



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

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

**MARCH 13, 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  
Robin Williams, Ph.D

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

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

1. [Welcome](#)

Ms. Ramsay called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance.

2. [Approval of Agenda](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval Agenda of March 13, 2013. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry	
Second: T. Jerry Lominack	
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
Robin Williams	- Aye

## II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### 3. [Approve Minutes of February 13, 2013](#)

Attachment: [02-13-2013 Minutes.pdf](#)

#### **Board Action:**

Approve February 13, 2013 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

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

Robin Williams - Aye

## III. SIGN POSTING

## IV. CONTINUED AGENDA

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

#### **Board Action:**

Continue the petition to April 10, 2013 due to an incomplete submittal. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

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
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

**Board Action:**

Continue to April 10, 2013 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

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
Robin Williams	- Aye

6. [Petition of John Harkins | 13-000595-COA | 141 Lincoln Street | Fence](#)

**Board Action:**

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

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

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
Robin Williams	- Aye

**V. CONSENT AGENDA**

7. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs for Goodwill | 13-000766-COA | 108 West Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval of the projecting principal use sign because it is in compliance with the preservation standards and sign standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

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
Robin Williams	- Aye

8. [Petition of Cynthia and Alton Thornton | 13-000846-COA | 509 East Harris Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Fence Stain Sample.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval of the front and rear yard wood fences and gates as requested because they meet the standards and are visually compatible with contributing structures to which this structure is visually related. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

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
Robin Williams	- Aye

9. [Petition of James Newkirk for Up Front Signs & Graphics | 13-000849-COA | 110 East York Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

**Board Action:**

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

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

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
Robin Williams	- Aye

10. [Petition of Denise Pipkin | 13-000791-COA | 103 West Congress Street | ATM](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approval to install the ATM because it meets the standards and is compatible, with the condition that the ATM cabinet be a darker color to be more compatible and blend in more with the space between the pilasters. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

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
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

11. [Petition of Matt Hebermehl for See Saw LLC | 13-000832-COA | 228 West Broughton Street | Mural](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Palette and Inspiration.pdf](#)

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

Application withdrawn by petitioner. No action required.

**VII. REGULAR AGENDA**

12. [Petition of John Deering for Greenline Architecture | 205 Papy Street | H-11-4521-2 | Amended New Construction](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**NOTE:** **Mr. Howington** recused from participating in this application. He is an employee of Greenline Architecture.

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

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to amend the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the new parking garage at 205 Papy Street. The petitioner requested approval to replace the brick towers with exposed concrete to match the other walls on the building at the February 13, 2013 meeting. The application was continued at the petitioner's request and now that portion of the request has been eliminated and the brick remains on the tower.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval of the amended design for the parking lot with the following conditions:

1. Submit colors for storefront, handrails, and spandrel glass to staff for final approval.
2. Construct a sample panel on-site for review and approval by staff, in accordance with the adopted Sample Panel Guidelines (attached).

**Dr. Henry** asked if the building materials were brick.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Deering** entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Deering if he had chosen a color for the spandrel panels. Would it be in the gray area?

**Mr. Deering** answered yes.

**Mr. Engle** thanked Mr. Deering for bringing back his request close to what the Board originally approved.

**Mr. Merriman** said it looks very good.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **Board Action:**

Approval of the amended design for the parking garage at 205 Papy Street with the following conditions:

1. Submit colors for storefront, handrails, and spandrel glass to staff for final approval. - PASS
2. Construct a sample panel on-site for review and approval by staff, in accordance with the adopted Sample Panel Guidelines (attached).

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

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

13. [Petition of Twin Rivers Capital, LLC | H-12-4672-2 | 702 West Oglethorpe Avenue | New Construction Commercial Building: Part I, Height and Mass and Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

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

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design Details, of a new commercial structure on the property at 702 West Oglethorpe Avenue. The sign plan for the new Family Dollar at this location was also submitted for review and approval.

The General Development Plan (GDP) was submitted for Site Plan Review (SPR) on February 23, 2012.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval for new construction Part I, Height and Mass of the commercial building at 702 West Oglethorpe Avenue with the condition that the horizontal transom storefronts on Fahm Street be eliminated.

**Ms. Ward** further reported that staff recommends continue Part II, Design Details for redesign and submittal of the following items to meet the ordinance and be visually



compatible as outlined in the above findings:

1. Replace stucco and EIFS with material permitted for commercial structures;
2. Submit mortar sample larger brick sample for review;
3. Provide transparent glazing in the storefront facing Oglethorpe Avenue. Opaque glazing is permitted in the transom. Storefront glazing must be recessed a minimum of four inches from the face of the building.
4. Reconsider wood arbor material to be compatible with materials in the primary building. A metal arbor to match the canopy would be compatible.
5. Where intersected by a new driveway, the sidewalk must serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

Continue the request for the signage to allow the petitioner the opportunity to revise the proposal to meet the ordinance. Reduce number of lighting sources and types.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the pylon sign counts as a principal use sign.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes. There are three facia signs and a pylon sign. The petitioner is proposing four principal use signs and they are allowed two principal use signs.

**Mr. Engle** asked if there could be one pylon sign and one facia sign.

**Ms. Ward** answered that there could be a combination of any of those.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if the street running west of the proposed building be considered as a service street.

**Ms. Ward** answered that as defined by the ordinance, the street classifications do not apply to this area. They are for the Oglethorpe Plan area where there are a series of squares and streets surrounding those squares. Once you go west of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, that street structure does not apply to this section.

**Mr. Lominack** said he understood what Ms. Ward said, but believes it should apply.

**Dr. Williams** wanted to know what street Mr. Lominack was talking about.

**Mr. Lominack** explained that he was talking about Fahm Street.

**Mr. Engle** said Fahm Street is to the east.

**Mr. Lominack** apologized and said Fahm Street does run east, but it runs north/south and is a secondary street and is important to Oglethorpe Avenue.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the dark color is wholly on the trellis or is it somewhere else?

**Ms. Ward** answered that the gooseneck fixtures are to be the bronze color and there are other details for the coping.

**Dr. Williams** said, therefore, the metal canopies will be over the windows.

**Ms. Ward** said glass will be opaque.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Ward if staff recommendation is translucent glazing.

**Ms. Ward** corrected that she meant transparent. The translucent was with regards to the sign and the amount of light that could push through the face of the sign.

**Ms. Simpson** asked if the petitioner addressed the sidewalk.

**Ms. Ward** answered that she knows the petitioner is working on it. The petitioner also receives a copy of the staff's report a week in advance. The petitioner has been asking questions about how to do the sidewalks.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if petitioner intends to ask for any variances.

**Ms. Ward** said that the petitioner has not stated this to her, but this is a question that can be asked of the petitioner when he comes forward to make his comments.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Lamberson** said his understanding of the staff's recommendation to Part I is to remove the horizontal transom on Fahm Street elevation and they have no problems doing so. Their architect felt that putting the horizontal transom here in lieu of canopies that the Board wanted to be removed. But, they will remove the horizontal transom and have a larger concrete area to match the Greyhound Bus Station. Some of the other items discussed sound like they are a part of Part II, Design Details and they have no problem addressing all of these. They have already started addressing them as soon as they received the recommendation. They will replace the stucco and EIFS. They will use the transparent glazing along Oglethorpe Avenue instead of opaque. He believes this is a part of Part II and he wants to ensure that they do not confuse Part II with Part I. However, they are agreeing to do so.

**Mr. Lamberson** said they appreciate the staff sending them some recommendations for the continuous sidewalk. He believes this, too, is a part of Part II, but they believe they can address all of the Part II comments if they can get a continuance for Part II. They are happy to continue the signage. Mr. Lamberson said he has an idea how to get this in line with the rules.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Lamberson how he feels about making the glazing on the Fahm Street elevation transparent.

**Mr. Lamberson** said he does not have a problem either way with what the actual glass is. He is afraid at the end of the day outside of what happens at this meeting what goes on the inside of the building, the shelving like any other retail business on the other three sides, if it was clear with nothing behind it, it would be shelves, but he does not think this would be good. They can also put some kind of backing or advertising behind clear glass. He is unsure if this is the look the Board wants or just glass material that you cannot see through.

**Mr. Engle** said the ordinance states that "storefront glazing shall be transparent." When

you look at the design standards on Page 9, it says "the ground floor area of a retail building featuring large windows." To him, Fahm Street is the ground floor and features large windows. Therefore, by definition required to have transparent glass. What they do inside is not this Board's business. They could put an aisle beside the windows and the shelves could go against the glass, but this is not a concern of this Board. Mr. Engle feels if the petitioner is going to have storefronts, they should be transparent so you could see the action going on inside. If not, why have storefront windows at all?

**Mr. Lominack** asked Mr. Lamberson if they intend to have any variances. Specifically, he was referring to the design standards that deals with height.

**Mr. Lamberson** explained that they are on the Zoning Board of Appeal's (ZBA) March 28, 2013 agenda. As was discussed at this Board's last meeting, in order for the Board to approve Part I, Height and Mass, it would be contingent upon ZBA granting a variance that they do not have to be a two-story building. If the Review Board approves Part I, they will still have to get the variance approved by ZBA.

**Mr. Engle** stated that the Review Board, two meetings ago, recommended approval to the ZBA for the variance.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Lamberson if it was safe to say that light does not penetrate this glass.

**Mr. Lamberson** answered yes. He said he is happy to make Fahm Street transparent as well.

**Dr. Williams** said given that it is secondary to Oglethorpe Avenue, it will enhance the pedestrian area and if there will be opaque glass. He believes that it would be in the petitioner's interest to have clear glass to invite the pedestrian. If it is just a solid wall, it will not be inviting. He realizes that he was the person who suggested having windows above where his shelves would be, but opaque glass defeats the whole point. Staff has recommended removing the transom windows. He just wanted to be sure that where the transom windows will be kept, that they will actually have clear glass. The whole point was to allow light from the inside to penetrate to the outer doors. Therefore, all of the comments about the opaque glass completely nullifies any benefit about having the glazing.

**Ms. Ward** explained that staff is only recommending eliminating the transoms on Fahm Street elevation (the street fronting façade). They are not as concerned about the internal facade facing the parking lot.

**Dr. Williams** asked if it is regarding the street classification.

**Ms. Ward** answered because it faces the public right-of-way which is their purview.

**Dr. Williams** said he just wanted to be clear. He asked if the glass on the Oglethorpe Avenue side where there is opaque glass, he recommends that if they are going to have glass in the transoms that it be clear.

**Ms. Ward** explained that the standards specifically allows opaque glass within the

transoms of any storefront because historically this is where you would put up your sign and so forth.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Lamberson if he was in agreement of having the transparent glass on Fahm Street.

**Mr. Lamberson** answered yes, if it has to be so.

**Ms. Ramsay** said this will come up in Part II, Design Details. They will see what is presented during this time.

**Mr. Lamberson** said looking at the internal parking it is all opaque. But, for them, it would actually be easier to have the transom clear if it helps to have light in and out because it is higher than the shelving systems. He does not want to agree to clear glass that is a better use and if they reconfigure something inside that actually looks worse when you are walking down the sidewalk or parking lot. But, they are happy to do so.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they agree with all of the staff's comments. More specifically, they agree to eliminating the transom windows on Fahm Street. They also would suggest that instead of providing articulation through some sort of releases through recesses, they are fine with it being solid, but they just believe that it would be better to have a little bit of articulation on the solid walls. They agree with staff as well that the arbor should not be wood, but a material that is compatible with the building and the surrounding area. Ms. Meunier said regarding the issue that has come up about the opaque glazing, they agree that the glazing along Oglethorpe Avenue should be transparent. As has been stated the Board does not have purview about what goes on within the inside, but they do encourage the petitioner to possibly to something that is visually appealing on the interior of these windows if it is putting up a wall and displaying something on the wall. CVS on Bull Street has put up images of historic pharmacies and this is visually appealing.

**Ms. Meunier** said in terms of the opaque on the other facades, the HSF suggests something like translucent glass that allows sunlight through, but it is not transparent to where you are actually seeing things through it.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said he did not see any conflicts with having the transoms over the storefront and the center bays on Fahm Street. He believes that staff commented that the transoms on either side bay has no historic precedent or nothing compatible to go along with that. The transoms over the storefronts are everywhere. Therefore, he would not suggest eliminating the transoms over the storefront. If they want to be translucent over the storefront fine, but the storefront, it self, should be transparent.

**Dr. Williams** said the reveals currently on the side panels are three-quarter (3/4) inch. If the transoms were removed, the HSF comment is to provide some articulation. If the transom is removed, there will be a lot of unarticulated wall here.

**Mr. Engle** said it will not be stucco.

**Dr. Williams** asked what the cladding materials will be.

**Ms. Ramsay** answered they do not know this yet as it is a part of Part II.

**Board Action:**

Approval for new construction Part I, Height and Mass of the commercial building at 702 West Oglethorpe Avenue with the condition that the horizontal transom storefronts on Fahm Street be eliminated and some articulation be provided in the north and south bays of the east elevation. - PASS

The applicant requested a continuance for Part II and the signage to address items identified in the findings and opacity of glazing.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

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

Robin Williams - Aye

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

**Mr. Matthew Allan** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction Part II, Design Details, of a two-story detached residence at 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue. The General Development Plan (GPD) was submitted to the City for

review on December 20, 2012.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval for new construction, Part II Design Details, of a two-story detached residence at 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final approval with the construction documents:

1. Wood fences must be painted or stained. Wood fencing facing the street and within the front yard setback be painted the color of the primary building.
2. Relocate trash and recycling storage to be within the fencing to be screened from the public right-of-way.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the restudied elevation is what is being submitted. What they are seeing now is not the restudied elevation which is what was in an earlier submission. He was looking at page 2.

**Ms. Ward** said three and four are the same. However, one just shows the fencing in front of it and the other shows it without the fencing.

**Mr. Engle** said the front elevation is changed greatly. He wanted to be sure which elevation the Board would be voting on. The other submissions had siding over the bay, but this submission shows paneling.

**Ms. Ward** said they could ask the petitioner to confirm this, but she believes it will be siding. When the petitioner submitted Part I, there was some discussion about the paneling within the bay. At the time, they were not the same size, they were different dimensions in the Part I. The petitioner was asked by the Board to consider the bay configuration when they resubmit for Part II. Therefore, she believes this is one of the studies that they were working on. What they submitted for the final approval was the siding, if she is not mistaken. But, the petitioner can answer the question.

**Mr. Merriman** said he believes the final approval was as shown on page 3.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes, on page 3 and 4 showing the siding.

**Mr. Engle** said the Board recommended at the last meeting that they consider putting in paneling instead of siding.

**Ms. Ward** explained that the petitioner had the paneling at Part I, but it was two panels and they were bigger on one section than the other. She cannot remember if it was the top or bottom, but the Board asked the petitioner to study this. The petitioner studied it and when they submitted their final plans, it was with the siding.

**Mr. Howington** asked staff if they were saying that there is a little fence in the front.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes. She explained that there is an elevation drawing towards the end of the packet. They are proposing a three foot - six inch tall wooden fence the same height as the brick fence to run perpendicular. There is a wooden fence that goes to the back of the property and gets taller.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Allan** said he was representing J. Leander, LLC. He entertained questions from the Board.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Allan if he would be willing to use the elevation that has the panels. He asked Mr. Allan to please clarify this,

**Mr. Allan** said it is not easy to clarify. He said the Board may recall that actually two meetings ago, they had the panels, but the Board was not necessarily in agreement with the panels. There was difficulty in actually getting the panels to look equal. There was a sort of difference between the panels that dealt with the heights of the floors. They drew it a number of different ways. Mr. Allan believes that Mr. Engle said whatever if there were two vertical panels here. They tried this and tried to raise the window and lower the window. Finally, they said why not side it as it would remove all these issues as they were not able to come up with a scale that he believes everybody struggled with at the last meeting.

**Mr. Allan** said in essence, they are not trying to replicate those existing buildings.

**Mr. Engle**, looking at the plan, said this row is unique in some respects in that the steps from the porches engage the brick wall out front. In two cases, the risers go out about an inch beyond the front face of the wall. He said the way this unit is being made, the plan does not agree with the elevation. The steps are ending eighteen (18) inches short of the wall or they are ending at the wall. They are not engaging the wall. Mr. Engle directed the petitioner to look how the steps in each case ends at the newel post and comes right out to the wall. But, this step is going to break that rhythm. This bothers him as this is a very unusual situation. He is unsure of another case where a wall is parallel with the front elevations where the steps are engaging that wall. Mr. Engle suggested that the staircase should be brought out. He is not saying that it has to be the exact same design as the others, but he believes the detail is needed for visual continuity. If they want to have a picket fence on the west side of the yard, he could see that because it is the back yard of that other house. But, these are open all the way across. There are no fences that come out from these front elevations and butt into the walls, but the stairs are doing this. The rhythm is being broken and he would say that it needs to be continued.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Engle if he was saying continued out to the front of the brick.

**Mr. Engle** said he was saying bring them out.

**Mr. Allan** said the buildings were not here originally. They were moved from across the street. Apparently, the wall went up around it. He was not there, but guesses this is what was done. The wall seems to have some historic detail, but then there is some infill to the wall as well. The other three houses on the street essentially have columns that frame the steps. In essence, they do not have the same openings as the other three houses. This is the point of having this little wooden gate which is essentially to the left of the stairs, directly to the west. They were attempting to keep the existing brick wall intact as possible. However, the problem is in the layout where it is intact, you would have to essentially tear it down and put it back together and recreate the columns, but you will not have the same

rhythm of the existing fence and the columns will not have the same rhythm.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Allan what was he referring to when he said columns.

**Mr. Allan** explained that he was saying the piers of the actual fence wall.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Allan if he was actually going to cut a whole in the wall for the entrance.

**Mr. Allan** stated that if they attempted to put the piers up on the other side of it, they would not have the same equal distance.

**Mr. Engle** said this opening is two feet wide.

**Mr. Allan** said yes; it is a small opening. This where they would be happy not to have the gate. It does not do a lot except for the fact that you have to close this gap somehow. They could attempt to replicate the wall, but something is going to be amiss somewhere. Either he takes the wall down and breaks up the equal distance of the existing piers or leaves it as intact as possible which include those two piers. Mr. Allan said they are happy to do whatever they need to do, but he wanted the Board to know that they felt this was the least obtrusive method of doing it. They may attempt to put the bricks back and recreate the pier, but it might defeat the purpose of the continuity.

**Mr. Merriman** asked that the drawings on page 3 of 7 where it shows the restudy of the panels, it shows the up rights that go from the apron to the drip cap and then below it, they have some that goes down to the stucco, he asked Mr. Allan why they have all of this in there where it looks like one big thing instead of continuing the siding all the way across underneath both of them.

**Mr. Allan** said the entire thing projects.

**Ms. Ramsay** said these are the bays.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**None.**

### **Board Action:**

Approval for new construction, Part II Design Details, of a two-story detached residence at 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final approval with the construction documents:

1. Wood fences must be painted or stained. Wood fencing facing the street and within the front yard



- setback be painted the color of the primary building. - PASS
2. Relocate trash and recycling storage to be within the fencing to be screened from the public right-of-way.
  3. Eliminate the wood gate (could possibly use iron within brick piers) and infill with brick piers and wall to match the wall east of the front stairs.
  4. Extend the front steps, newel, or porch to be consistent with other houses in the block face.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Ebony Simpson

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
Robin Williams	- Aye

15. [Petition of J. Leander, LLC | 12-002149-COA | 212 Houston Street | New Construction Residence: Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

**Mr. Matthew Allan** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Part II Design Details, of a two-story detached residence at 212 Houston Street. The general development plan was submitted for review on December 20, 2012. The Park & Tree Department said that the building and stoop as they are being proposed would require some pruning of a City oak tree. This would need to be coordinated with the City. Additionally, an encroachment permit would be required for the stoop within the right-of-way.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval for the new construction, Part II Design Details, of a two-story detached residence at 212 Houston Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final approval with the construction documents:

1. Wood fences must be painted or stained. Submit finish for review and approval.
2. Locate trash and recycling storage to be within the fencing to be screened from the public right-of-way.

**Dr. Henry** said the materials look exactly the same as proposed for 502 East Ogleshorpe Ave.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the materials are the same.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Allan** said he was representing J. Leander, LLC.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Phyllis Lang**, owner of 214A Houston Street, came forward. Ms. Lang said her property has a rear entrance which is will be beside the proposed building on the right. Her only entrance will be past the fence in the back. Where it is now between their side of the building and the property line is thirty-four (34) inches. Ms. Lang said she was requesting that the fence on this property be extended eight (8) inches over so that there will be ample walkway for her to get furniture in and out and whatever access needed to get to her property.

**Ms. Ramsay** advised Ms. Lang that the Review Board could not make that request as their purview is to look at visual compatibility. She encouraged her to work with Mr. Allan to try to achieve her goal.

**Ms. Ward** asked that if the property owner works with the neighbor and they are able to work out something to accommodate her, does this change need to be resubmitted to the Board or is the Board comfortable with deferring that decision to staff for review and approval.

**Ms. Ramsay** answered that the Board would be comfortable in allowing the staff to review and approve this.

#### **Board Action:**

Approval for new construction, Part II Design Details, of a two-story detached residence at 212 Houston Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final approval with the construction documents:

- PASS

1. Wood fences must be painted or stained. Submit finish for review and approval.
2. Locate trash and recycling storage to be within the fencing to be screened from the public right-of-way.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

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
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

**Mr. Jasper Wayne Proctor** was present on behalf of the petitioner

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction, Part I, height and Mass, for a six-story, 137 unit, hotel located on the vacant parcel at 135 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (508-510 West Oglethorpe Avenue). A revised General Development Plan that reflects the new design in this application was submitted to the City on February 26, 2013. As of the writing of this staff report, no revised comments were made. Ms. Michalak stated that Part I, Height and Mass, was continued at the petitioner's request from the February 13, 2013 meeting. The petitioner made wholesale changes to the design of the building, therefore, the prior staff recommendations no longer pertain the newly proposed design. Part I, Height and Mass standards are re-evaluated in their entirety.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval of the New Construction Hotel: Part I, Height and Mass at 135 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard because it meets the standards and is visually compatible.

**For Part II, Design Details:**

- The material standard must be met and the sustainable roof certified by the City Manager and submitted with Part II, Design Details to include the additional story.
- The required information, per the application checklist, for site walls, fences, and any appurtenances including any visible structures that may be associated with gardens, patios, dumpsters, and pools must be submitted with the Part II, Design Details.

- Signage is indicated in concept only. The required information on the checklist must be submitted for review of this element and can be a separate application from the building application.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Michalak to clarify what she said about the balconies on the sixth floor, east elevation. He said the center section is 50 feet wide and projects forward.

**Ms. Michalak** answered no; it is a flat front building.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the building is wide enough so that it has to have that variation.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes; it is large-scale development.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Michalak was is the trigger.

**Ms. Michalak** answered the 9,000 square feet.

**Dr. Williams** said there is a certain linear continuous façade.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that is for commercial development not including large-scale. If it was over 120 feet, it would also have to incorporate additional standards.

**Dr. Williams** said his question is, "if it did not setback it would not be in compliance?"

**Ms. Michalak** answered right. It would only meet one of the standards for large-scale development.

**Dr. Williams** questioned that this is just one way of meeting that standard.

**Ms. Michalak** answered right; they have to meet two. The other standard that the petitioner is meeting is the division of the base submittal on top which is subdivide horizontally. The other standard that the petitioner is using is roof line variation.

**Mr. Engle** asked why is this not covered by the setback variation under large-scale development as these are setbacks and not roof line. He said that the roof line does not go up and down, but the building goes in and out which is setback.

**Ms. Michalak** said it also decreases by one floor at the front façade.

**Mr. Engle** said it does not decrease enough to meet the setback standard as it has to be eight (8) feet and 24 feet wide.

**Ms. Michalak** said this would have to be the full height of the building.

**Dr. Williams** stated that the roof line has to get five (5) feet back from the front façade to back up to the main height. Therefore, the roof line has not changed.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that this is the way it is allowed under the ordinance.

**Ms. Ward** stated that they think it meets both the standard and the intent of the

standard and are recommending approval. She believes that if the Board wants to discuss it, then they can do so under the Board Discussion. But staff feels that the petitioner has come up with a good solution that meets the roof line variation at the street.

**Mr. Lominack** stated that he would like a little clarification on the materials.

**Ms. Michalak** said they do not know anything about the materials yet. The materials will be presented under Part II, Design Details.

**Dr. Williams** asked that if the Board does not agree with staff that this solution for the sixth floor is visually compatible, would a motion need to be made to deny the entire thing or can you move to approve and just deny that portion.

**Ms. McClain** explained that a motion can be framed however the person deems necessary.

#### PETITIONER COMMENTS

**Mr. Proctor** came forward and said that he is designer of the building.

**Dr. Henry** said he believes the building has improved a lot.

**Mr. Howington**, too, believes the building has improved. However, he wanted to ask a question about some of the windows, especially on the Alton Street and Oglethorpe Avenue. Some of the windows look arbitrary on the plan. They are not centered in the rooms and he was not sure why they were done this way. On some of the bays, it is a more contemporary detail with the window being right up against the corner of a recess. Could some of the windows be centered. It is very hard to read. Several windows are crammed in the corner; but when you look at the plan there is no reason for it.

**Mr. Proctor** said there is a reason for it in the rooms. In some of the other areas, they moved the windows around in the room so they could meet the bay spacing criteria. Basically, they have done the same thing on these other views as well although they do not face the street or they may partially face it.

**Mr. Howington** stated that they are visible from the street. Therefore, he believes that a part of the criteria would be that the window be centered in the bay or there be some consistency.

**Mr. Proctor** said that on Alton Street side, a stairway is there. They put windows in there for architectural or visual reasons, but they did not put windows on this view. This is a street, but it is somewhat like a driveway for the development. Alton Street is a one-way street and is narrow. This is why they did this as they did not think that this was as important as Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.

**Mr. Howington** said there is no consistency with the bay and the space of the window.

**Mr. Proctor** said it is a fifteen (15) foot criteria and their rooms are thirteen foot wide. Therefore, this is the two (2) feet.

**Mr. Howington** stated again that it seems arbitrary that, that window is stuck in the corner.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Michalak to pull up page 3. He believes the windows are shifted and over in the far left you can see the windows up against the corner. Therefore, you will actually have windows with no brick beside them. According to the plan, there is no reason why that window can not be moved over.

**Mr. Proctor** said they can move the window over, but they were trying to make the fifteen (15) foot rule.

**Mr. Howington** stated that the way he reads it, it is less than the fifteen foot rule. Actually, it falls below the 15 foot rule.

**Mr. Proctor** said he would rather put the window in the center, too. If the Board approves it, he will do so. They can do this on Alton Street and Oglethorpe Avenue, but on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard they had to maintain the 15 foot rule. Is this right?

**Mr. Howington** stated he believes that MLK is more successful with the centering of the windows as there is equal spacing between them.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the third space down from MLK would be a window.

**Mr. Howington** said it will be a wall with spandrel glass.

**Mr. Proctor** said a window is here; they did this so they could get the spacing - the thirteen versus the fifteen.

**Mr. Howington** asked if this would be a blank window.

**Mr. Proctor** answered that it will be a real window; they will have a wall behind it. Light will come through there. He explained that the rationale is they have 13 foot rooms width and they have to have the 15 foot bay according to the regulations.

**Dr. Williams** said there has to be some vertical articulation. The division has to be broken up in vertical elements at a minimum of fifteen to twenty feet wide.

**Mr. Howington** said it appears that a different route is being taken here because this façade is flat.

**Dr. Williams** asked where are the bays. If this is flat, does having the hard joints between the brick constitute on a flush façade.

**Mr. Engle** stated that he has pilaster here.

**Mr. Proctor** said pilasters are here. He stated the bricks protrude about four inches where the pilaster is and along the lower level they will have limestone. This was the Board's question before. They will have limestone on the first floor and the top floor with brick in the middle.

**Mr. Engle** said the pilasters create the bays.

**Mr. Proctor** stated yes, the appearance of the 15 feet, but behind it is 13 feet. All the franchises are like this; the program is that width and the rooms already have layouts like this. It is hard to change that.

**Mr. Lominack** said it seems like somewhere along the line an application of bay spacing and reasons should fall into the equation. To follow a bay spacing that works to the detriment of the appearance of the building, seems to make no sense at all.

**Dr. Williams** said it is not really a window, but it will necessitate some kind of improvised solution. It will be opaque glass or something; you will see a wall behind the glass.

**Mr. Proctor** said they will offset the wall around the window; light will still come through it. The wall will only partially block it and then there is another window that will not be blocked at all.

**Dr. Williams** did not know if this would work, but in symmetries instead of having two windows in that bay have a single window. Therefore, it would be two windows, then a single window; alternating the rhythm of the façade.

**Mr. Engle** said they are now getting into solutions.

**Mr. Proctor** said they tried the single window and then came back to the double window. They have had others buildings like this too where you had window spacing and the walls did not necessarily line up behind it.

**Mr. Lominack** said the Board can not redesign this building, but the way the plan works and the way the exterior of the building works should be at least related to each other in some way.

**Mr. Proctor** said the historic character on Martin King Jr. Boulevard has to be maintained. Therefore, they have to keep this area the same. Along Alton Street and may be Oglethorpe Avenue, as they are partially blocked, they could probably move these around. He said he would rather have single windows, but they do have the rules that they must follow.

**Mr. Lominack** said may be the rooms are the wrong shape or the wrong size. The two are not mutually independent of each other. The exterior of the façade of the building and the way it is configured inside should be developed at the same time.

**Mr. Proctor** said may be at the next go round they could move some of the walls around where they are bothering them. However, he believes they need to keep Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard the same, but the other street if he can be given authorization from the staff and from the Board to center them, he will do so.

**Mr. Engle** said he was concerned about sheets 10, 11, and 12 showing the parapet. The parapet has to be high enough to show the roof equipment, but the Board has no idea what the roof equipment is. If they approve that, they have no idea how high the parapet will be. If they end up with a six foot high compressor unit, they will end up with a six foot

parapet. He said that he does not believe that two feet - eight inches (2' 8") is going to be enough to cover any equipment.

**Mr. Lominack** said it probably depends on where it is located on the roof.

**Mr. Engle** said according to the drawing, two-third (2/3) of the roof looks like it is going to be solid panels or green roof.

**Mr. Proctor** said the will move the equipment back far enough so that it would not be seen from the ground level. He reminded the Board that this is a six-story building. You might be able to see it from the building across the street that is six-stories, but from the ground you will not be able to see anything.

**Mr. Howington** stated that along Oglethorpe Avenue and Alton Street towards the back side, there is some variation in the height of the parapets in the bays. Is this just to meet the criteria for large-scale development?

**Mr. Proctor** said when they read the ordinance, they thought they would try to make it look like it was a group of buildings that were put together. He believes they are held to a four feet maximum high parapet. They can make it all four feet.

**Mr. Howington** stated that he was not saying this would be a solution, but was only asking.

**Mr. Proctor** said he was deferring to Ms. Michalak and Ms. Ward; they are the staff.

**Ms. Michalak** said there is nothing in the ordinance that precludes this all from being the same height. This is just what developed over time.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** stated that they agree the windows should be centered in the bays, if possible. The HSF also feels that the set backs that are indicated where the balconies are, are more set backs. But, they do not regard them as adequately changing the visual roof line. Ms. Meunier said they agree with all staff's comments that they have in their report. However, there are a few other discrepancies that they noticed a lot of places where walls are hitting the windows. She knows that the petitioner has addressed this. Also, there is a stairway on the northeast corner of the building and MLK. It moves around on all of the floor plans. They were not sure how this is working; particularly, on the sixth floor where there is a balcony on this level and the stair is a little further back. She said that the HSF is unclear about the orientation of this.

**Ms. Meunier** stated that on the streetscape there is a set back or something on the north part of the building. They are not sure what this is indicating. On Alton Street where they are opening it back up is very narrow on this side of the property. There is no where for the valet or anything to pull in, hotel guests are going to be coming in to park and check-in; they did not know if there is any space for traffic to actually flow normally around all of this. Where they are proposing this is where the street is much more narrower. Therefore, they anticipate that a lot of parked cars will be here and the traffic will not be able to move back and forth.



**Ms. Meunier** said that they suggest reducing the number of lanterns that are being proposed to be placed along the wall on Oglethorpe Avenue. A lantern is shown on every pier and they think they should be fewer.

**Mr. Kirit R. Patel** came forward and stated he wanted to answer the question about Alton Street. Mr. Patel explained that on their previously approved project for two major hotels, they had that street open up exactly the same way as the one-way street. He said [pointing to an area on the drawings] this area here is a small pull-in area and the street would be one-way. This is how it was previously approved when they were planning for the two hotels in 2007 and 2008.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** moved for conditional approval of the New Construction Hotel: Part I, Height and Mass at 135 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. with the acceptance of the staff's recommendation and the additional conditions that the windows on the north and south elevations be centered within the actual bays; that the parapet be consistent in height around the perimeter with the exception of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard; removal of the balconies because they are visually incompatible and that the recesses be restudied because the petition otherwise is in compliance visually compatibility criteria and design standards as set forth in the Historic District ordinance.

**Dr. Henry** seconded the motion.

**Ms. Ramsay** called for the discussion on the motion.

**Mr. Engle** said forgetting the window issue to some extent it is not this Board's concern because it is dealing with the interior plan. What happens on the inside is not their purview. The only thing that this Board is concerned with is what happens on the outside. Mr. Engle said his biggest concern is the roof. He does not concur with staff's assessment that shoveling in two balconies is a roofline variation. It is a set back and the set back variation is very explicit; it has to be eight feet (8') deep and has to be 24 feet long. A roofline is consistently high all the way across. If you are standing straight in front of that building you will see one horizontal line. Balconies do not change this. Mr. Engle said he believes the roofline needs more articulation. He does not care whether it is a Renaissance or not. He has no problem with the balconies per se, but he does not believe they meet the roofline variation.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Engle if he was specifically referring to MLK or to that all the rooflines need to be more articulated.

**Mr. Engle** answered that he concurs with Mr. Howington's opinion that the little raises along the sides do not work. They do not serve a purpose. He believes that the entire roof needs more articulation. He said that one point four inches (1.4") is not enough to be significant on the parapet. Therefore, this needs to be reworked.

**Mr. Engle** said he thinks the project has come along way, but he thinks that they can conditionally accept the roofline changes and dealing with the question of the windows. He

wanted to ask that the motion be amended to address these two concerns.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes that the window issues need to be resolved. But, he thinks for the Board to say center the windows in the bay is giving design directions, if this is met and is unsuccessful they have painted themselves in a corner. He believes it is the architect's responsibility to resolve the issue. Personally, he will not support an amendment that would require the petitioner to relocate the windows.

**Ms. Simpson** asked Mr. Lominack if he could clearly restate the issue.

**Mr. Lominack** explained that the windows are arbitrary in their location; there is no order to them. Some are even located in areas that he feels are not constructible. The Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard elevation does not turn him on, but at least there is order here. The elevations on the north and south sides lack a sense of order. There does not seem to be any rime or reason to why and how windows occur within that wall.

**Ms. McClain** stated she believes the petitioner said he could bring this back before the Board. If the petitioner is willing to bring the window issue back to the Board, would a continuance be more in order? She believes the motion will probably fail. She explained that once the Board votes on the motion that is on the floor, the petitioner may request a continuance.

**Ms. Ramsay** said a motion is on the floor now.

**Ms. McClain** said the Board needs to vote on that motion.

**Mr. Howington** asked if the Board votes to deny the motion on the floor, is the project denied.

**Ms. McClain** answered no. They would be voting to deny the motion.

**Dr. Williams** said that the MLK elevation and the five foot deep setback is really four and one-half (4.5) feet deep once you factor in the railings.

**Mr. Howington** stated that this is not usable anyway according to the elevation as a window and a PTAC unit is underneath it. Therefore, the window is probably not operable. But, this is a question that the petitioner can answer.

**Mr. Lominack** said it is really not a balcony.

**Dr. Williams** stated that he does not really see the balconies up there as visually compatible. he does not see the rationale for them. The sign seems anemic in terms of the size. If it is limited to 80 square feet and the band is six stories up and is 18 inches tall, it will not be an effective sign. He is concerned about the scale of the signage and the railings.

**Mr. Engle** said the Board is not dealing with the signage proposal today.

**Dr. Williams** stated that the sign is framed by the massing of the building. Height and mass will dictate what kind of sign is put there.

**Mr. Howington** said his thoughts on the parapets are the same as Dr. Williams. It seems a little miniature to the scale of the building. He appreciates that they are framed signage because often at a hotel, the signs are just put up without a frame. The balconies are not visually compatible. He can not recall anything like them in Savannah other than residential.

**Mr. Engle** said if the Board rejects the balcony, they would have rejected the second large-scale development standard. They are basing the roofline variation on this standard. Therefore, if this is rejected, the petitioner must meet another large-scale development standard, such as set backs, recessed standards or whatever.

**Ms. Ward** stated that she did not want to make anybody design this building, but she wanted to ask a question. She asked if there is still a potential to use that a roofline variation test maybe if the set back or recess there was more substantial. She does not believe that this would be a design solution, but staff has been working with the petitioner a long time to try to get to a place where they can meet the ordinance. She feels this was a good solution and this is why staff supported it to meet that roofline configuration. Ms. Ward said she hears the Board discussion and may be the railings could be eliminated; there is no railing there. She believes there is a potential solution, but could the petitioner still use that setback for roofline variation if it was more significant; would it meet that test?

**Mr. Howington** stated that this is not a design solution, but as a comparison it seems in the past that may be that part where it is recessed has been the masonry instead of railing. It would be a raised parapet of masonry which is more solid. Then it steps back from there and there have been some other solutions that he has noticed.

**Mr. Engle** said he believes they approved the Springhill Suites that had a balcony on the third floor just like this.

**Mr. Howington** said it was a similar situation.

**Ms. Ramsay** said a motion and a second is on the floor for a conditional approval.

**NOTE: The motion failed.**

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Proctor if he wanted to request a continuance.

**Mr. Proctor** came forward and asked for a continuance.

**Board Action:**

Approval of the New Construction Hotel: Part I,  
Height and Mass at 135 Martin Luther King, Jr.  
Blvd. because it meets the standards and is visually - FAIL  
compatible and as stated.

**Vote Results**

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

**Board Action:**

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

1. Center the windows to be equal heights along Oglethorpe Avenue, Alton Street, and Ann Street.
2. Change all parapets to be equal heights along all facades, with the exception of the taller parapet in the center architectural bay on MLK Jr. Blvd. Increase the presence of this parapet through height and/or articulation. - PASS
3. Further articulate the "balconies" on the MLK Jr. Blvd. façade. Increase the depth and change the railings to a parapet wall to further demonstrate the "Roofline Variation" standard required for Large Scale Development.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	
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

17. [Petition of Francis X. Hayes | 13-000391-COA | 224 West Charlton Street | Rooftop Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Preservation Brief 14-New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Mr. Shedrick Coleman**, architect for the project, was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a rooftop addition to the property at 224 West Charlton Street. The petitioner continued the petition for the addition from the February 13, 2013 meeting to amend the design and retain a large portion of the hip roof, reduce the footprint and height of the addition, and eliminate all terracing.

**Ms. Ward** reported that the staff recommends approval for the rooftop addition as amended because it is in compliance with the preservation standards, visual compatibility factors, and design standards. All colors must be submitted to staff for final approval.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Coleman** stated that staff has summarized what they have done to try to bring this project closer into what is expected. He entertained comments from the Board.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they are in the process of resolving whether or not they hold a preservation covenant on this project. They have directed their attorney to do a title search. They are waiting to hear from their attorney. The attorney will have the title abstract go back from today to the deed in 1970 as this is when the covenant was attached. Mr. Carey said this is important to the HSF because as a rule, they oppose and object to rooftop additions on buildings. Therefore, rather than comment today and box them in one way or another, they will reserve comment, but did not want the Board to misunderstand their silence. They want the Board to also know that they will work with the petitioner as soon as they hear from the attorney.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Carey to explain what a covenant is.

**Mr. Carey** explained that this was a revolving fund property of Historic Savannah Foundation in the past. When the HSF sold such properties to new buyers, they attached covenants which basically reserve the right of review and approval of exterior changes to Historic Savannah Foundation. This was a protection, for example, if the property was sold to a non-preservation minded buyer, that person could not just "willy nilly" make changes. This was especially important in 1970 as it was three years before the ordinance was enacted. The older covenants were particularly important at that time as it added a protected layer somewhat like an easement. The covenant runs with the property in perpetuity.

**Mr. Engle** said he wanted to ask Mr. Coleman a question.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Coleman to please come forward.

**Mr. Engle** told Mr. Coleman that he did not notice this initially and asked that sheet two of six be shown. He asked him if the right-hand plan is the roof plan. Mr. Engle said the parapet appears to be three feet tall and is extending towards the street when in fact if the parapet is moved back to just screen the HVAC unit, you would be reducing the visual impact of the whole addition. Isn't the parapet going around the entire roof?

**Mr. Coleman** answered that it is not a three foot parapet. It is about an eight inch lip. He has kept this at the minimum height possible and pushed it to the back side. There is no three foot parapet here at the roof level.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Lominack** said he had one question about the screening of the compressors. Without a parapet the compressors are visible. They are not shown on the drawings. He said he does not know whether putting a screen or something around them would cause more attention to them. He does not have as big a problem with rooftop equipment as some people.

**Dr. Williams** said the Board does not have drawings that show the compressors in elevation rising above the parapet. Therefore, this is an incomplete presentation.

**Mr. Lominack** said that may be a little bit of an exaggeration.

**Ms. Ward** explained that they do not have any elevations of the mechanical screens at this time. This is something that staff can review.

**Dr. Williams** said it is not the screen, but the compressors. They do not have an idea how high the compressors go.

**Ms. Ward** stated that this is something that staff reviews and approves. Staff will be happy to work with the petitioner and review this.

**Dr. Henry** said he realizes they are in "Board Discussion," but can't they ask the petitioner about the compressors.

**Ms. McClain** said the motion could be amended with a condition that this matter be brought to staff for their approval.

**Dr. Henry** said the petitioner would have to do this anyway.

**Mr. Engle** said the bottom line is whether it would be visible from the street. If it does not show, it does not matter. It will show from the side streets.

**Mr. Merriman** said this is the public right-of-way.

**Ms. McClain** asked if they were saying that this is an incomplete application and should come back to them for their approval.

**Mr. Engle** said his issue is whether the entire unit will show. In the past, they have made people put up test poles and staff went out and looked at them to see if they could be seen or not.

**Ms. Simpson** asked if it is too late for the Board to request this.

**Mr. Engle** said the bottom line is does it show; if not, then it does not matter.

**Mr. Howington** said they know the screen will be another four feet or so.

**Mr. Engle** said he was not talking about the compressor screen, but the entire addition. The Secretary's Standards say they should not show and their standards say it should not show from the front.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes that the petitioner has done a good job of tucking it back in the corner. But, his fear is they might be setting a precedence of ripping off roofs and putting in rooftops. This is his only concern.

**Dr. Henry** said he is not necessarily wild about this, but they do have to let the people have some level of freedom in their own property. It is the Board's duty to decide whether it is acceptable aesthetically and historically.

**Mr. Thomson** stated that he believes the Board needs to keep in mind that if the staff typically reviews those units and ensures that they have the proper screening, the Board should let that happen. His second comment is that there should not be a standard of double jeopardy. This is the second time that a significant change in the design has occurred, they have had the whole discussion. They discussed this twice with staff before it came go the Board. Therefore, the design has been changed at least once or twice because of the staff input. The Board at its conversation at the last meeting and now the petitioner has brought back a design that he would say is close. Adding additional items he believes that double jeopardy should apply in some of these cases where they keep coming back. He had a boss that would say it is mostly good and or mostly right. Consequently, he believes they need to move on that standard and treat people cautiously.

**Ms. Simpson** asked Ms. Ward if a pole at this point could be set up for staff review as Mr. Engle has said.

**Mr. Lominack** said if it is going to be visible, it would be such a small amount that he does not believe that in the whole scheme of things that it would make much difference. Buildings do transition over time and they have additions to buildings that were done at one time or another that now have reached historic significance. If they don't allow some changes to buildings, this will never occur in the future.

**Ms. Simpson** said not all additions are good.

**Mr. Lominack** said they have some old buildings that are not good. However, this seems like such a minor issue in comparison to so many other things that do happen in the district. He does not have a problem with it.

**Ms. Simpson** said even though it may be minor, but they should not let all minor issues slide because ten (10) years from now they may be major.

**Dr. Henry** said this is a major change, but he believes it needs to be balanced.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes a part of this, using Mr. Lominack's comments that using the historic precedent, they are to look at Savannah as their historic precedence rather than the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines. He said Preservation Brief 14 that was given to the Board in their packets does not address rooftops very much. He disagrees with the Preservation Brief because he can point to quite a number of them in Savannah which would not conform to this preservation brief which are the kinds of things that Mr. Lominack is alluding to that are handcuffing the petitioners and handcuffing the Board. Traditionally, you would have had a full story addition rise up and be compatible and contradict the guidelines and preservation briefs which gives them this so-called false sense of history. Well, they have lots of false history around town which is a part of the process of history. Buildings are living creatures, they do get additions and the crazy guidelines of this preservation brief is hemming them into these, well intended, but if they use Savannah historically, the Juliette Gordon Low birthplace is a classical example of an additional story, not to mention the entire side porches.

**Mr. Lominack** said this includes the Scarborough House and others.

**Dr. Williams** said also the house that is a law firm on Chippewa Square, the Baptist Church and the Federal Courthouse where two thirds of this building is an addition. Do they use the guidelines that are issued out of Washington to trump what is the historical pattern in Savannah? He said he was throwing this out because he got frustrated seeing the petitioners dance around these rules which are absolutely taking them away from what is a precedent and the tradition in Savannah. He respects Historic Savannah Foundation's position on this because in principle, additions can be very bad and destroy a building, but there are plenty of precedents in Savannah where additions can be quite compatible, but they are no longer allowed. Then what they end up with is these hybrid compromise proposals.

**Dr. Williams** said he is frustrated with these guidelines. He does not know what the Board's purview is. Are they bound by these preservation briefs or can they actually look to Savannah's own precedent?

**Ms. Ward** explained that the Board is bound by the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for preservation, but she believes they are subject to a lot of interpretation by this Board. The Preservation Brief outlines the best practices, but it does not say in this case, this is the answer. This is the solution. It is a guide. Everything is a case-by-case basis.

**Mr. Lominack** said if a zoning ordinance keeps you from doing the right thing, something



is wrong with that zoning ordinance.

**Mr. Merriman** questioned for clarity, even if the Board votes to approve the motion, the issue about the heating, air conditioning unit and the screening will definitely come back to the staff for final approval.

**Dr. Henry** stated yes, they have to come back to staff.

**Ms. Simpson** said just as Mr. Thomson said, the Board has seen this project before. However, she believes they skipped over what Mr. Howington said in terms of setting precedence. She understands that each thing is done on a case-by-case basis.

**Board Action:**

Approval for the rooftop addition as amended because it is in compliance with the preservation standards, visual compatibility factors, and design standards. All colors must be submitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Nay
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	- Nay
Ebony Simpson	- Nay
Robin Williams	- Nay

18. [Petition of Greenline Architecture | 13-000831-COA | 411 West Congress Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

**Mr. Eric O'Neill of Greenline Architecture** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for the addition of a covered grilling area at the northwest corner of the existing courtyard for the business, "The Social Club," located at 411 West Congress Street. The grilling area will

house a grill, a stainless steel table, a hand sink within a stainless steel cabinet, and a brick knee wall with gates above, fronting Congress Street. The existing low brick planter located in the proposed grilling area will be removed.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval of the addition of a covered grilling area at the northwest corner of the existing courtyard for the business, "The Social Club," located at 411 West Congress Street because it meets the standards and is compatible.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. O'Neill** came forward and stated that he was representing Greenline Architecture.

**Ms. Reed** asked what is the purpose of the gates swinging in.

**Mr. O'Neill** answered that the gates are swinging in because they will remain open when the grilling area is in operation. Otherwise, they would be swinging outward into the middle of the sidewalk.

**Ms. Reed** asked, "why are gates here?"

**Mr. O'Neill** answered that presently gates are here; he does not know what the original intent was for the gates, but the existing gates swing inward. When they say that they are altering the gates, they are just raising them up a little to come above the new brick knee wall.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**None.**

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Merriman** moved for approval of the petition. This was seconded by Ms. Simpson.

**Ms. Ramsay** called for discussion on the motion.

**Mr. Lominack** stated that he had some comments as he was the member who asked that this petition be removed from the consent agenda. He said that he does not agree with the staff's interpretation of some of the visual compatibility factors and the design standards. Specifically, visual compatibility factor 8 which deals with roof shape and 10 which deals with the scale of the building. The thing about it being the rear of the building, he believes is questionable since that is the main entrance to the facility. It has, become by use, the front of the building. On the design standards a minimum of two stories is required by the ordinance for a building on a street; this is specified in 2B-i and in 2B-8 (2)(i). Mr. Lominack said that he does not believe that the ground floor height does not meet the minimum required height. He said that in 3A and B of the building form are some other areas; however, he will not cover all the things that are stated therein, but he thinks there is violation of all these particular criteria.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Lominack if he was reading from the ordinance.

**Mr. Lominack** said yes.

**Mr. Engle** said from a consistency standpoint, he believes it would be better if the roof matched the same pitch and height of the other roof. It is eighteen (18) inches lower than the other. When you look at this sideways, it is a bit awkward. The Board has reviewed this project many times. He is a little confused with what is going on here.

**Mr. Lominack** said he was not on the Board when this was reviewed previously. He said this appears that it will be a pavilion. There it needs to take on the character of something like a pavilion should be. A carport is put up in the back yard; this roof to him seems like a carport.

**Ms. Reed** agreed with Mr. Lominack.

**Mr. Lominack** said it could be a nice playful structure that would almost become an icon for the business, but presently it is missing that opportunity.

**Ms. Simpson** said this is a removable structure.

**Mr. Merriman** said he guesses he will withdraw his motion. Mr. Lominack has brought up some good comments regarding the ordinance.

**Mr. Engle** said there is nothing in the visual compatibility standards that talks about permanent and temporary. The point is you have to live with the visual impact whether it is going to be there ten years or 100 years. He said that he agrees with Mr. Lominack.

**Ms. Ramsay** said if she understands it correctly, if the Board denies this motion, the petitioner could ask for a continuance.

**Mr. Merriman** said he withdrew the motion.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. O'Neill if he wanted to ask for a continuance.

**Mr. O'Neill** came forward and asked for a continuance.

**Board Action:**

Continue the petition for the addition of a covered grilling area at the northwest corner of the existing courtyard for the business, "The Social Club," located at 411 Congress Street to consider the following items:

1. The roof shape and pitch are not visually compatible with this building or visually related to contributing buildings. Potentially match the height and pitch of the roof with the recent shed

- PASS

addition in the same courtyard, and/or extend the existing shed in an L-shape.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Reed Engle

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

19. [Petition of Roy Ogletree | 13-000834-COA | 543-547 East McDonough Street | New Construction Residences: Part 1, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

**Mr. Roy Ogletree** was present on behalf of the petitioner.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction Part I, Height and Mass of eight (8) three and four story residential townhouses at 543-547 East McDonough Street. The General Development Plan was submitted to the City on February 28, 2013. The only comments to date that may potentially affect the design comes from Traffic Engineering. This could potentially affect the wall of continuity standards. Traffic Engineering's comments are the 25' is required between the back of the sidewalk and end of the driveway, wall, and garage door, etc. Ms. Michalak said she believes there is some confusion with the garage door as this is only shown as open parking, not a garage. Traffic Engineering comments also that 20' is required between the back of the curb and a gate.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that based on the report, staff was recommending that the petitioner request a continuance, but they met with the petitioner this morning and they have actually revised the drawings to meet all the conditions and considerations that are listed on the staff report, except number 11 regarding adding "walls of continuity: flush with the front facades in front of the open parking area between each of the buildings. The walls are as tall as the first level will help mitigate the "too tall" appearance of Units 1, 2, 7, and 8 in addition to creating a consistent wall of enclosure along all of the street." She said if the Board would permit the petitioner to present the changes, staff would now recommend approval with number 11 still as a condition.

**Mr. Engle** said that at their Special Called Meeting that they decided they would not accept

information this way.

**Dr. Henry** said the Board is missing one-fourth of the information.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the Board will not accept the changes today as the information was not presented to the Board previously.

**Mr. Lominack** said there are no definitions in the ordinance for what a low stoop house is. There is a definition for a high stoop and a raised elevated basement. He asked that on the ones Ms. Michalak referred to as a low stoop house, what would make that a low stoop instead of a raised basement?

**Ms. Michalak** said the stoop literally projects forward of the building. Therefore, it is not a flush entrance into the building, but it is actually a projecting stoop from the building.

**Mr. Lominack** stated that if you had a porch above and still had a door at that level, would that still be a low stoop?

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes; she would say that it is still a low stoop if a porch is on top.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Michalak if she was saying it is the principle entrance.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes; it would be the principle entrance.

**Mr. Lominack** said if the principle entrance was on the ground what keeps this from also being able to be a raised basement? He said that there is nothing in the ordinance that says you cannot enter a building from a raised basement.

**Mr. Engle** said that raised basements are typically below grade.

**Ms. Michalak** said they are partially below grade.

**Mr. Lominack** said this is not the definition given in the ordinance.

**Ms. Michalak** said she does not know how the ordinance clarifies this. She said usually a raised basement would not be the primary entrance whereas something like the low stoop would be the primary entrance.

**Dr. Henry** asked if anyone has measured where the cars can get in or out of there. However, he knows this isn't the purview of this Board. Dr. Henry asked Ms. Michalak if the Board previously had seen a proposal for this same location requesting six units.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes; but she was not on staff at that time.

**Dr. Henry** asked what is the range of floor space roughly for each unit. They look awfully small.

**Ms. Michalak** said this is in the staff report, but the buildings are 21 feet wide by 30 feet deep.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ogletree** apologized for the last minute request for changes, but they received the staff's

comments late Friday afternoon and they tried to do their best to accommodate the comments and bring them forward. If they are allowed to show what they have done, he believes they have done a tremendous improvement on the design based on the staff's comments.

**Ms. Ramsay** informed Mr. Ogletree that unfortunately, the Board has not had a chance to review the changes. She informed him that as he can tell, the Board puts a lot of time into reviewing the drawings before the meeting.

**Mr. Ogletree** said he understood the Board's position. He said he is the original owner of the property and they developed the two townhomes on East Broad Street in 2006. They are unable to continue as the developer because of economic reasons.

**Ms. Ramsay** injected she wanted to remind Mr. Ogletree of what she said during the opening of the meeting. She repeated that she said "the remarks should be addressed to the Board and should be confined to the facts of the petition under the purview of the Review Board. This specifically does not include issues such as landscaping, parking, noise, safety, or financial impact over which the Review Board has no control, whereas they are individually concerned with quality of life issues, this Board does not consider these."

**Mr. Ogletree** stated that he was not requesting any relief for economic conditions, he is only explaining that he is no longer the developer. They are trying to sell this property to the Development Associates and they have requested that he submit the new design which is different from the six (6) units design that he had planned in 2006. He is giving a reason why the submittal is like it is. What they really want to come out today is some reassurance or some kind of nod as to whether this concept of a development will be something that the new developer should pursue as they are trying to decide whether to purchase the property and pursue this type of development. Mr. Ogletree said without some kind of nod, they will not purchase this because it would not make sense for them to do that.

**Mr. Ogletree** explained that they came to MPC staff and asked if they could get a subdivided piece of property together for this developer and they were recommended to come to the Height and Mass in order not to separate the idea of land use as far as lot size and subdivision from the fact that it is in the Historic District. Basically, they are getting a preliminary and trying to get feedback so they will know whether or not an eight (8) unit townhome development is a viable option on this property within the basic guidelines. It does meet all the requirements as far as lot size, parking and all the specific requirements that they were given, it meets. However, this does not mean that the Board will approve it when it comes down to it. They are looking for some kind of reassurance that this concept is okay.

**Dr. Henry** told Mr. Ogletree that the Board is not in the business of "winking and nodding." The Board cannot do anything until they see the entire thing.

**Mr. Merriman** suggested that Mr. Ogletree ask for a continuance and bring his revised plans to the Board next month in the proper order.

**Mr. Ogletree** said he was not asking for a wink or a nod, but asking for a ruling whether this development is an acceptable type of development.

**Ms. Ramsay** informed him that the Board does not have enough information.

**Mr. Howington** said as presented, he believes the Board would have to follow all of the staff

comments pertaining to all of the issues.

**Mr. Engle** said there are some other issues that were not brought up by staff. He does not see where the HVAC units will be placed on any of these units. Mr. Engle said also he does not see where the trash and dumpster will be located. These are not shown. The way it is laid out, unless he is going to put the trash on the patio, there is no place for them.

**Mr. Ogletree** said courtyards are at every unit in this design which will accommodate air conditioning units and trash.

**Mr. Thomson** said following the Chairwoman remarks, if the petitioner wants to present his revised concept, this is his time to talk as long as it pertains to the issues that this Board would address, if not today, then in the future. The Board does not have to comment, approve or say anything. But, this is his time to present. Therefore, having a lot of conversation about nothing at the moment and if he wants to say this is what we are thinking about doing, he can do so and walk away because it is his time as long as the Chair gives him time to speak. Mr. Thomson said he just wanted to make that distinction between talking about if they had money or the other things versus the actual proposal.

**Ms. Simpson** asked Mr. Thomson if he was saying the petitioner could present the revised changes if he wants to.

**Mr. Thomson** stated that he was saying that it is the petitioner's time to speak on his proposal. If it is a new proposal, he can speak on it. Now, the Board has already said that they don't have it nor reviewed it in advance. Therefore, they are not going to act on it, but from a public process point of review it is his time to say what he wants as long as it is within the guidelines of what the Chair has said. Even though it might not be what is in the application at this point.

**Ms. Ramsay** explained that the Board prior discussed this at length at their last meeting. It was the general consensus of the Board that they would be wasting their time.

**Mr. Merriman** said he was curious about Mr. Thomson comments. He explained that this was posted in a timely manner so that if any one of the public wanted to come in and review the plans, they could do so. But, the revised plans were not on file nor posted. Since the plans have been revised, they need to be posted. There has not been a public notice that the plans were revised.

**Mr. Thomson** said he was agreeing that the Board not take action on any changed plans because they have not been posted. He explained that all he was saying is that the petitioner is standing there and it is his time to speak. As long as it does not sway off the topic of the development proposal, he has the right to have the time to speak as to whatever time the Chair and Board wants to give him to speak.

**Mr. Howington** gave Mr. Ogletree the background on what the Board was saying to him. He explained that sometimes the petitioner would come up with brand new changes and expect the Board to vote on it when they have not seen the changes. Obviously, they do not have enough information to vote on it. What ends up happening is it goes on for hours [not saying this will be the case now] and it is not that anyone is trying to be curt or short with the him, but it is just that they do not have enough information to vote on it and sometimes in discussions there maybe discussions that could be taken the wrong way as an opportunity to change this or change that when the whole Board has not had a chance to let it sink in and vote on it. There is a fine line and he did not want to lead Mr. Ogletree to another way that may come back and everybody vote against it. In the past, this is what has happened.

**Mr. Ogletree** stated that he thoroughly understood; he has been through this process multiple times and understands the process. This is a little different where he is coming from on this project. The developer is present who wants to purchase the property and develop this particular type of arrangement. He is fine with presenting this if he cannot present the other. But, he would rather present the revised drawings. He is not asking the Board to vote on the revised drawings today, but asking that they look at it and do some public discussion so that the developer can go away from here knowing what the Board thinks about the project. Mr. Ogletree said he is not asking for an approval, but asking for discussion on it. If the Board discusses it and say it is the worse think that they have seen, then the developer will know that. He believes it has subtle differences in certain ways, but is not entirely different. Mr. Ogletree said he believes it is worth the Board seeing the revisions as they are accurate to what will come back to them the next time rather than they going through the entire process of making comments and review something that is not intended to come back to them. Without the Board's discussion, they go back with a goose egg and have nothing to come back to and will have to continue it for 30 days and come back basically at square one.

**Mr. Engle** said he would be happy to discuss what they have, but he will not discuss something new as Mr. Ogletree is presenting now.

**Mr. Merriman** said they did not let Dawson Architects do so with the building next to Garibaldi's Café.

**Mr. Engle** said they have turned other petitioners down and this would not be fair to the Savannah Historic Foundation (HSF). Their Architecture Review Board met yesterday and they are not present now and cannot comment on the new drawings.

**Mr. Ogletree** said he is fine discussing this as fundamentally it is the same project.

**Ms. McClain** said she believes that the Board has said they will not do these type of things again. If they are not going to take any action on it, she sees no reason for the Board to go into all of that, even though, you have the right, but the Board is not going to have a discussion on anything because they have already made that decision.

**Mr. Lominack** said a motion could be made to deny it.

**Ms. Ramsay** said then that would be the petitioner's answer.

**Mr. Ogletree** said he is fine with that. If they want to take this through and even though he finds it a bit of futile approach knowing that they have a better solution, he is willing to go through this like he believes he has the right to do and have the Board rule on it which will have the Board's discussion.

**Ms. Simpson** asked if the Board could proceed on this as it appears they will be going back and forth on this matter.

**Mr. Ogletree** asked the Board that since they have seen the packet and understand it, is there anything they need further explanation on as it was explained to him because as it is drawn it was explained well by the staff.

**Mr. Lominack** said there is an issue with the Traffic Engineer.

**Mr. Ogletree** explained that the issue with the Traffic Engineer and with all due respect to Ms.



Michalak, she did not understand what the Traffic Engineer was trying to get across. He went to the Site Plan Review (SPR) meeting and what Cindy Cottingham was asking for or says is the requirement is from the back of sidewalk to basically the front of automobile on the lot has to be twenty-five feet (25') not the back of the sidewalk to the curb. He said that the intent is they are trying to make sure that the people can get their vehicles off the street and not block the sidewalk. Therefore, this complies. It is twenty-five feet (25') from the back of sidewalk to the front. He believes they call it the back of the driveway, but he believes it is the far end of the driveway. Therefore, it is in total compliance with what Cindy Cottingham requested on both Perry Street and McDonough Street.

**Mr. Engle** said he believes the biggest problem in the overall plan, and staff has identified it, there is no line of continuity and the twenty-five foot gaps between the buildings are not visually compatible with contributing structures in the district. Staff has identified this and when they call for a line of continuity, obviously, you cannot build a wall as staff has recommended or you can not get your cars into the parking space. Basically, this is what staff was saying. There is no line of continuity. This is like a suburban development and does not represent the Historic District.

**Mr. Ogletree** said he had some photographs that he sent today supporting the walls of continuity. He showed the photographs on the screen and pointed out that they show two buildings separated by approximately twenty (20) feet and their solution was to put a garage door in a stucco wall. This is a solution that would meet the wall of continuity intent, but he would say not very well. It does not do architectural justice to the Historic District.

**Mr. Ogletree** showed another example within the Historic District where two buildings are gaped similarly to what they have. They have straight in parking and put a covered parking pad here. He said that they are not trying to cover the parking pads, but it is fundamentally the same as what they have. He showed another set of buildings within the Historic District that have a gap. What is shown beyond is the back of the building behind or is a recessed wall.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Ogletree if this is Jones Street. Is this between Whitaker and Bull Streets?

**Mr. Ogletree** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** said he is very familiar with this building. It is unique in the district. The recessed part is an "L" shape townhouse. This is not similar to what Mr. Ogletree is saying. Basically, it is a side yard in the front half of the lot. He wanted the Board to be sure of what they are looking at.

**Mr. Ogletree** said the reason why he included this is because they are getting a visual block and, therefore, they don't see through the property. He said even though they do not have multiple stories visual block on their design, between the buildings they are proposing a full height first floor garden wall between the back-to-back court yards to give a visual block. This is an effort to mitigate this street line that they are discussing trying to give the line of continuity. The problem is that on lots such as this as it is a trust lot there are a lot of examples of what has been done. If you ride around and look at the area you will see that they have tried to put gates and other things on trust lots to try to give that line of continuity and have failed. The gates do not work; they swing out into the sidewalk. Nevertheless, there is a requirement that they put parking on the properties. He said that if it was not a requirement to have parking at all, then they could just do row houses. But, they are required to do the parking and they are trying their best to accommodate the parking in a sympathetic way. On trust lots you cannot put a complete solid wall and still get into the parking.

**Dr. Henry** said the first floor could be eliminated and turn that into a garage. Would that work?

**Mr. Ogletree** said the first two townhouses they built, they did an approach similar to that where they came in and turned ninety degrees and parked underneath. He said that the ordinance actually precludes this now. Therefore, they are hemmed in by the ordinance where they cannot actually do this any longer. What they have shown is the only thing that they can do to get off street parking. They are trying their best to accommodate all of the requirements. You can only do so much with those apartments.

**Mr. Ogletree** said the pictures that he has included shows that they are not the only projects in town that have had to do these sort of things where buildings are separated for whatever reasons. They are not a total anomaly to having separated buildings. This is the kind of discussion they were looking for because it is not an easy design solution and they need some feedback so they will know what to come back with. As he has said, they have to accommodate parking on the property. The only other outcome would be to cram all the buildings together and do an open parking lot which to him would lessen the look. The density of the lot would have a large open space in the middle and everyone would know that it is just a big open parking lot. Mr. Ogletree said to him, this is much worse than having a less in line of continuity.

**Dr. Williams** said he has seen with other trust lots that one street or the other was chosen as the front street and had parking in the rear.

**Mr. Lominack** said that Troup Row and Cohen Row are prime examples of that.

**Mr. Ogletree** said if the Board goes and look at these examples, they have the nice public side and a very bad rear side. There is nothing redeeming about that side because what has become of them is they have multiple garbage cans, motorcycles, cars and everything that you can imagine sitting behind those houses because everyone treats it as a service side.

**Mr. Lominack** said that this is not true in Troup Row and Cohen Row.

**Mr. Ogletree** said he is not sure about these, but he knows that there are multiple examples of that.

**Mr. Engle** said he begs to differ. Where are the people going to put all of their stuff here? He said there are no sheds and nowhere for the garbage cans. These are going to be both sides instead of one side. Trash cans will be sitting on the street and big wheels will be here. As he has said, it will be on both sides instead of the back side.

**Mr. Ogletree** said this is an enforcement issue. He said you will not have this if the people do what they should do. He showed a site plan and stated that these two townhomes do not have their trash cans sitting out on the street. They bring the trash cans into the service court yards that they have provided. The same thing should happen here if the people comply with what they are supposed to do which is to use these court yards for their service yards. Everything is off the street. If you do what was suggested of putting all of the frontage on one street, he can guarantee that the trash cans will sit on the street as this is what they do now. Mr. Ogletree said the trash cans and the infrastructure are being internalized into the lot rather than having it exposed to the public.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they agree with staff's

recommendation that the large spaces between the units are incompatible. It occurred to them as well that on many trust lots where you have multiple units as the Board has brought up, a lot of times they do face one street; parking and all the other uses are concentrated at the rear, which is another street technically because they are on trust lots, but she begs to differ that it can be done successfully. Ms. Meunier said on the other side of Crawford Square, the Board recently approved four (4) attached residences that face McDonough Street and on Hull Street on the rear as are all of the yards, parking and everything. They do have a privacy wall that creates a line of continuity along the back. She said that in terms of orientation and how these buildings are sited on this lot, she believes it might be more successful to concentrate them all to one side; in this case, have them all face McDonough Street and have the parking and so forth on the rear. She stated that if they look at the Sanborn Maps on this particular lot, this is how everything was developed. Everything was fronting McDonough Street and Houston Street.

**Ms. Meunier** said in general, the HSF believes that the proportions of the buildings are a little too tall and this further emphasizes these large spaces that are between, they think that the use of different roof forms on each building is a little inappropriate. They feel they should be simplified as specifically the center four units that are all attached have a side facing gable that is extremely tall. It is almost an entire floor height; it becomes the tallest building and looks very strange from the sides. Therefore, the HSF suggests reducing the number of different roof forms that are used and stick to one or two forms. They also agree with the staff's comment about doing just a very low pitched hip roofs or flat roofs with a parapet.

**Ms. Carmen Redmond** resides at 537 East Perry Street said the properties that are being suggested will be directly across the street from her. Ms. Redmond said that Perry Street is twenty-two feet wide; they are very close to that property. They also have eight (8) townhomes common walls that will be facing this property within this block. Whereas on McDonough, there is a four (4) unit apartment building and the side of the old funeral home which is now being turned into a residence. She said that if in fact it would be suggested that the backs of those new properties be put on Perry Street, there would be eight (8) families looking at the backs of those garages; plus the fact that they get wall-to-wall parking here everyday. Ms. Redmond said she knows this is not a part of the Board's purview, but they do have parking problems here. There would be no feasible way for them to be able to pull into a garage with any kind of parking on Perry Street. Parking is only allowed on the right-hand side because it is a one-way street.

**Ms. Redmond** additionally said that there is also more of a setback on McDonough Street if the Board notices on the drawing. She said that she went through the staff's recommendations and agrees wholeheartedly. She objects to the fencing and wall, even though she understands the talk about the visual continuity and she sees their point, but she also agrees that there is no off street parking if a wall is put here. Therefore, she does not know how this would work. Ms. Redmond said that Mr. Ogletree has worked with them in the past and has been very good as far as being involved with the community. She knows he wants to sell the property and she does not have an objection to what he is trying to do, but they just want to ensure that they get a good plan. Crawford Square is one of the few trust lots that is left. It is very active and is a well organized community and they want it to remain viable as a part of the historic area. The old drawings that Mr. Ogletree put forward had garages. They were more in compatibility to their present area.

**Ms. Laura Potts-Wirht** lives at 543 East Perry Street and owns 547 East Perry Street. They will be looking directly at this development from their parlor. She said that she is disappointed in this project and does not believe this height and mass of the proposed project is compatible with the historic district. Ms. Potts-Wirht believes the model that is shown, if they look around the neighborhood and square at the other height and mass of the buildings presented, the new development that is before them today is not compatible of the nearby structures or with the historic district. Ms. Potts-Wirht said she

also works in the Historic District and you feel this height and mass. There are not big gaps as in this project between the buildings. This is a short term project, but they will have to live with it for decades, possibly centuries, therefore, she believes that they should not say this is the best they can do. There are many examples of developments on trust lots, historic developments and newer developments that have better plans than this and have a better height and mass compatibility.

**Ms. Potts-Wirht** asked that this be seated and try to find something better. She said that Mr. Ogletree presented some photos of other properties in the Historic District that have larger gaps between the buildings, but she noticed that the development on McDonough Street between Price and Habersham Streets facing McDonough Street and Hull Street [close to the police station] was not included. This is a newer development that has been done. There are all kinds of problems with parking and lack of court yard space. She is aware that the Board does not get into parking, but she is sorry that those pictures were not included because they give a great example of how this type of a development with large gaps between the buildings does not work, beside not being compatible with height and mass.

**Ms. Potts-Wirht** said that Ms. Redmond mentioned that sometimes if the development faces one street or another, and as Historic Savannah Foundation representative mentioned, there is a larger turning radius on McDonough Street and it does seem to be better that if the back of the building has to be somewhere; it seems that McDonough would better. However, she believes that a better plan can be developed.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Ogletree if he wanted to comment to the public comments.

**Mr. Ogletree** stated that he wanted to make one comment. They started their first project that Ms. Pott-Wirht referred to between Price and Habersham Streets just after the Gararad project. The project keeps getting referred to as an unsuccessful project, but their project was not unsuccessful and everyone has given it good reviews. He believes that what has happened in a lot of cases is the people that came after that project are getting punished for the concepts that they did that were not followed through well. The gaps between those buildings between Price and Habersham Street are between nine foot - six inches (9.5) and ten (10) feet wide, which is an impossible situation for parking. They have curves that go up where you need a SUV or a jeep to get into those spaces. This is why he did not show a picture of that. It is a terrible example and he would never want to use that as an example of good planning.

**Mr. Ogletree** requested a continuance. He said that they have achieved what they were looking for from the Board which is the feedback. They don't have a reading from the Board as far as the developer goes. He does not know if they ever will because of the difficulty of these trust lots and the conflict between parking, parking with open space and the fact that they will always have a street that you address. He does not think there is a better solution than what they have proposed and he does not feel like he has gotten input from the Board that they think there is a better solution. They get the feedback that the Board does not like things, but this is the problem in this process. They go back with no guidance on what they can do to make it better.

**Mr. Lominack** informed Mr. Ogletree that the Review Board is not a design board. They do not provide architectural services. He said that a part of the problem that the design professional has to address in doing projects that have these criteria, is bringing them all together where they work. Mr. Lominack said he gets the consensus of the Board is that this does not really work very well. Beyond that, he does not believe that the Board can say do this or do. They could make a mistake because they did not have time to think about it that factually might not work at all.

**Mr. Ogletree** said the problem they have going away from this is the 2006 submittal was approved and it was fundamentally not different in one big way that has been discussed. There were 22 feet between the buildings in the previously approved design. It was unanimously approved. They go away from this now with 20 feet between buildings unanimously rejected. Basically, they have no direction because they have been rejected on one hand and unanimously approved on the other for something that is fundamentally the same.

**Mr. Ogletree** again requested a continuance and said he will meet with staff to try to resolve how they deal with these issues.

**Mr. Engle** said overwhelmingly, the Board agrees with the staff's comments.

**Mr. Howington** said maybe he overlooked the staff's comments, but besides the roof lines, there is also proportions of the buildings that sees like an issue to him. He said for example, the one on the trust lot is very narrow. It is 20 feet wide facing the square. The proportions are very tall and very skinny. As a designer, these are issues as well that he would look at in addition to the others.

**Mr. Lominack** said there is no reason to try to make all the units look different from each other. He said he could not help when looking at the elevations thinking that they look like a cartoon of historic buildings.

**Mr. Howington** stated that the unit on the opposite end of the block is successful. He said he guesses this was Mr. Ogletree's previous development. The proportions are wide and are more proportionally correct than these presented today.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Ogletree if his 2006 project was for six (6) units.

**Mr. Ogletree** answered yes.

**Mr. Engle** said the proposal now is for eight (8) units. May be the eight is pushing the envelope too much.

**Dr. Williams** said for further guidance since staff has suggested that if the petitioner was to realign all the buildings on one street; staff recommended fronting McDonough and the public has recommended fronting Perry Street. He said he thinks in context to seeking guidance an excellent precedent would be as mentioned by Mr. Lominack are the townhomes on East Charlton Street by Troup Square running east between Habersham and Price Streets.

**Mr. Ogletree** asked if these are ones next to Shavers.

**Ms. Ramsay** answered no. They are on Charlton Street.

**Dr. Williams** said he just wanted to make it clear that when the Board says they endorse the staff's comments, but on this specific comment he would be more inclined given the scale of the street and precedence, he thinks the best model is on Troup Square.

**Mr. Ogletree** thanked the Board for their comments as they were looking to get the Board's opinions as to where they should go with this. It is a difficult design problem when you are fronted by four streets.

**Board Action:**

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

1. Provide a rear (east) elevation of the buildings on Lots 7 and 8.
2. Provide the proposed roof pitch for the buildings on Lots 3-6.
3. Clarify the proposed roof type for the buildings located on Lots 7 and 8.

And to consider the following items:

1. Narrower spaces between buildings existed historically than proposed for this project and are not visually compatible with the open spaces between contributing buildings to which these buildings are visually related. (See comments below for proposed mitigation).
2. Historically and within this ward, a low stoop building form exists on lower two-story buildings. However, a few three-story buildings with low stoops (not ground level) exist within the district. The ground level has a higher visual height than the stories above when a low stoop is used.
3. High stoop buildings are historically, within this ward and throughout the district, three-stories and the ground level has a lower visual height than the second floor.
4. All Lots:
  - The first floor heights for all proposed buildings need to meet the 11 foot floor-to-floor height minimum on the second floor for the buildings with raised stoops.
  - The buildings with low stoops need to meet the 11 foot floor to-floor height minimum on the ground floor.
5. Lots 7 and 8: The ground floor is too tall (as described above) lower the string course. The sill should not exceed over the string course. - PASS  
Staff recommends reducing the second and third floor heights to 10 feet to result in an overall building height that is Visually Compatible.
6. High stoop and low stoops building forms to not have the same floor-to-floor heights.

7. Reduce the height of the buildings and alter roof shapes to provide more compatible proportions. Buildings appear too tall because of their narrow width, which, and as a result are not visually compatible to the contributing structures to which they are visually related. Heights are further emphasized because of the amount of open space between buildings.
8. Staff recommends adding one (1) step to the side of all of the low stoops.
9. Staff recommends redesigning the entry stoops to be visually compatible with porch projections on contributing structures. Increase the width/scale of the stoops to be more proportional with the front façade, reduce the height, and consider either completely connecting or disconnecting the two stoops.
10. Staff recommends changing the roof shape for the buildings on Lots 7 and 8 to a very low pitched hipped roof or a flat roof behind a parapet wall to lower the height and create proportions that are more compatible.
11. Staff recommends adding "walls of continuity" flush with the front facades in front of the open parking areas between each of the buildings. Walls that are as tall as the first level with help mitigate the "too tall" appearance of Units 1, 2, 7, and 8 in addition to creating a consistent wall of enclosure along all of the streets.
12. The sidewalk should serve as an uninterrupted path across the driveway.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Reed Engle

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

Robin Williams

- Aye

## VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

## IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

20. [Amended Petition of Whitlow Construction | H-12-4674-2 | 125 West Gordon St. |Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 125 West Gordon Street H-12-4674-2 Amended.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 125 W. Gordon Street H-12-4674-2 Amended.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

21. [Amended Petition of Whitlow Construction | H-4701\(S\)-2 | 125 West Gordon Lane |Staff Review - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 125 W. Gordon Lane H-12-4701\(S\) Amended.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 125 W. Gordon Lane H- 12-4701\(S\) Amended.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 13-000390-COA | 2 West Broughton St. |Staff Review - Recover Awning Frames](#)

Attachment: [COA - 2 West Broughton Street 13-000390-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 2 West Broughton Street 13-000390-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Sandy Portis for Coldwell Banker Platinum Partners |311A West Taylor St. | 13-000472-COA | Staff Review -Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 311A West Taylor St. 13-000472-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 311A West Taylor Street. 13-000472-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Matt West for J. T. Turner Construction Co., Inc. | 13-000498-COA | 200 West Harris St. |Staff Review - Existing Windows and Shutters](#)

Attachment: [COA - 200 West Harris Street 13-000498-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 200 West Harris Street 13-000498-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of Paul Bush | 13-000545-COA | 306 West Upper Factors Walk |Staff Review - Install Mounted Hood Exhaust Sytem](#)



Attachment: [COA - 306 West Upper Factors Walk 13-000545-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 306 West Upper Factors Walk 13-000545-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Jeff Hart | 13-000601-COA | 128 Habersham St. |Staff Review - Windows](#)

Attachment: [COA - 128 Habersham Street 13-000601-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 128 Habersham Street 13-000601-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Boyd Schalnat for Coastal Canvas Products | 13-000608-COA | 508 Factors Walk |Staff Review - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 508 East Factors Walk 13-000608-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 508 East Factors Walk 13-000608-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Natalie Aiken for SCAD | 13-000609-COA | 618 Drayton St. |Staff Review - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 618 Drayton Street 13-000609-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 618 Drayton Street - 13-000609-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Lisa Bolak for Savannah Rose | 13-000665-COA | 206 East Bay St. |Staff Review - Paint Signs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 206 East Bay Street - 13-000665-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 13-000665-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Adrienne Dickerson | 13-000684-COA | 608-610 Abercorn St. |Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 608-610 Abercorn Street 13-000684-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 608-610 Abercorn Street 13-000684-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Boyd Schalnat for Coastal Canvas Products | 13-000751-COA | 4 East Liberty St. |Staff Review - Recover Existing Awning Frame](#)

Attachment: [COA - 4 East Liberty Street 13-000751-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 4 East Liberty Street 13-000751-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Caitlin Moultroupe for City of Savannah Development Services | 13-000758-COA | 301 West Oglethorpe Ave. | Staff Review - Light Fixtures](#)

Attachment: [COA - 301 W. Oglethorpe Ave. 13-000758-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 301 W. Oglethorpe Avenue 13-000758-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Kathy Ledvina | 13-000798-COA | 1 East Broughton St. | Staff Review - New Awning Sign](#)

Attachment: [COA - 1 East Broughton St. 13-000798-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 1 East Broughton Street 13-000798-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Doug Patten for City of Savannah | 13-000850-COA | Abercorn St. Ramp | Staff Review - Remove Cementitious Repairs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 101 East Bay Street 13-000850-COA Abercorn Street Ramp.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 101 East Bay Street 13-000850-COA Abercorn Street Ramp.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Jenny and Blake Long | 13-000853-COA | 420 East Liberty St. | Staff Review - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 420 East Liberty Street 13-000853-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 420 E. Liberty Street 13-000853-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Lou Thomann | 13-000905-COA | 313 and 315 East York St. | Staff Review - Windows/Wood Siding](#)

Attachment: [COA - 313 and 315 East York Street 13-000905-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 313 and 315 East York Street 13-000905-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

**X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

37. [Report on work performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness through March 13, 2013](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Ward Work Without COA 3-13-13.pdf](#)

**XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF**

38. [Report on items deferred to staff through March 13, 2013](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Ward Items Deferred to Staff 3-13-13.pdf](#)

## XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

### Notices

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

**Ms. Ward** informed the Board that Board member Brian Judson resigned and his notice was accepted by City Council. A certificate of appreciation will be given to him in recognition of his service on the Review Board.

\*\*\*

**Ms. Ward** stated that she has been asked about the upcoming Preservation training. As the Board is aware, they do Spring training and Fall training every year. The Fall training will be held in Savannah. She has talked with the MPC's Controller and Executive Director about the training. She asked that the Board consider holding off going to the Spring training and they could potentially send more people to the Savannah training as it will be here and there would be no payment for travel or room and board. The training is scheduled for August 15. It will be a full day.

\*\*\*

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that since she has gotten a lot of questions about the demolition on Congress and Houston Streets, she asked the staff to address this.

**Ms. Ward** said this was on the Review Board's agenda either last month or the month before. This is a non-historic building. The Board will see the new construction proposal coming forward soon.

40. [Georgia State Historic Preservation Conference | April 26-27, 2013 in Milledgeville, Georgia](#)

41. [US/ICOMOS 16th Annual International Scientific Symposium | May 2-4, 2013 in Savannah, Georgia](#)

42. [HSF Savannah Preservation Festival, May 2013](#)

Attachment: [Historic Savannah Foundation, Re; 2013 Savannah Preservation Festival 021113.pdf](#)

### XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

#### New Business

43. [Proposed amendments to the Procedural Manual and By-laws](#)

Attachment: [DRAFT PROCEDURAL MANUAL and BYLAWS-2013.pdf](#)

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that they have in writing the new proposed amendment to the by-laws. She was hopeful that everybody was able to review them. The change to the by-laws is changing the Historic Review Board meeting time from 2:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.

**Ms. Ward** pointed out that the staff realized that internally the change would have an effect. The submittal time is also the same time as the meeting date which is 24 days in advance at 2:00 pm. Therefore, this will be adjusted to be consistent with this time. Ms. Ward said they may go to the cutoff as being 12:00 o'clock. Two o'clock is a little hard on staff because the majority of petitioners bring their applications in at 1:55 p.m. and all that time staff has to juggle going to lunch [whether or not they can]. Therefore, they usually go after 2:00 p.m. Therefore, if they can move this time up, it will actually help the staff and will be consistent with what they are doing with the time change.

**Ms. Ramsay** said someone might say that they have the old schedule.

**Ms. Ward** explained that if someone says they have the old schedule, staff will accept it. The new schedule time changes will be placed on the website and also sent to the regular petitioners.

**Ms. Simpson** said she likes the 12 o'clock cutoff.

**Ms. Ward** said she, too, likes the 12 o'clock cutoff. This will allow the staff to go to lunch and also the staff meets with the Board Chair to go through the packets. Also, it appears that there may be other members of the Board who want to join them and go through the packets. This will give them a little more time to review the packets instead of being rushed at the end of the day to get this completed with the two-hour time.

**Ms. Ward** explained that for Board members who are interested in preparing for the meetings, this is not the meeting to attend. This is the meeting where they quickly go through each of the packets to ensure that they are complete. She said if a Board member wants to come and look at files to prepare for the meeting, she suggested they wait until the week before the meeting once the staff's reports are out as they will the staff recommendation to help guide them through the packets. Once the agenda is released, they try to put all the files up at the front desk. The Board member does not need to meet with staff, but just come and review the files.

**Ms. Ward** said in meeting with Mr. Thomson on the time change, he said that his experience 1:00 p.m. can be tricky for people because you are just ending

your lunch hour. He suggested the meeting time be 1:15 p.m.

**Mr. Thomson** said this would give the Board members fifteen (15) minutes to get to the meeting after their lunch.

**Ms. Ramsay** explained that they have submitted it for 1:00 p.m. If they changed it to 1:15 p.m., could they still vote on it.

**Dr. Williams** asked what is the problem with 1:00 p.m.

**Ms. McClain** answered that people may be a little late coming back from lunch.

**Mr. Thomson** said he has experienced that with 1:00 o'clock meeting that it starts at 1:30 p.m. Therefore, if the Board wants their meetings to start at 1:30, start without a quorum or whatever, he was suggesting giving it a fifteen (15) minute grace period. Mr. Thomson said he was only making a suggestion. The Board can keep the 1:00 meeting time.

**Mr. Merriman** said the Board could try 1:00 p.m. and if that does not work, go to some other time.

**Mr. Engle** moved to have the Board new time at 1:00 p.m. This was seconded by Dr. Henry.

**Ms. Ward** stated that she believes the Board would need to rest a month on the by-laws change a month.

**Ms. Ramsay** explained that the change will not be next month. It will take effect in May.

**Mr. Engle** said they brought up the change time up at the last meeting.

**Ms. Ramsay** said it has to be a regularly scheduled meeting. Written notices will have to be brought up at a regularly scheduled meeting. She asked Mr. Engle to withdraw his motion.

**Ms. McClain** said the Board could vote on the new time at the meeting in April which will go in effect in May.

**Mr. Thomson** explained that it is true that the Board cannot amend its by-laws except by the procedures outlined in the by-laws, but they can set a time at the next meeting and advertise it for 1:00 o'clock. You would say in the ad, a special time or special meeting.

**Ms. Simpson** said she believes they should give everyone an opportunity as the people are use to the 2:00 time.

**Ms. McClain** said no; as long as the Board gives them fourteen (14) days in

accordance with the Board's by-laws. The agenda is advertised at least two weeks.

\*\*\*

**Mr. Engle** proposed that before an item can be moved from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda, the Board members should be given a 48 hour notice in advance. He brought this up because if they look at today's agenda, there were seven (7) things on today's Consent Agenda, one of which was a parking garage which they thought would require a lot of time to deal with. If the Board is given a 48 hours notice in advance, they would not have to review all those consent projects. As it is now, they really need to review them all intensely as somebody might say they want to put it on the regular agenda.

**Mr. Engle** said if they can get 48 hours notice, they know they do not have to read them and this would save them sometime to concentrate on the regular agenda items.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the staff was in agreement with this.

**Ms. Ward** stated that she believes this restricts the Board members more than having anything to do with staff. She said if a Board member does not get a chance to look at their packet the night before and finds that he/she wants to pull something, this restricts you from doing so.

**Mr. Merriman** said if working days are counted in the 48 hours, if you get the packet on Thursday afternoon, you have Friday, Monday and Tuesday.

**Ms. Ward** explained that staff could receive two letters the day of the meeting from the public and she would want to pull it that morning before she finalizes the agenda as she knows there is a public interest in it.

**Dr. Williams** asked that when Ms. Ward says pull it, is she saying pull it off the agenda.

**Ms. Ward** said pull it off the consent agenda and place it on the regular agenda. She explained that the items placed on the consent agenda are items that the staff has reviewed and in their opinion meet all the standards. They are usually simple projects and staff has received no public comments. If she gets one angry letter the day before that is actually relevant, but the comments are relevant to the design, it may be beneficial to pull that item and place it on the regular agenda.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes the Board needs to be able to remove the items if they feel they need to for some reason.

**Board Action:**

Special meeting at 1:00 p.m. to begin Regular Meeting early April 10, 2013. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

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

Robin Williams - Aye

**XIV. ADJOURNMENT**

44. [Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Ms. Ramsay adjourned the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah P. Ward  
Historic Preservation Director

SPW:mem

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