top of the pinnacle.

Mr. Shay asked Ms. Simpson if she was saying on Hotel I.

Ms. Simpson answered yes.

Mr. Shay said they are presenting it today as a part of Part II. What is the Board's desire?

Mr. Lominack said he does not have a problem with what Mr. Shay has done. He definitely prefers the original treatment of the glass entryway and he agrees on the window treatment that Mr. Shay has proposed.

Mr. Howington said on the west elevation renderings, the granite on the cap is shown going all the way around, but on all the other sides, they have the consistent cap of granite, marble on the top and in this elevation it is broken up in the bays. The renderings show that it is actually in there, which he feels is more consistent with the other elevations as this is presented as one big building. Is this going to be granite in the negative part of the bay?

Mr. Shay said that he apologizes if they have presented a rendering that is inaccurate. He does not know which one it is, but the idea is that they were trying to additionally break up the massing by differentiating between the segments very clearly and giving sort of crowns to the segments that were proud and not to the ones that were recessed or shy.

Mr. Howington said he does not know if there is a way that the stairs that lead to River Street could be pushed north because there is a very odd corner. In between here there is a four foot corner and then it recesses back as a part of the cantilever. This is towards Bay Street. In the plan, they can see that the corner of that stair tower on the right-hand side architecturally, structurally comes down to the ground. He was speaking of the south west.

Mr. Shay explained that this is not a stair element. But, he heard what Mr. Howington said. He said the bits of glass are actually in the hotel room.

Mr. Howington said Mr. Shay was correct, but it reads as a stair tower. He said on the back side, it is kind of odd to have the corner come down and then the other side of the glass recessed back and cantilevered over. He said he did not know if there was a way to push the stair towards the north just a little to bring it architecturally, structurally down.

Mr. Shay explained that the stair towers are located a way from the ends of the buildings so that the hotel rooms on the ends will have these spectacular views.

Mr. Shay thanked the City of Savannah's staff and the City Manager's office. He said the Board would be glad to know that they went through a very rigorous process of demonstrating the rooftop gardens and worked with a great consultant, Stella Matthews, in making sure that not only would it be beautiful on day one, but that it will be maintained forever and putting landscape maintenance covenants in with the City of Savannah.

Ms. Ramsay thanked Mr. Shay for informing the Board of this as she knew many Board members had this concern.

Mr. Shay explained that the solar likewise as been thoroughly vetted. One of the things that the Board might be interested in is the area of solar was determined to be only the area of the actual collectors. Therefore, they could not take only a few solar panels and spread them around on the roof and call this a certain amount of area.

Mr. Howington said pertaining to his question, picture 45 shows it the best. He said the recess in the bracket catches the cantilever. Structurally, the entire bump-out should down to the ground. Mr. Howington said he realizes that Mr. Shay did this to make more pedestrian way. However, he does not know if there is a way to push the stair towards the north to make the solid come down. He said that when you look at this in elevation, it is very odd.

Mr. Shay said they may be able to achieve what Mr. Howington is asking for architecturally, but they will not be moving the stairs to accomplish it. However, if it is a condition, they probably could live with it. They tried very hard and the stairway is unusual in a sense as it is not a public right-of-way, although it will be opened for public access. Therefore, they are not encroaching on anybody else's property. They are encroaching on his client's property. They wanted to try to keep it wide enough, but the nearest one on Factors Walk is between four and six feet wide. Therefore, it would not be unprecedented for this to be a little narrow.

Mr. Shay explained that the reason he believes they like this is because it will give them the opportunity that when they come back for their signage, etc. to make it a lot more obvious to somebody who is approaching that River Street is down that way. He said that once someone gets to the point where they can see between the buildings, you will actually be able to see all the way down between buildings on the River Front as well. This aligns with the space between the buildings. Therefore, it will be obvious when you come around to it, but as you are approaching it for example from Trustees Garden, they would like to have the opportunity to put something there that is a "way defining element."

Ms. Simpson asked if the color of the bricks are the same as the SEPCO building.

Mr. Shay answered no. The colors depicted are chocolaty brown for the brick. The existing SEPCO building is much more a red brick. They presented an earlier color scheme that was a bit of a dandy and they liked it, but it was a little too much for the staff members. Consequently, they calmed it down and at the end of the day, he likes this scheme better. They are using the Georgia Natural Elbeton Granite. At the top, it is not treated and at the bottom it will be oiled. It will be a manufactured stone. It will basically have a light gray/dark gray contrast.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that overall they believe a successful effort has been done. However, they have a few questions for the petitioner. Their first questions relates to the need for the overhang. What is driving the need to make this change from what was originally approved? He said it is difficult to tell, but looking at the renderings, he wonders if there will be a way to ensure that they do not have pigeons or birds roosting here. He does not know if there is space for this or whether this is a sheer, clean corner.

Mr. Carey said the rendering is helpful with respect to the green PTAC grills underneath the windows. He believes the windows are bronze. Then the green PTAC is there. The question is, should there be a little closer relationship between the grills and the windows. They do not need to necessarily be exactly the same, but he believes the bronze and green could work, but it is a little difficult to tell. May be it could compete a little and

this could be a part of the intention, but, the HSF asks that there be some consideration in making those a little more consistent with each other.

Mr. Carey said with respect to the lantern and the corner tower, they had a lot of fun with this as well. They were pleased to see the creativity. He said as he understands it, there is no access up there on either level other than maintenance. However, they want to ensure that the openings will look as deep and true as they should and not appear to be shallow or false. He said the HSF really likes the tower a lot. They were trying to grapple it with the rest of the building, especially how the windows line up here. They like the vertical element and they were wondering if the windows should maybe not be a little more vertical. But, they have to honor the rest of the building and the horizontal line. Maybe there is an elevation that shows Bay Street. Mr. Shay said they understand the need that these relate to each other and the tower is significant and could be a little differentiated. As Mr. Shay has said, where the building rises, they think slightly narrow windows that are a little more vertically-oriented might assist with this.

Mr. Carey said also on the same line, he believes that Mr. Howington had a question about the color of the granite towards the top. He said the HSF suggests that the building gets lighter in color as you go up, particularly in the tower. Consequently, a lighter color granite towards the top would be helpful. Mr. Carey said literally lighten it up.

Mr. Carey said they agree with the staff's recommendation to have this centered. He realizes that the Board may differ on this. He agrees with Mr. Shay that the existing windows as presented are preferred to the paired double sash windows. Mr. Carey said he is not sure that they know what the spandrel material is here between the floors. This might have been just a detail that was left out. However, the HSF would like to know how this will relate, color wise and material wise, with the rest of the building.

Ms. Simpson said she realizes that Building II is not presently on the table, but she believes that one of the Board members brought up a very good question or concern about both towers.

Mr. Carey said the HSF did not look at Building II. However, he heard Ms. Simpson's question earlier regarding whether there would be a relationship between Hotel I and Hotel II. However, he does not know; but what he would say is let's accept this as it is and then consider that in the context of this. Nevertheless, he will say that this probably makes a lot of sense if they are going to have one, this would probably be the place to do it. Mr. Carey said, however, he might have questions about Hotel II having one, but he believes this makes sense.

Ms. Ramsay asked for other public comments. No one came forward. She asked Mr. Shay to please respond to the HSF's questions.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Shay that in the event, during the Board's Discussion, they discuss one building having a tower over the other, "would there be a preference from his team?"

Mr. Shay answered that this is certainly intended to be, if they pardon the reference "Savannah's Flatiron Building" they think the weird shape where it divides a very unusual condition of having River Street and Bay Street which are parallel for a mile and come

down actually to a bit of a point; they have gone to a great deal of trouble to ensure that this building actually relates to that curvature. Therefore, if there was ever a place that needed to have this tower, they think this building is the place for it. He said they will make the case for Hotel II when they get there.

Mr. Shay thanked Mr. Carey for his comments. He explained that why an overhang is on the western side is because the desire was there to increase the fenestration on that side. Also, because they were going from what was in essence two hotel rooms that were each 18 feet wide to three hotel rooms were 12 feet wide, there was not sufficient depth in order to create a standard hotel room. Therefore, they are actually a foot shy of this still, but they needed to come out as far as they could. They could not go beyond three feet in the cantilever for other building code reasons; they needed a five foot separation between the buildings. The reason ultimately is so they could have a few more hotel room keys and, therefore, increase the amount of fenestration that is on that side which is also consistent with one of the comments.

Mr. Shay said they will be very careful about the pigeon roosting. He said he appreciates Mr. Carey bringing this to their attention. They will talk about this later today. They have mediated the color with a kind of olive green color so that it has enough natural tone to relate to the bronze of the windows and the dark color of the brick. So, they believe they have it right. They heard a comment that people would have them make this bolder and this comment that perhaps it would be somewhat closer to brown which would be calmer. But, they look forward to the Board's discussion on this.

Mr. Shay said he was very glad that the HSF likes the lantern. The reason there is no access is because they don't want people and children going up there. The lower half of this is actually mechanical equipment. The grills will be recessed very deeply in the granite so that they read as portals and not as something that is forced up there. Mr. Shay said he believes this is detailed in the 48 pages of drawings that they have submitted.

Mr. Shay said he has discussed earlier the tension between vertical and horizontal. He said he believes they have it right that where they have a horizontal line that is in there so that you know that it is a window. It actually meets the letter of the ordinance because it is a double-hung window and they believe they need this in order for it all to read as being a place where people live and it is not an office building or something else. He explained that the lighter granite at the top is something that they have looked at back and forth. They like it with the dark so that it accents even more the contrast between when it is lit, but if it was dark at the base [which it is everywhere else and light all the way up], this would not be something that is a great problem.

Mr. Shay said the HSF prefers the "H" windows and, therefore, agrees with them. He explained that regarding the spandrels in the corner, the glass that is being proposed is not dark gray; the tinted glass and spandrels will be same glass only obscured on the inside panels.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Shay what were his thoughts about the vertical windows in the tower as Mr. Carey stated. He said he believed that Mr. Carey was talking about bringing the windows on the right all the way across the tower. Is this correct?

Mr. Carey clarified that the HSF was suggesting is that perhaps these [pointing to an area]

would be more vertical. However, they understand as Mr. Shay has said that there is a tension between this and this. They did not have an answer, but it was more of a question and an observation. But, if this is the feature that they think it is, he believes that you could argue that it would not necessarily have to relate so stringently to the others. He pointed out these muntins are horizontal and line up. However, he guesses this is per the rules and they wonder if this is not too much. Mr. Carey said [pointing to a section] that these windows look a little out of sync. He realized that Mr. Shay is respecting one rule, but with the other, he is winding up with something else that the HSF believes is a little awkward.

Ms. McClain asked if the tower is meant to be open at the top.

Mr. Shay replied yes; actually it will be lit from below and the light will shine up on the petals of the flower.

Ms. McClain asked if the lighting will be on the inside.

Mr. Shay explained that the lighting will be on the floor or the roof of that part, because of the structure, and will shine up.

Ms. McClain asked Mr. Shay if he considered opening the petals more.

Mr. Shay answered because of maintenance reasons, the answer is no. They would not be able to have a continuous depth that goes all the way around it to have the ability to get up there and maintain it.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said the Board did not agree with the paired sashes that the staff has recommended. The lighting on the roof has potential issues and has been discussed. The sample panel is a requirement. Therefore, the sample panel has to be constructed.

Ms. Harris explained that because of the scale and the importance of materials and because they are getting an extra story, staff felt that the Board should be afforded the opportunity to review the sample panel.

Ms. Simpson said the Board has not talked about the top of the tower. She knew that some of the Board members like it and she believes that it has come along way, but she believes it is on its way, but has not made it yet. Ms. Simpson said she was asking the Board members what are their opinions on the tower.

Mr. Engle said nothing is going to be compatible. Therefore, they are not talking about a compatibility issue. There are no buildings that are compatible to this. But, once you get to this point, he does not want to say that he likes it because "like" does not have anything to do with it. This is fine and will be landmark. Mr. Engle said he had no problems with the tower.

Ms. McClain said she is glad that they put it in to let the staff review the potential lighting because she believes the lighting will be the biggest issue. She knows that there has been some discussion about the second tower on the second building. Ms. McClain said she

does not see a problem with either tower, but the Board needs to consider each when presented.

Ms. Simpson stated that each one is separate and she struggled about bringing it up as Building 2 is not on the table. However, it is still difficult not to discuss it because at that point it is complete with the project in its completion will have two towers. Will this be a bit too much? She said she was not saying whether it is or it is not, but was only bringing it up as a topic for discussion. On Building 2, the tower may be more relevant. Who knows?

Ms. Weibe-Reed said the Board has nothing to compare it to.

Ms. Simpson said once the Board approves Building 1, it is approved. Therefore, the pinnacle will be a very interesting discussion ten years from now.

Mr. Engle said it makes it harder on the architects because they would have to have something to compare it to.

Board Action:

Approve Part I - Height and Mass Amendments, and Part 2 - Design Details with the following conditions:

1. Indicate any potential lighting on rooftop element.
2. Provide information on trash collection or any on-site storage; - PASS
3. Construct a sample panel on-site to be reviewed by the Board and approved by staff prior to installation of materials in accordance with the HDBR Sample Panel Guidelines because it meets the design standards and is visually compatible.

Vote Results

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye

Ebony Simpson

- Aye

16. [Petition of Anthony D. Hampton | 13-001767-COA | 532 East Taylor Street | Alterations and addition/new construction](#)

Attachment: [Staff report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Attachment: [Contributing Building Map - Davis Ward.pdf](#)

Mr. Anthony D. Hampton was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting exterior alterations to add a second story to the one-story structure at 532 East Taylor Street and clad the entire building in Hardi-plank siding. No changes to the footprint are proposed, with the exception of the front stoop. The project was heard at the May 8, 2013 HDBR meeting. The Board continued the application at the petitioner's request to address staff concerns and provide more details. She said for the most part, the petitioner has addressed most of the comments.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of Part I, Height and Mass of the new two-story addition (reviewed as new construction due to its size) with the condition that a transom and/or sidelights be incorporated at the front entrance and a traditional projecting header and side trim be incorporated and echoed in the window details.

Ms. Harris additionally reported that staff recommends approval of Part II, Design Details, with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final approval with the construction drawings:

1. Provide stucco finish color;
2. The window muntin width must not exceed 7/8 inch in dimension;
3. Provide the materials and confirm operability of shutters;
4. Specify dimensions of portico columns and newel posts. The column capital must project forward of the architrave;
5. Identify the location for electric meters, trash and recycling receptacles.

Mr. Lominack stated that on the provided details of the door design including new trim to be incorporated with wood frame exterior, staff reported that it is complete, but he could not find those details in the submittal drawings packet.

Ms. Harris explained that staff is recommending that additional information be provided and include transoms and sidelights.

Mr. Lominack asked why does the staff comments say complete first if it says provide details on the door design including new trims to be incorporated with the wood frame exterior; then it says complete [in bold]. If it was complete, it should have been included in the submittal packet.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said the elevation is a little misleading when compared to the floor plan. The front door is not centered. Staff is recommending a sidelight?

Ms. Harris said the petitioner could be asked to verify whether the front elevation is shown correctly.

Mr. Engle said a window is not shown in the kitchen in the front elevation. There is one shown on the elevation, but is not shown on the plan.

Ms. Simpson said she guesses that elevation does not show that there is a difference in the width of the two windows on the first floor. Does the width change or is it still exactly the same?

Ms. Harris said her understanding is that they are exactly the same. However, perhaps they can get some clarification from the petitioner.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said there are two shutters on the rear. Two windows are side-by-side

Ms. Harris explained that the standards state that the shutters have to be operable and sized to fit the opening. There are instances where shutters fold into each other. She said basically what the Board is seeing here may be a double shutter. However, one of the recommendations of staff is for the petitioner to provide this information.

Mr. Lominack asked if the site plan was submitted.

Ms. Harris answered that she believes the site plan was submitted.

Dr. Henry asked staff that on the rear view if they were okay with the two windows being together.

Ms. Harris answered yes. She said that the site plan is on page eight (8).

Mr. Engle asked, "where will the garbage be located?"

Ms. Harris said the garbage is one of the staff's condition.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Hampton came forward and stated that he is the designer of the project. He said regarding the details of the door, the trim, and the addition of a sidelight, if the Board has noticed the picture of the building that has been provided, concrete block exists here now. The standard structure design has an angle that runs from block-to-block over the front door. He said if they cut out the structure for a sidelight, this would not leave any structural integrity over the front door for the sidelight. They are working with the existing structure.

Mr. Hampton said they are recommending that the electrical meters be placed in the rear of the building; However, Georgia Power is going to ultimately determine where the box will be located. He said that there is an existing fence with a small strip of land behind there. The building does not go all the way to the lane. They will store the trash cans in the

rear of the building and on the day of the trash collection, the cans will be brought to the front.

Mr. Hampton stated that he has another detail of the porch that addresses the capital issue. He said as the Board sees, they have reduced the height of the front porch. The blocks have been brought down to the level of the capitals. Mr. Hampton said he believes this meets the intent of the top capital. He as far as the windows are concerned, they can place the windows inside the existing four feet span and can go down to put in a three foot high window. But, there is nothing that they can do across the top of the window. They have the same situation here as they have with the front door.

Ms. Simpson asked if the four feet window on the front elevation would remain four feet.

Mr. Hampton answered no; it will be reduced to a three foot by five foot window. They have tried to do everything that the Board asked. However, if there is something that they have not done, they will be happy to do so. He said, however, with the sidelight issue he was only explaining that they cannot address this because of the structure of concrete block of the building.

Mr. Hampton stated that he has the hinge hardware kit that they have purchased for the shutters. The shutters will be constructed out of one-by-four material. The double window on the back is folded over; therefore, when it is opened, it will cover both windows.

Mr. Merriman asked if the front door will be centered as shown.

Mr. Hampton said the front door is in an existing location that can not be moved to the right or left. Therefore, it will remain where it is now.

Mr. Merriman said he did not have a picture showing the door.

Mr. Hampton said it is off-centered.

Mr. Merriman said it is not the off-centered door. The front elevation shows the door in the center. Is this the correct location?

Mr. Hampton said the door is slightly off-centered.

Mr. Merriman explained that he has worked on some projects where they made the doorway wider and the lintel had to be replaced. The steel angle can be moved and a bigger piece can be put there. Therefore, the opening can be wider. A major renovation is being done here and he does not believe that it would be that much more difficult to do this with all that is being done to make this happen.

Mr. Hampton said dealing with concrete blocks of the early 1950s, he is willing to bet that the blocks are hollow. However, they can try to do it before the second floor is added.

Mr. Merriman said he was saying that it is possible to do the work.

Dr. Henry informed Mr. Hampton that he believes that he and the owner are heroes in

the neighborhood.

Mr. Hampton said they are trying to improve the neighborhood and correct the eyesore that is between two nice houses. They did not come before the Board to try to reinvent the wheel, but to try to make it compatible with the neighborhood.

Ms. McClain asked Mr. Hampton if was going to try to widen the opening.

Mr. Hampton answered yes. They would have to widen the front door opening. Because they are putting Hardi-board over the front, the steel angle fits over the back.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Hampton if the plan view is correct, as the door opens up against the wall. He said if this is the case. They could not get a sidelight here regardless of moving the lintel.

Mr. Howington said the petitioner could do a transom. The door would not be centered.

Mr. Hampton said they need to take in consideration that there is an eight foot high ceiling here. It is not a ten foot high ceiling where they could put a transom over the top. Therefore, they are constricted.

Mr. Merriman said that while it is true that the lintel can be changed and moved, but there would only be room for one sidelight on the right-hand side. A sidelight would never be able to be put on the left because the wall is running all the way down.

Mr. Lominack said the elevation does not agree with the plan.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HFS) said they believe that this is just so close, but they would not want to leave it unfinished. They believe there are adjustments that must be made and the staff has picked up on most of those and they agree. There is the need for a transom or the sidelights. A little more detailing is needed on the porch stoops; a heavier beam under the stoop and a number of other comments that have been made. Mr. Carey said the centering and widening of the door is necessary. He said that all of this will complete this. He believes the petitioner should be applauded for coming as far as they have, the goal line is in sight, but he does not believe that they should leave it on the 20 yard line. Therefore, with the adjustments and recommendations of staff, some things could be worked out and this will be a true success.

Mr. Carey said this is an important building and the work is important. This would be establishing a new standard when you are going to rehabilitate an old block building. If it is going to be done, then he believes it should be done right. Mr. Carey said he believes that all the suggestions and discussions that they have heard will get it to that point.

Ms. Ramsay asked if there were additional public comments.

Ms. Annie Rockwell came forward and stated that she is the immediate neighbor to the east at 538 East Taylor Street. Ms. Rockwell applauded Mr. Hampton and the owner for what they are doing. The rest of the neighbors and she are thrilled. However, she does not

believe that the double windows on the back of the building fit in with the rest of neighborhood.

Mr. Hampton said the Board asked him to put the double window here.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Merriman said just as Mr. Carey stated the petitioner is getting there, but there are still some things that need to be tweaked.

Dr. Henry asked if those things are covered in the staff's recommendations? Is there something else?

Mr. Merriman said the door has to be centered to make it look like the elevation drawings that the petitioner has presented. If he is going to do this, the wall has to moved inside. This is a major change.

Mr. Engle said the wall has to be moved four feet front to back.

Mr. Merriman questioned if the Board should make a motion approving this with the condition that the petitioner does this.

Mr. Engle said they must deal with the reality. An eight foot ceiling is here and the petitioner is raising the roof anyway.

Mr. Howington said there is plenty of room for a one foot transom. He commends what the petitioner is doing and believes that it will be an overall great improvement to the block, but he thinks that some inconsistencies are present in the elevations. The front elevations are not going to be symmetrical in real life. It is going to be more like the floor plan. Therefore, it is going to be odd. Towards the rear elevation with the double windows, there are ways to put in a false window in the middle. He believes the Board talked about this before which was to be studied. The porch is another concern. Mr. Howington said he appreciates the petitioner bringing a revised porch, but he thinks the two example on the east and west are nice examples to look at as far as building a portico. However, all in all he believes there are some lack of detail in the submittal that is not represented correctly in the elevation. This gives a false sense of symmetry. He said that he would like to see it the way it is in reality.

Dr. Henry asked if the Board is suggesting that Mr. Hampton ask for a continuance.

Ms. Simpson said since Mr. Hampton has studied the double window as was suggested by the Board, can they suggest that he go back to one window rather than trying to create two windows in this room.

Mr. Lominack said he believes the first thing that needs to be done is to have accurate measure drawings that agree with one another.

Ms. Ramsay informed Mr. Hampton that she believes the consensus between the Board is that they would like to hear this petition continued.

Mr. Hampton said if this is necessary, he would like for the Board to continue the petition until they get everything like they want it. He said they are determined to get this project done, but they want it to be in keeping with the Historic District. He asked for the continuance.

Mr. Merriman commended Mr. Hampton on the work that he has done.

Mr. Engle said they are getting hung up on symmetry, but if they look at the aerial photograph, the house two doors down on the right is not symmetrical. Perhaps, there is an alternative in moving the doorway and the stoop over to the side. He does not believe that the Board has to insist on symmetry.

Mr. Lominack said one of the problems could be trying to make it look like an old "historic building" rather than accepting it has a concrete block facing.

Board Action:

Approval to continue the petition to address the following:

1. Restudy the front entrance and incorporate a transom and/or sidelights and incorporate a traditional projecting header and side trim echoed in the window details.
2. Restudy the paired windows on the rear elevation.
3. Provide stucco finish color. - PASS
4. The window muntin width must not exceed 7/8 inch in dimension.
5. Provide the materials and confirm operability of shutters.
6. Specify dimensions of portico columns and newel posts. The column capital must project forward of the architrave.
7. Identify the location for electric meters, trash and recycling receptacles.

Vote Results

Motion: Ebony Simpson

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

- | | |
|--------------------|-------|
| Reed Engle | - Aye |
| Nicholas Henry | - Aye |
| Keith Howington | - Aye |
| T. Jerry Lominack | - Aye |
| Zena McClain, Esq. | - Aye |

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

17. [Petition of Roy Ogletree for East End Development | 13-001862-COA | 545 East McDonough Street | New Construction Residences: Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Aerial - Facing North.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Examples Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Renderings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Specifications.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [May 8, 2013 Board Decision Part I Height and Mass.pdf](#)

Ms. McClain and Mr. Engle left the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

Ms. Annabelle Guldner 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 five (5) three and three and one-half story residential townhouses at 545 East McDonough Street. The trust lot is bounded on three sides by East McDonough Street to the north, Houston Street to the west, East Perry Street to the south, and two attached townhouses to the east.

Ms. Michalak stated that there has been a discussion between the petitioner and staff regarding the intentions of the Board for requesting the condition of the walls of continuity at the last meeting. The petitioner is requesting an interpretation from the Board regarding this matter to the intention of that condition to determine if the walls of continuity criteria has been satisfied. Ms. Michalak said that the staff would not make its recommendation until after this discussion is handled with the petitioner.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Michalak if staff would make their recommendation today.

Ms. Michalak answered yes; after the Board makes its interpretation about the wall of continuity condition on the Part I approval.

Ms. Guldner came forward and stated that she was representing Mr. Roy Ogletree. Ms. Guldner said the wall of continuity has been discussed at length for this project. They have proposed open parking similar to the Troup Square examples for the townhomes.

This photo was submitted in the packets. A suggestion was to use this as a model and the neighbors have been supportive, especially since they are doubling the minimum parking to alleviate a potential parking problem for the entire area. She explained that they are getting two cars off the street as opposed to getting only one car. There is no way for them to get a gate or wall of continuity on the back side of the Perry Street homes because they cannot accommodate a gate. The gates would block the sidewalks when they are open and rolling gates cannot be accommodated because there is not enough wall space.

Ms. Guldner said [pointing to an area] that they have come up with a compromise of having a rolling gate right here for the Houston Street units that rolls along the walls. She said [pointing to a section] that they have wing walls here where the driveways come to the Perry Street units that imply a wall of continuity along those parking spaces.

Dr. Henry told Ms. Guldner that he is not an architect, and, therefore, asked her what is a wing wall.

Ms. Guldner explained that these walls actually stick out at the property line and you pull in through those to park into the parking space. Therefore, it is just an opening of in the wall where you can pull in with a car. So, the walls are actually at the property line and they imply the wall of continuity.

Dr. Henry said to him it appears to be a wall.

Ms. Guldner explained that the walls are further out at the property line. She said they are requesting from the Board clarification of the condition of the wall of continuity and how they are supposed to accommodate this on those three units. Ms. Guldner said there is no way for them to do this.

Ms. Ramsay asked Ms. Michalak if she was asking the Board to determine if what the petitioner has provided is in fact a wall of continuity.

Ms. Michalak answered yes because staff's direct interpretation of the condition that the Board placed on it is provide a wall of continuity. However, her interpretation is that the standard is still not met. However, the petitioner is asking for the Board's interpretation of what they meant by this condition and if what they have submitted meets the condition.

Ms. Ramsay asked Ms. Michalak if she recalls who made this condition.

Ms. Michalak said initially this was the staff's recommendation. All of staff's recommendations were adopted. This is a visual compatibility factor and a specific design standard.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked if it is defined in the ordinance what a wall of continuity is.

Mr. Lominack answered no. He just tried to find it.

Mr. Howington said by definition, he would arguably say that this is not a wall of continuity. He realized that there are site limitations on this project, but on most other projects there would be a garage or the building would continue to the property line and then you pull into a garage which would create a part of that wall of continuity. But, here they have an open space above. Therefore, they need site.

Ms. Guldner said they are restricted with the garage because it is not allowed any longer to have the garage doors right at the property line and you pull in. They are requesting a variance for the structured parking on the house because they are off the street with the parking. Since this has been approved in Phase I, Height and Mass, they are faced with a condition for those three buildings that does not leave them much room to create this continuous wall which they would be happy to accommodate the gates, but they are

restricted with the side posts swinging out. They have no way to open the gates without getting in the way of other standards.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the gates could open inward.

Ms. Guldner said the problems is the gates would open into the sidewalk and will block it. They could not be opened inward as there would be no way to close the gates once the car is parked.

Mr. Howington said it is not the Board's responsibility to design this or solve it, but by definition he would say that this is not a wall of continuity. But, the issue with the sites of the driveway crossing the sidewalk is what happens when you have a wall or gate here, the cars end up being parked on the sidewalk. The place that was to be used for parking the cars usually become a courtyard. This is what will probably happen anyway.

Mr. Howington stated, however, relatively to the question, by definition this is not a wall of continuity in his opinion.

Ms. Ramsay asked the Board that as presented, do they interpret this as a wall of continuity?

Dr. Henry stated that you cannot do a wall of continuity on a trust lot. The petitioner has done the best they can.

Ms. Ramsay said her main concern if the Board interprets this as a wall of continuity it will come back over and over again.

Ms. Guldner showed the Board some pictures and said that opening parking is there that does not have walls at the property line going through.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Guldner to explain again why the pictures are being shown to the Board.

Ms. Guldner explained that the photos show the back of the Troup Square Townhomes.

Mr. Lominack said if he was not mistaken before the Urban Renewal Troup Project took place, carriage houses were behind these places.

Ms. Ramsay explained to the Board that they have a question to vote on as to whether what has been presented today constitutes a wall of continuity.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked that the definition of a wall of continuity be given to the Board.

Ms. Michalak read from the ordinance that Visual Compatibility Factor #9 - Walls of Continuity "appurtenances of a structure such as a walls, wrought iron, fences shall form a consistent wall enclosure along the street." Ms. Michalak explained this means rather it be gates, rolling gates, walls, fences or whatever.

Dr. Henry said, therefore, what has been presented is not a wall of continuity.

Ms. Ramsay agreed and said an opening is here.

Mr. Merriman said in order for it to be considered a wall of continuity, a gate would need to be here for it to be considered as a continuous wall.

Mr. Lominack said he was not sure whether some would need to be customized, but an eight-to-eight door that was a wall that rolled up and was not undercover could certainly be done.

Ms. Michalak pointed out that this zoning district only requires one parking spot per building.

Ms. Guldner said they have provided two parking spots per unit to get rid of the parking problem because along Perry Street the owners/tenants are parking along that side. As designed as is, they will be getting rid of the parking on the McDonough Street side. Consequently, they would be getting two cars off the street because in most households today there are at least two cars.

NOTE: The Board did not interpret that what was presented was a wall of continuity.

Ms. Michalak stated that since the Board does not interpret that what was presented constitutes a wall of continuity, staff recommends continuing Part I, Height and Mass.

Ms. Michalak asked the Board since the condition of Part I has not been met, "should she now present Part II, Design Details, today?"

Ms. Simpson said she believes the condition of Part I will affect the design of Part II.

Ms. Ramsay explained to the Board that a question is before them as to whether they want to hear Part II, Design Details, today or wait until the wall of continuity is met.

Ms. Simpson stated that maybe they need to find out from the petitioner if this will completely change their design as presented.

Ms. Guldner said they feel that they have accomplished a design that would satisfy everyone, the neighbors, the Board, parking requirements and zoning. They feel that there is not a possibility in this design that they can accommodate that part. She said at one point, they talked about arches over the openings connecting the wing walls. Would this be a possibility to create and apply a wall of continuity instead of having gates or a consistent wall?

Mr. Merriman said there are examples that he thinks of where this has been done.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board cannot solve the problem, but they have found that what has been presented does not provide a wall of continuity.

Ms. Guldner asked the Board to explain the trust lot situation again. She stated that they have actually looked at the possibility of doing the parking and eliminate the curb cut

entirely on that side. They feel that this design will create a more pleasant view of McDonough Street than if they just eliminated the curb cut completely.

Mr. Lominack said between Harris and Charlton Streets, parking occurs on both sides of the street that comes into the square. Because of landscaping, trees and other things that are occurring there, it is mostly like any other urban street.

Dr. Henry said he wanted to reiterate that this project has gone from poor to pretty good. He does not believe that they should let "perfect" be the enemy of good in this case. Dr. Henry said maybe the petitioner can do some more with the wall of continuity, but the petitioner has done so much already. They almost have of the number of units there.

Ms. Ramsay said the question still before the Board is: "do they want to hear Part II today without approving Part I?"

Mr. Howington said he had no problem with the Board hearing Part II, Design Details, today.

Ms. Michalak gave the staff's report for Part II, Design Details. She reported that staff recommends continuing the New Construction: Part II, Design Details for 545 East McDonough Street to consider the following:

1. Revise the window section detail for the East Building to inset the window sashes not less than three (3) inches from the exterior façade of the building;
2. East Building: Reduce the height of all railings not to exceed 36 inches. Reduce the depth of the balconies to three (3) feet. Add brackets to the balconies that meet the standards. Indicate the baluster spacing (not to exceed the standard).
3. West Building: Reduce the depth of the balconies to three (3) feet.
4. Add a horizontal rail to the shutters that corresponds to the location of the meeting rail of the windows.
5. Provide walls of continuity at all drive and parking areas. Provide all application checklist items required in the Fences/Walls section for Board review. No information was provided in the submittal packet.
6. Reduce the garage door openings to meet the standard.
7. Screen electrical meters, HVAC units, and refuse storage areas as required.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Guldner stated that she wanted to point out the two errors in the drawings. Firstly, the garage doors are going to be two garage doors, each being nine (9) feet wide. They realize that it was shown as one 16 foot wide garage door on the plans. Secondly, the railings are going to be 36 inches maximum for the eastern building.

Ms. Guldner said regarding the shutters, they did specify the model without the meeting rail, but they have already picked the right model that is in accordance with the elevation. She said as for the service area and the mechanical systems, the trash for all the units is screened from view as shown on drawings A-3. She said [pointing to an area] that the

rolling gate here and here are screening the HVAC units for the Houston Street units and the trash is on the other side in the little service area. Ms. Guldner said the HVAC for the Perry Street units is going to be on the roof and the electrical units will be located 20 feet from the property line and not entirely visible in this location.

Ms. Guldner said for the fences, trellises and walls, the walls for the Perry Street units are going to be scored stucco walls to match the building. She said that the Houston Street units will be brick to match the buildings. The separation walls between the Houston Street units will be a brick wall with a wood trellis in the front. Ms. Guldner said they have a detail of this in their submittal packet. This will be the separation wall between those two units with landscaping in front of it.

Ms. Guldner stated that they feel strongly about the six foot balconies because none of the units have outdoor or green spaces. She said in order to make it a usable space for the people, six feet are needed. They feel that by creating this usable space, the people would be encouraged to use the parking spaces as such and will not be creating a parking problem for the whole area.

Ms. Guldner said that actually there is a balcony on the existing townhomes that extends four feet from the building. She said they suggested the rolling gate as a compromise for the wall of continuity is indicated on their drawings and plans and it will be coordinated with the manufacturer to the exact size and height. Ms. Guldner entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Lominack stated that the plans show the rolling gate, but he did not see them in the elevation.

Ms. Guldner said the rolling gates were not shown in the elevation. They are only shown in the plan. The rolling gates were added on as a compromise. She apologized that they did not update the rolling gates on the elevation. The gates are wrought iron.

Mr. Howington asked the petitioner if they would have any objection to changing the window pattern in the dormer on the east building.

Ms. Guldner said she does not believe that this would be a problem.

Mr. Lominack asked the petitioner how are they going to ensure that the people use the parking area.

Ms. Guldner explained that the reason they have the driveways shaped as such is to ensure that people use them as driveways and not as parking spaces and block the sidewalk. She said they realize that they cannot enforce this with people, but they do feel that this solution is given towards the best possibility to make this work for everyone. If the people have the balconies out of their living space, they will use this space for barbecuing, provided they actually have enough room to use it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Ramsay informed Ms. Guldner that staff has recommended a continuance for Part I and Part II. She told Ms. Guldner that she would need to ask for the continuance.

Ms. Michalak said the Board has already approved Part I, but they are waiting on the condition to be met.

Ms. Simpson said she believes that the Board does not want to vote on Part II until they see that the condition for Part I has been met. Therefore, she believes the Board's option would be to deny Part II, if the petitioner is asking that the Board vote on Part II today.

Ms. Guldner explained that she was requesting that the Board continue Part II. She said that Part I has been approved with the condition. Next month they will come back for Part II, they will also bring the condition of the wall of continuity for Part I.

Board Action:

Approval to continue the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass and Part II, Design Details for 545 East McDonough Street to consider the following:

1. Revise the window section detail for the East Building to inset the window sashes not less than three (3) inches from the exterior façade of the building.
2. East Building: Reduce the height of all railings not to exceed 36 inches. Reduce the depth of the balconies to three (3) feet. Add brackets to the balconies that meet the standards. Indicate the baluster spacing (not to exceed the standard). - PASS
3. West Building: Reduce the depth of the balconies to three (3) feet.
4. Add a horizontal rail to the shutters that corresponds to the location of the meeting rail of the windows.
5. Provide walls of continuity at all drive and parking areas. Provide all application checklist items required in the Fences/Walls section for Board review. No information was provided in the submittal packet.
6. Reduce the garage door openings to meet the standard.
7. Screen electrical meters, HVAC units, and refuse storage areas as required.

Vote Results

Motion: Ebony Simpson	
Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	
Reed Engle	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

18. [Petition of Billy Bashlor | 13-002277-COA | 554 East Charlton Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Billy Bashlor, the petitioner, was not present.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval of a wooden, white, shadow box style fence with a lattice top connecting the main house to the carriage house along the East Broad Street elevation at 554 East Charlton Street.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends denial of the petitioner's request because it does not meet the visual compatibility factor that, "fences shall from consistent walls of enclosure along a street" because the proposed fence protrudes beyond the facades of both the main house and the carriage house.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Absent.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Merriman asked staff if they knew why this was an after-the-fact request.

Ms. Harris answered that staff does not know why this is an after-the-fact request. She knows that the petitioner wants to push the fence out further because of security reasons. During construction, the petitioner did not want to remove the existing fence while building the new fence. Therefore, they wanted to leave the fence in place, build the new fence and then remove the existing fence.

Board Action:

Denial of the petition for the principal fence because it does not meet the visual compatibility criteria. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.
Reed Engle - Not Present
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
T. Jerry Lominack - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Marjorie W Reed - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye

19. [Petition of Gerry Cowart, AIA for Cowart Group, Architects | 13-002558-COA | 107 East Gordon Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

Mr. Gerald Cowart was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to construct a two-story brick addition to an existing structure located at 107 East Gordon Street. The addition will be on the north façade of the building, and the floor area of each floor will be 323 square feet. The proposed materials, colors and details will match the 1922 building to which it is attached. The addition measures 22 feet, eight inches (22'8") by 16 feet, nine inches (16'9").

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval as submitted because the project meets the Visual Compatibility Factors and Design Standards.

Dr. Henry said he was looking at the aerial view. He realizes that the tree is not the responsibility of the Historic Review Board, but he wonders if the tree will be removed.

Ms. Harris answered that she does not know if a tree will be removed. This is probably something that the petitioner will be able to address.

Mr. Lominack asked if the building is currently entered from the eastern elevation.

Ms. Harris explained that the entrance is from Gordon Street through the courtyard and the doorway is on the east elevation. She said that a doorway is at the rear.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cowart came forward and said the tree was removed approximately one year ago with the permission of Park & Tree. It was a large sycamore tree that was hollow and at-risk of falling. When the lawyers bought the building, they got rid of the tree. Mr. Cowart entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Lominack asked Mr. Cowart if they would consider removing the raised piece of parapet that is on the roof.

Mr. Cowart answered that he does not want to remove the raised piece of the parapet.

Mr. Howington commended the petitioner on what he considers a great addition.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated they are very supportive of this addition. They believe the design is excellent and creative. Mr. Carey said, however, he shares Mr. Lominack's question about the parapet. He agreed that the parapet should not be there, but if so, carry it all the way around.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Cowart if he wanted to respond to HSF comments.

Mr. Cowart said at this point the parapet is to aesthetically emphasize that center of the building. He said, therefore, it is an aesthetic choice and he does not believe that it is functional in any way. Mr. Cowart said he likes it.

Ms. Ramsay asked for additional public comments. There were no additional public comments.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for the addition as requested because it meets the preservation standards, design - PASS standards, and is visually compatible.

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye

20. [Petition of Bill Coggins | 13-002604-COA | 313 Berrien Street | Porch Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

Note: Mr. Howington recommended that, because since they may lose a quorum at 6:00 p.m., that the staff, during their report, present a shorter version of the summary so that they do not run out of time by not having a quorum as they want to be fair to the last petitioners.

The Board agreed with Mr. Howington's suggestion.

Mr. John Leonard of Sawyer Design was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of an addition/alteration to the new construction at 313 Berrien Street. The addition/alteration involves second and third floor porches on the rear (south) elevation, as well as an exterior staircase within the proposed rear porches to the third floor.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval with the conditions that the specifications and color sample on the PVC louvered panels be submitted to staff for approval and the column capitals extend forward of the architrave.

Mr. Merriman said he read in the report that the Board has approved the use of PVC shutters in the past because they were determined to be visually compatible. Mr. Merriman said he does not remember when the Board has done this.

Ms. Harris said this was her understanding. She had a question from a Board member before the meeting if this was true. She said if the Board feels that this isn't true, then the staff will request a different material or she would be happy to research and if she is able to find examples, come back at the next Board meeting and make a report. The applicant will be advised accordingly.

Ms. Ramsay said what Ms. Harris suggested is a great idea.

Mr. Howington said he knows in the past that the Board has approved a PVC cellular composite.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Leonard said in terms of the questions on the columns, he does not see any issues or concerns with making the adjustments. He said pertaining to the shutters, he is sure they will be able to get the right materials and the right color selected.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said that his question relates to the two dormers. He asked staff if the profile of the building is visible from the right-of-way. If it is visible, is it troubling?

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Carey to point out exactly which dormer he is referring to.

Mr. Carey said there is a gable dormer and a shed dormer. He does not know if it needs to be exactly symmetrical from the profile. Mr. Carey said he has not done enough study to know if they all are the same as there are a lot of "asymmetrical buildings."

Mr. Howington explained what is coming off is the new addition, the shed dormer on the back will be extended and the porch on the bottom will be a double porch with a longer shed.

Mr. Carey thanked Mr. Howington for the explanation and said may be Mr. Howington underscored his point in terms as being more exaggerated. Mr. Carey said they did not want to bog things down, it just caught their eye and they wanted to make the point.

Mr. Howington stated that he believes the question is if it is really that visible from the street. He does not know how it will be resolved.

Mr. Leonard said the elevation to the left is approximately four (4) feet from the existing building. Therefore, you will not see it from the road at all. The right-hand elevation there is a vehicular pass-through to where you will see the front left-hand corner of the building, but the back of the building is really not visible from the street. He said from a view perspective, you will not see it.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for the porch addition/alteration with the conditions that the louvered panels not be constructed of PVC and the alternate material and color sample be submitted to - PASS staff for approval, and that the column capitals extend forward of the architrave, because it meets the design standards and is visually compatible.

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Nicholas Henry

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

Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

21. [Petition of Andy Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects, PC | 13-002609-COA | 422 Habersham Street | Rehabilitation/Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Mr. Andrew Lynch was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations to the building located at 422 Habersham Street. She said the historic building was built in 1955-56 as "Madonna Hall" and is a rated structure in the Savannah Historic District.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for the proposed canopies, to replace the main entrance storefront system, to install the green wall cable system, to alter the brick garden wall, and to install the trellis at 422 Habersham Street as requested because the work is visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards.

Ms. Michalak additionally reported that staff recommends denial for the proposed replacement of three (3) awning window bays and the tile below, and the replacement of the second and third floor balcony infill openings with a new storefront system at 422 Habersham Street because the work is not visually compatible, and does not meet the preservation and design standards.

Ms. Michalak stated that a new design that preserves the existing ground floor windows and tile to the greatest extent possible and incorporates windows and doors at the balconies to match the original is recommended and may be resubmitted under a new application for staff level review.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said on the second and third floors the balconies that are infilled and what is being proposed does match.

Ms. Michalak said it looks like it, but these are original metal, steel angle single pane windows whereas what is being proposed is a clear anodized double glazed storefront system. It matches the light pattern and this is what she was saying. However, it does not match in texture or material.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked if you would be able to differentiate between what is existing and what is new.

Ms. Michalak explained that it is sort of a mix of the two because they are replicating the light pattern. The standards say that if you are going to replicate something, it must do so in color, material, texture, everything. She said that those kind of steel windows are still being made. If the petitioner wants to replicate or mimic the light pattern, they would have to do so with the same type of window, a metal operable window instead of an aluminum

storefront.

Ms. Michalak said if the petitioner wanted to use a different material such as being suggested, she believes it should be a completely new design and not mimic the light pattern in the historic windows. This would be differentiating from the old.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked if the petitioner will be taking out the storefront that was built in the 1970s and replace it with a storefront that does not have bottom rails

Ms. Michalak said staff is okay with that as it meets the Preservation Standards. She said [pointing to a storefront] that it is from the 1970s that is anodized aluminum which is a more modern storefront. She explained that the petitioner is replacing it with a modern anodized aluminum storefront in a wholly new configuration.

Ms. Michalak pointed out the original steel awning windows. She said that each one operates as an awning and down here, it basically a knee wall that is in blue tile. The staff is not recommending that the petitioner replace these, but the standard says "that new storefront must have a base of 18 to 24 inches high of contrasting material." Ms. Michalak stated that these have glass all the way down. Therefore, per the standards, it is not met.

Dr. Henry said it appears, therefore, that Ms. Michalak is saying that the blue tile will remain.

Ms. Michalak confirmed that this is what the staff is recommending.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said a lot of the windows built in the 1950s are not energy efficient.

Ms. Michalak said she does not agree. She said a lot of studies have been done showing that historic windows can be as energy efficient as new windows.

Dr. Henry asked if trees were growing on the roof.

Ms. Michalak answered that this is a question for the petitioner. She does not know.

Dr. Henry asked if the plans are to use this building as an office building.

Ms. Michalak answered that she believes the plan is to use the building as office space.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lynch came forward and said he wanted to make one clarification. He explained that on the storefront, the two bays that were added adjacent to this section were added in the 1970s, but this section they are trying to keep it as an original existing storefront.

Mr. Lynch stated that regarding the upper windows, they have not been able to find any aluminum products that they can match with what is there. Therefore, they want to go back with the original pattern as closely as they can, but they can alter it if the Board has objections to it.

Ms. Michalak explained that there is a product that the Board has approved in the past,

Hopes Steel windows.

Mr. Lynch said the steel windows are actually an aluminum system. This is why they were going back to the aluminum storefront system. He said they have just completed a big project and they tried to find some replacements that were essentially the same kind of windows. They had a lot of trouble finding a natural source. However, they will be willing to continue looking for it; but, as he has said, they have not been able to find it.

Mr. Lynch stated that on the lower section they talked with staff about this after their initial submittal. He said they will be willing to look at this further, but the issue they had is if they were to remove just a section for the doors and leave the flanking sections, existing windows and tile in place, they were afraid that the window sections were all molded together as a single unit. They believed that it might destroy the window when the demolition is done. Mr. Lynch said, however, they will be happy to go back and revisit this and, if possible, present it back to staff.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked if the transom portion is taken out so that it looks different from the upper two floors, would this be acceptable?

Ms. Michalak said her recommendation is that the petitioner go back with the same material.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Merriman asked if the staff's recommendation would include the denial for the three (3) awning window bays and the tile.

Mr. Howington stated that he believes it is fruitless in the bottom three bays to try to piece together the old window with a new window. He said he commends the petitioner for leaving a portion of the tile on each side, but he does not think that it will be successful to try to marry two different systems together. Therefore, he personally is in favor of leaving two portions of the original tile and removing the center portion for the door and replace the entire storefront system. Mr. Howington said that storefront systems are just that - they are quite versatile. Consequently, he does not believe it would be successful unless the entire windows in the bottom three bays are replaced.

Dr. Henry said he agrees with staff in keeping it the way it is.

Mr. Howington stated that a choice is to keep it as is without any entrances in there and this would become a dead space. He said that buildings have to be able to evolve and if the new life of this building becomes tenant spaces on the bottom, they will all need separate entrances. He said that he understood staff and the Secretary of Interior's Standards, but if they leave a remnant of the tile on each side of the door, he thinks this would signify the historical significance of the base of that storefront. But, he does not believe that it would be successful to replace just the center portion and leave the other two.

Mr. Lominack said there is a common lobby. There is an upper level and the common lobby on Habersham Street could also be the access to tenant one and tenant two on the first floor and preserve two of those on the north and south side and modify the center noticeably different. This will still reserve the ability for those tenants to be separate.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Lominack, for clarification, how was he saying the outer space would get into their area.

Mr. Lominack explained that there is tenant one; then a lobby and tenant two on the first floor. The lobby only serves the upper floors presently. However, it could easily serve tenant one and tenant two.

Mr. Howington said, therefore, leave the two outer flanking ones intact and only modify the center door.

Board Action:

1. Approval for the proposed canopies, to replace the main entrance storefront system, to install the green wall cable system, to alter the brick garden wall, and to install the trellis at 422 Habersham Street as requested because the work is visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards.
2. Denial for the proposed replacement of three (3) awning window bays and the tile below, and the replacement of the second and third floor balcony infilled openings with a new storefront system at 422 Habersham Street because the work is not visually compatible, and does not meet the preservation and design standards. - PASS

A new design that preserves the existing ground floor windows and tile to the greatest extent possible and incorporates windows and doors at the balconies to match the original is recommended and may be resubmitted under a new application for staff level review.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye

Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

22. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 13-002612-COA | 151 Bull Street | Rehabilitation/Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

NOTE: Ms. Weibe-Reed recused from participating in this petition. She is an employee of Dawson Architects.

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for alterations, additions, and awnings to the property located at 151 Bull Street. The project location consists of the southern ground floor portion of this four-story building. The project includes placement of existing entry door along Bull Street, reinstallation of the shuttered/infilled windows along West Oglethorpe Avenue, install of a door and addition of a stair in the sidewalk to the basement level, the installation of exterior lighting, and new awnings. Ms. Michalak stated that the petitioner attended the May 16, 2013 Site Plan Review (SPR) meeting with the City. A couple of comments were made at this meeting that could affect the design. The General Development Plan is required by the City, but as of this report, it has not been submitted.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends continuing the petition for alterations, additions, and awnings to the property located at 151 Bull Street for consideration of the following items:

1. Submit a Right-of-Way management plan for transaction window queuing on the sidewalk to the City for review.
2. Submit a General Development Plan to the City for review.
3. Determine whether a gate to the basement stair will be required by the City. If it is required, include it in the design. Provide the proposed baluster spacing for the guardrail at the basement stair. Provide a section through the proposed entrance door at the basement stair to ensure that the door frame is inset not less than three inches (3") from the exterior surface of the façade of the building or match the historic inset for the existing windows on the building.
4. Redesign the proposed windows on the ground floor of the west and south facades to meet the preservation and design standards.
5. Provide a section through the window to ensure that the sashes are inset not less than three inches (3") from the exterior façade of the building or match the historic inset for the existing windows on the building.
6. Redesign the proposed transaction window to meet the preservation and design standards, including but not limited to: a permitted window type, meet the standard for the permitted storefront base height, relocate the solid surface transaction

counter to the interior of the building (an exterior transaction counter is not compatible with the district), provide a section through the proposed storefront, and ensure that the storefront glazing is inset a minimum of four inches (4") from the face of the building or match the historic inset for the existing windows on the building.

7. Provide an awing fabric sample, paint color samples, lighting specifications and color samples. Provide a mounting height for the light fixtures proposed on the West Oglethorpe facade.

8. Relocate and/or redesign the ductwork proposed on the west façade.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson came forward and stated that they agree predominantly with the staff's recommendations. He said that items 1, 2, and 3 are dictated by the City's Site Plan Review (SPR). They have submitted the plan for the review.

Mr. Dawson explained that they selected this location for the door because actually there was an entrance that went into this door. He showed the Board a picture of this opening. Stone steps down into this entrance; therefore, they felt this opening, although it is on a primary façade was the best because it was historically an entrance and required the least amount of modifications to the historic fabric. Mr. Dawson stated that he has done two of these in his career. He said that the City changes the standards on what they require. On one there was a drain at the bottom and one they did not. Therefore, he really does not know what the standard will be from the City on this petition. But, as soon as they get it, they will comply with submitting the right details.

Mr. Dawson said as the Board can see on their proposed plan the reason they need this is because the exit that is currently being used actually goes through an electrical room and then through an elevator machine room with the door swinging the wrong way into the stairwell. He said that this is only 24 inches wide; there is nothing about the existing condition that is safe for the building occupants. Obviously, they are going to an assembly function.

Mr. Dawson said regarding the service counter, they agree with staff's comments and will redesign this so that the façade on that particular location looks just like the entry façade. They believe this is a more appropriate design. Pointing to an area, he said what they will present next month will look more like this. When they looked at the McDonald's window that this Board approved, they actually have somewhat a double-hung window and when it is opened, a service window is behind it. Mr. Dawson said they have talked with the owner and he believes that they will have a moveable service counter piece of equipment that can be moved there when he does this obviously there will be limited times when there will be opened window service. He explained that this will be a moveable thing and will essentially function as an entrance the rest of the time. Mr. Dawson said they feel this is a pretty good solution.

Mr. Dawson stated that the only issue he has, and it concerns item eight (8), the ductwork on the west façade. He said as the Board can see, there is an existing opening where the kitchen is located. They chose this because no changes would be done to the historic fabric. They will be able to come through the opening. Mr. Dawson said they checked with the City because the lot is owned by the same owner as to whether or not they can discharge horizontally. He said that the rules are it has to be eleven (11) feet above the

ground and then 24 feet from any adjacent opening, plus some for angle. He said, pointing to an area, therefore, they can discharge here straight out. The roof is the only other option. There is a mechanical filtration system for greases that have been used twice in Savannah. Mr. Dawson said he did one of the projects at Planter's Inn. It requires a very large piece of equipment. It is extremely heavy and difficult to service. It also requires huge discharge grills. If they did this, and they are still considering this, it would dictate the entire design that the kitchen be moved to this location as the hood would have to hang here and discharge through the louvers that would probably be located above both of the windows on the façade.

Mr. Dawson said they do not feel that this is a good solution. They are incredibly difficult to maintain. The City and the owners hate them. They have tried to exhaust all options and, they feel that the west façade is the best option. Obviously, they would like to bring it inside the building, but there are apartments and retail tenants above. Therefore, it would be impossible for this tenant to go in there and modify the other people's spaces to bring an exhaust on the inside.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Dawson if a system this size could conceivably go on top of the roof.

Mr. Dawson answered no; it has to go in the space as they would have to physically get up there and clean all the grease containers. Basically, it is like a filtration. He said regarding item 8, he is sort of between a rock and a hard place. The Board does not like it and he does not like it, but it is what is required by the mechanical code.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Dawson if he is willing to continue the project.

Mr. Dawson stated yes. As he has said, they agree with all of the staff's recommendations, except for the SPR and exhaust portion.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approve to continue the petition for alterations, additions, and awnings to the property located at 151 Bull Street for consideration of the following items:

1. Submit a Right-of-Way management plan for transaction window queuing on the sidewalk to the City for review.
2. Submit a General Development Plan to the City for review.
3. Determine whether a gate to the basement stair will be required by the City. If it is required, include it in the design. Provide the proposed

baluster spacing for the guardrail at the basement stair. Provide a section through the proposed entrance door at the basement stair to ensure that the door frame is inset not less than three inches (3") from the exterior surface of the façade of the building or match the historic inset for the existing windows on the building.

4. Redesign the proposed windows on the ground floor of the west and south facades to meet the preservation and design standards.

5. Provide a section through the window to ensure that the sashes are inset not less than three inches (3") from the exterior façade of the building or match the historic inset for the existing windows on the building. - PASS

6. Redesign the proposed transaction window to meet the preservation and design standards, including but not limited to: a permitted window type, meet the standard for the permitted storefront base height, relocate the solid surface transaction counter to the interior of the building (an exterior transaction counter is not compatible with the district), provide a section through the proposed storefront, and ensure that the storefront glazing is inset a minimum of four inches (4") from the face of the building or match the historic inset for the existing windows on the building.

7. Provide an awning fabric sample, paint color samples, lighting specifications and color samples. Provide a mounting height for the light fixtures proposed on the West Oglethorpe façade.

8. Relocate and/or redesign the ductwork proposed on the west façade.

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

Windows

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

NOTE: Ms. Weibe-Reed recused from participating in this petition. She is an employee of Dawson Architects.

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for the installation of new windows on the property located at 126 West Bay Street. The project is currently under construction. The windows are a custom wood frame, double-hung sash, single-glazed, true divided light, four-over-four windows with a one and three-eighths inch (1 3/8") wide muntin by Jeld-Wen.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends after-the-fact approval of the custom wood frame, double-hung sash, single-glazed, true divided light, four-over-four windows with a one and three-eighths inch (1 3/8") wide muntin by Jeld-Wen as installed and requested.

Dr. Henry said from the pictures, he was having a difficult time seeing what is being built here.

Ms. Michalak explained that the Ryan Hotel is being built here. This hotel is adjacent to the Bohemian Hotel. It has been in the works since 2005 and is now under construction. She explained that the windows on the right are the existing windows and were installed in 2005. The windows on the left are the ones that they are presently requesting approval for.

Ms. Simpson asked if the windows being requested now are a replica of the 2005 windows.

Ms. Michalak answered that the windows are a replica with the exception of the muntin size.

Mr. Merriman asked if the windows are putty glazed or simulated.

Ms. Michalak answered that the windows are putty glazed. She explained that the only thing that does not match the existing windows is the muntin size. They are wood double-hung, single-paned, true divided light.

Ms. Ramsay asked Ms. Michalak if the Board has ever approved any muntins on any windows wider than an inch.

Ms. Michalak answered that she does not know specifically, although if someone was requesting that their historic window be replaced, they would have approved it in the same exact design. Therefore, she does not know if any of those exceeded the 7/8 or not.

Mr. Merriman said typically, for most of the time, right in the middle you either have 3/16 inch or 7/8 inch. This does not mean that there was not some other kind.

Ms. Michalak said this is the staff's position. They do not know and there is certainly the

potential and is completely undocumented what the original windows looked like on this building. Therefore, who is to say that the windows did not historically exceed that.

Mr. Lominack said he believes that a thorough analysis was given as to why the decision was reached.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson stated that the windows they specified in terms of manufacturer was a Jeld-Wen window and did have the 7/8 inch muntin. The window supplier out of Florida was totally unfamiliar with any standards and did not check. Frankly, when he submitted the shop drawings, he included that in the package. Mr. Dawson said when they looked at it, there were no dimensions and obviously they had all kinds of details on it. After it was brought to their attention when he got back to the office, he put the scale on it and saw that the dimension was 7/8 but it was at half scale. He said they would have preferred the 7/8. The windows were installed by one of his former clients in 2005 and they came back to the Board in 2007 because they were not compliant. Therefore, they rebuilt these and used the manufactured system.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Dawson, how many windows are you talking about?

Mr. Dawson answered a lot of windows; more than \$100,000 worth of windows. He said they have checked and doubled checked what it would cost to replace the sashes.

Ms. Michalak explained that staff has been working with the petitioner for more than three months on this issue before finally bringing it to the Board to make a decision.

Ms. Ramsay asked why is this an after-the-fact approval.

Mr. Dawson explained that technically there is not a detail that shows 7/8 inch where he could reject all the windows. There is not anything in any of the decisions, even though they have had seven decisions on this building, that specifically said 7/8 inch. Therefore, they went back through the standard and there is not a standard that says it has to be 7/8. Technically, these comply with the contract documents, all the approvals and the ordinance. Mr. Dawson said, therefore, he does not have a leg to stand on for all of these windows to be rejected.

Ms. Ramsay said based on Mr. Dawson's interpretation, the ordinance needs to be tightened up. She said they need to do something because what is being said that by doing this if you take out historic windows and do not have a record of it, you can put back anything that the manufacturer sticks you with.

Mr. Dawson concurred with Ms. Ramsay and said he was surprised that there was not a standard that specifically said this. He does believe that this should be addressed and tightened up.

Ms. Michalak said she believes the bigger issue is that none of their other Certificates of Appropriateness (COA) mention muntins.

Mr. Merriman said he thought the ordinance does say something about no wider than 7/8 inch.

Ms. Ramsay explained that the ordinance does, but it pertains to new construction.

Ms. Simpson asked, "what is this building considered?"

Ms. Ramsay said this is historic and because it is historic, the Board does not address it.

Mr. Howington said the windows have been replaced in the past.

Mr. Lominack stated that there is no documentation of what was originally there.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Simpson said she agrees with the fact that they need to tighten this ordinance because a precedent is going to be set. She knows that Mr. Dawson is a good architect and that clients request certain things, but in the previous project she knew that the service window from McDonald's was going to be an issue for the future. Ms. Simpson said she believes that if the Board continues to allow this and not tighten up the ordinance, it will continue to happen.

Mr. Lominack said the ordinance needs to be at least clarified.

Board Action:

After-the-fact approval of the custom wood frame, double-hung sash, single-glazed, true divided light, four-over-four windows with a one and three-eighths inch (1 3/8") wide muntin by Jeld-Wen as installed and requested. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Abstain

Ebony Simpson

- Nay

24. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 13-002614-COA | 114 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Rehabilitation/Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

NOTE: Ms. Weibe-Reed recused from participating in this petition. She is an employee of Dawson Architects.

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

Ms. Michalak gave the staff report. A petition for this location was denied at last month's meeting. The petitioner has returned today with an alternate design requesting approval to rehabilitate and alter the façade of the building located 114 East Oglethorpe Avenue. She explained that the proposal remains the same for the first and second levels; with regards to the balcony, lowering the sill height for the second floor, replacing the windows with the Ellison Bronze Narrow Stile in dark bronze anodized aluminum windows with a one-inch wide (1") wide center, flat, applied mull that match the existing lite configuration. Instead of a door on each side, moved one center door to middle. The changes that have been made center around the third-story. Most recently an office building, it will be converted back to its original use as a residence.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval to rehabilitate and alter the façade of the building located at 114 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the condition that the balcony railing height be reduced to 36 inches.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson said they accept staff's recommendation for the railing to be 36 inches. He said actually it will align because this is a 32 inch sill, but the canopy is down a couple of inches. Mr. Dawson said he was not sure how this mull is not added into their drawings, but it should not be. Their intent is to restore what is there now. Mr. Dawson entertained questions from the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) commended Mr. Dawson. He said they spoke on this last month. All the improvements are terrific and the HSF supports this proposal.

Board Action:

Approval to rehabilitate and alter the façade of the building located at 114 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the condition that the balcony railing height be - PASS

reduced to 36 inches.

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle - Not Present

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

25. [Petition of Greg Jacobs for Tidewater Preservation | 13-002616-COA | 223 East Jones Street | Rehabilitation/Alterations and Additions](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Packet submittal- application and photos 1.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Packet submittal- photos 2.pdf](#)

Mr. Greg Jacobs was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the report. The petitioner is proposing a rehabilitation of and alterations to 223 East Jones Street.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval with the condition that the proposed garage does not exceed 12 feet in width. She said, however, the petitioner may be providing some evidence that there is a historic precedent for the wider opening which the Board may consider in their deliberations as to whether or not they find this visually compatible.

Mr. Merriman asked Ms. Harris if she said that the stucco on the addition will match the existing stucco.

Ms. Harris answered yes. She passed samples of the stucco to the Board for their review.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Jacobs came forward and introduced himself to the Board.

Ms. Ramsay informed Mr. Jacobs that she believes the Board's major question pertains to the garage door.

Mr. Jacobs said they did some exploratory removals to the stucco on the lane side of the building. They discovered that an historic, clearly not an original, steel high beam which

equated to a 16 foot wide opening. He said that he does not know the exact date when it was installed, but believes it was some time in the late 1940s. Therefore, it has historic merit of its own right. Clearly, not original, but they want to propose to go back with that 16 foot opening, reusing the structure member that is there. Mr. Jacobs said by comparison in terms of visual compatibility, the neighboring building to the west which was constructed approximately 15 or more years ago, has nearly a 20 foot wide garage door. However, they are simply proposing a 16 foot garage door. He does not believe that the Board has the authority to approve that, but maybe approve visual compatibility so that they might seek a variance with the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Jacobs if he believes that the opening goes back to the 1940s.

Mr. Jacobs answered yes. Maybe earlier, but he would say the 1940s to be on the safe side.

Ms. Ramsay informed Mr. Jacobs that the Board has been very strict on the 12 foot opening. Whereas, his neighbor does have a 20 foot garage, it was not when these standards were in place. She said a proliferation of those is what got them to the 12 foot.

Mr. Jacobs asked if historic precedent has anything to do with it in this case whatsoever since it was clearly there as a 16 foot opening dating back nearly 70 years ago.

Ms. Ramsay said they have the ordinance in place and without having the exact time, she would not feel comfortable. However, she is just one Board member.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked Mr. Jacobs if there is a test for the beam that could support what he is saying.

Mr. Jacobs answered that he is sure there is, but they would have to do some further investigation.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said there is evidence that this existed earlier and she understands the ordinance, but it would be better proof if there was a date.

Mr. Merriman said the petitioner would have to certainly seek a variance.

Mr. Jacobs said he would like to seek the variance with the blessings from the Review Board that says there is visual compatibility at the very least; he said that while it may clearly extend outside the existing ordinance, at least there is nothing adversely aesthetic about it.

Mr. Howington divulged that he has never met the owner, but for the record he was involved in a nonprofit and they reconstructed most of the interior. Consequently, he has been in this house and it is a fantastic house. He said he is in favor of all the additions, renovations, with one question. Mr. Howington knows that the petitioner has found the piers and, therefore, knows this is the original layout. There are examples of round columns on Greek Revivals, but his question is are there any historic photos because his first instinct is that the round column should be square. He guessed the best example of that would be something similar as the Hartridge House on Charlton Street which has the details of the porch, the cornices, and the eave. Mr. Howington said, however, on this

porch his instinct believes it is square columns and may be the eave is a little more pronounced. He does not know whether Mr. Jacobs was pulling from an old photograph or not.

Mr. Jacobs stated that there is completely a lack of evidence of what the original porch details were like. Clearly, if they all were leaning towards the Greek style, you do see rounds, you see squares, and a variety of different column configurations. He said that what led them to this decision had mostly to do with proportion. Based on the proportions of the house and the proportions of the existing piers that they found, he believes a square column of that proportion would have been certainly not what was in place in this case. Mr. Jacobs said he wished they had better evidence, but the fact is they do not.

Mr. Lominack asked Mr. Jacob if there is room to do two eight or nine foot garage doors, according to the drawings.

Mr. Jacobs answered yes.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked Mr. Jacobs if the Historical Society did not have photos on this building.

Mr. Jacobs answered that they have done extensive research and have researched through the Historical Society. One of the uses along the way was a dormitory for nurses at St. Joseph Hospital. They went through St. Joseph's archives who was managed by the Catholic Dioceses and they have researched their archives. They have been in touch with the family who are descendants of the doctor that owned the house and went through their collection. They have spoken with nurses that once lived in the house and tried to see if they had any photos. But, they were not able to find nothing at all that gave them any clues as to what the original porch configuration would have been like.

Dr. Henry said it appears that the petitioner has done his homework.

Mr. Jacobs said they have done extensive research. He said it is really disappointing as it is such a significant house. It appears that somewhere along the way, there would have been something.

Mr. Lominack asked what happens in that little room on the top fourth floor.

Mr. Jacobs said it is a bit of a mystery. He said that the addition was a part of a renovation. The building was built as a single family house and converted into an orphanage. In 1905, it was reverted to a single-family residence and a four-story addition was constructed.

Mr. Lominack asked if the stairs are accessible.

Mr. Jacobs explained that the whole four-story addition houses the staircase. The original staircase was removed in 1905 and a renovation was done.

Mr. Thomson, MPC Executive Director, explained that the procedure to go forward to

the ZBA requires a finding of fact from this Board. However, going to the ZBA is about hardship. They have had the garage doors come up in the past converting the carriage houses in the grade of the floor and a lot of issues that were structural or geometric limiting that you cannot make the turn into the garage. He said, however, with this, it does not appear to be that. It seems to be an easy solution of putting in a post and a double door and the dimensions would allow it to work. Mr. Thomson asked what is the hardship here or is it just a design preference?

Mr. Jacobs said in his mind, they are preservationists and they would be removing historic material in order to do that.

Dr. Henry said they would be removing a 70 year old beam and this what they are preserving.

Ms. Michalak explained that what the petitioner uncovered is actual an original 16 foot wide door header.

Ms. Ramsay said it is not an original.

Ms. Michalak said it is the 1940s.

Mr. Jacobs said it is historic, but not original. He believes this was done when the building was used as a nurse's dormitory. In the 1930s when they converted it to a nurse's dormitory, they added as many rooms as they could to the building. The ground floor of the carriage was not without alterations. What is on top of here, is the edge of an original brick and the same thing at this end. Therefore, this makes it exactly a 16 foot wide opening. This has been easily in place for 70 years or longer.

Mr. Jacobs said he understands and respects the ordinance, but they are simply asking in this case because it is precedent and it is historic material here.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Ramsay said she believes that Ms. Weibe-Reed made a good point that if they could date the steel, they would be more comfortable with it being historic.

Dr. Henry said he would not be more comfortable with it simply because they are not Williamsburg and they don't have an obligation to restore every single phase of a building.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said although it is not original, they have proof that it exists. Therefore, they can restore the building back to whatever date they want to.

Ms. Simpson asked, what kind of opening was it?

Mr. Howington said they know it was an opening and therefore, it has some historic precedence.

Ms. Simpson said it could have been a window.

Mr. Merriman said it is a reasonable doubt that it was a window. But, was probably some other sort of large opening.

Ms. Simpson asked if a previous case that they said "no" to could come back to them?

Mr. Merriman said he wanted to approve that petition too. He believed the petitioner was absolutely right.

Dr. Henry said that was not a hardship, but was a convenience.

Mr. Merriman said the Board was split on that vote. However, Mr. Jacobs has more clear cut evidence than Attorney Yellin had with his petition.

Ms. Simpson said that this was true, but she just wanted the Board to be aware of this.

Mr. Merriman said that Mr. Yellin did not have evidence, but he had an alley that had plenty of examples of what he was asking to add.

Ms. Michalak said the ZBA approved the variance.

Mr. Merriman said this Board does not have an obligation to follow a precedence.

Mr. Lominack said if that beam did not exist, then this would be different.

Mr. Howington said this would not have been approved by the Board, if the beam did not exist.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for the rehabilitation, alterations and additions as requested because it meets the preservation and design standards, and is visually compatible.

The Board further recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals of a variance from the standard in Sec. 8-3030(n)(13) which states that, "Garages opening shall not exceed 12 feet in width" to allow a 16 foot wide opening because the Board finds the 16 foot wide opening visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle

- Not Present

Nicholas Henry	- Nay
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Nay

26. [Petition of Kathy Ledvina | 13-002617-COA | 323 East Jones Street | Fence and Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff report.pdf](#)

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

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

Ms. Kathy Ledvina was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations to the property at 323 East Jones Street to install a vehicular entry gate and replace the roof-top access stairs.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval with the condition that the sidewalk serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration and height because the proposal is visually compatible and meets the design standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Ledvina came forward and introduced herself.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Ledvina if she was in agreement with staff 's recommendations.

Ms. Ledvina answered yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for the fence alteration and stair with the condition that the sidewalk serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration and height because the proposal is visually compatible and meets the design standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed	
Second: Nicholas Henry	
Reed Engle	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

27. [Amended Petition of Lori Collins | 13-001381-COA | 217 West Liberty Street | Staff Approved - Exterior Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 217 West Liberty Street 13-001381 Amended 5-7-13.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 217 West Liberty Street 13-001381-COA Amended 5-7-13.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Boyd Schalnat | 13-001622-COA | 211 West River Street | Staff Approved - Awnings](#)

Attachment: [COA - 211 West River Street 13-001622-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 211 West River Street 13-001622-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Boyd Schalnat | 13-001771-COA | 2 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awnings](#)

Attachment: [COA - 2 West Broughton Street 13-001771-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 2 West Broughton Street 13-001771-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Kathryn Johnson for Savannah Christian Church | 12-001899-COA | 202 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 202 East Broughton St. 13-001899-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 202 East Broughton St. 13-001899-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of John T. Hughes for Hansen Architects, PC | 13-002017-COA | 102 East Liberty Street |](#)

Staff Approved - Mechanical Openings

Attachment: [COA - 102 East Liberty St. 13-002017-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 102 East Liberty St. 13-002017-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. Petition of Andrew Barber for Coastal Canvas | 13-002037| 9-11 West York Street | Staff Approved - Awning

No action required. Staff approved.

33. Petition of Tommy Harrison for Custom Metal Fabricators, Inc. | 13-002059-COA | 105 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Stair Treads

Attachment: [COA - 105 West Oglethorpe Avenue 13-002059-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 105 West Oglethorpe Avenue 13-002059-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. Petition of Doug Patten for City of Savannah | 13-002189-COA | Staff Approved - Barnard Street Ramp

Attachment: [COA - 201 W. Bay Street 13-002189-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 West Bay Street 13-002189-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. Petition of Ralph Anderson | 13-002190-COA | 118 West Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Stucco Repair

Attachment: [COA - 118 W. Gaston St. 13-002190-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 118 W. Gaston St. 13-002190-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. Petition of Greg Jacobs for Tidewater Preservation, Inc. | 13-002191-COA | 223 East Jones Street | Staff Approved - Portico

Attachment: [COA - 223 EAST JONES ST. 13-002191-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 223 East Jones Street 13-002191-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. Petition of Mike Schulz | 13-002232-COA | 418 East Bryan Street | Staff Approved - Replace Deck Boards

Attachment: [COA - 418 East Bryan Street 13-002232-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 418 East Bryan Street 13-002232-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Taylor Reid | 13-002254-COA | 217 East Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Color Change, Shutters, Wall Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 217 East Taylor Street 13-002254-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 217 East Taylor Street 13-002254-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of Paul Miller | 13-002255-COA | 224 Houston Street | Staff Approved - Stucco Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 224 Houston Street 13-002255-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 224 Houston Street 13-002255-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Petition of Pat Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architect, PC | 13-002342-COA | 201 West Bay Street | Staff Approved - Stucco Repair/Repointing](#)

Attachment: [COA - 201 West Bay Street 13-002342-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 West Bay Street 13-002342-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. [Petition of Robert Wright for Dawson Architects | 13-002380-COA | 4 East Jones Street | Staff Approved - Alterations and Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 4 EAST JONES ST 13-002380-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 4 East Jones St. 13-002380-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. [Petition of Greg Skinner for Coastal Canvas Products | 13-002381-COA | 2 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 2 West Broughton Street 13-002381-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 2 West Broughton Street 13-002381-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. [Petition of Sam Carroll for Concrete Interior Forms | 13-002429-COA | 14 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 14 West Oglethorpe Ave \(Carriage House\) 13-002429-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 14 West Oglethorpe Ave \(Carriage House\) 13-002429-](#)

[COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. [Petition of Telfair Museum of Arts, Inc. | 13-002562-COA | 121 Barnard Street | Staff Approved - Four Banner Mounts](#)

Attachment: [COA - 121 Barnard Street 13-002562-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 121 Barnard Street 13-002562-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

45. [Petition of Arvin Ward for Southern Urgent Care, LLC | 13-002574-COA | 10 Whitaker Street | Staff Approved - Color Change and Light Fixture](#)

Attachment: [COA - 10 Whitaker Street 13-002574-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 10 Whitaker Street 13-002574-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

46. [Petition of Thomas A. Lyons | 13-002578-COA | 405 East Charlton Street | Staff Approved - Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 405 E. Charlton Street 13-002578-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 405 E. Charlton Street 13-002578-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

47. [Petition of James Nutt, AIA for Free People | 13-002592-COA | 217 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Paint Alcove Ceiling, Door Replacement](#)

Attachment: [COA - 217 W. Broughton Street 13-002592-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 217 W. Broughton Street 13-002592-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

48. [Petition of John and Gabriella DeBeer | 13-002623-COA | 9 Drayton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 9 Drayton Street 13-002623-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 9 Drayton Street 13-002623-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

49. [Petition of Josh Bull for Greenline Architecture | 13-002602-COA | 466 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. | Staff Approved - Elevator Machine Room](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 466 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd 13-002602-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [COA - 466 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd 13-002602-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

50. [Petition of Commonwealth Construction of GA, LLC | 13-002744-COA | 406-416 West Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [13-002744-COA Staff Decision.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 406-416 West Gaston Street 13-002744-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

51. [Petition of Penelope Johnson | 13-002747-COA | 417 East Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Minor Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 417 East Taylor Street - 13-002747-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 417 East Taylor Street 13-002747-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

52. [Petition of Harley Krinsky | 13-002757-COA | 411 West Congress Street | Staff Approved - Gooseneck Light](#)

Attachment: [COA - 411 West Congress Street 13-002757-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 411 West Congress Street - 13-002757-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

53. [Petition of Walter J. Freeman | 13-002870-COA | 331 Tattnell Street | Staff Approved - Window](#)

Attachment: [COA - 331 Tattnell Street 13-002870-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 331 Tattnell Street 13-02870-COA.pdf](#)

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

54. [Report on Work Performed Without a Certificate of Appropriateness](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without COA 6-12-13.pdf](#)

Ms. Ramsay explained that staff's report on the recent work performed without a COA is in their information packet.

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

55. [Report on Items Deferred to Staff](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Items Deferred to Staff 6-12-13.pdf](#)

Ms. Ramsay stated that the summary of items deferred to staff from May 8, 2013 - June 11, 2013 is enclosed in their information packet.

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

56. [Next Meeting - Wednesday July 10, 2013 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

57. [2013 Historic Preservation Commission Training, Thursday August 15, 2013 in Savannah, Georgia](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Burns HPC Training August 2013 in Savannah.pdf](#)

Ms. Michalak explained that the training will be in Savannah this year and allows more of the Historic Review Board members to attend. The training is only one day. As they knows, each Board member is required to attend one training session during each of their terms. Only three members so far have done this.

Ms. Ramsay said this it is a requirement for each Board member to attend at least one Historic Preservation Commission training.

Mr. Merriman asked that if a Board member gets appointed to another three years, does the member attend another training session.

Ms. Michalak answered, yes, once every three years.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked if this requirement is shown on the application when the person applies for possible appointment to the Historic District Board of Review. She said this is the first time she has heard this requirement.

Ms. Michalak answered that this is a state requirement. She explained to the Board that space is limited as the training is open to other Board's members; therefore, she advised them to please get their request in as soon as possible.

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

58. [Adjourned.](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, Ms. Ramsay adjourned the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen I. Harris

Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH: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.