



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room 1:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

NOVEMBER 13, 2013 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Linda Ramsay, 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

HDRB Member Not Present: Ebony Simpson, Vice-Chair

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Call to Order and Welcome](#)

Ms. Ramsay called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. She outlined the purpose and role of the Historic District Board of Review.

Ms. Ramsay reported that a member of the Board wanted to make a statement prior to the official beginning of the meeting.

Mr. Jerry Lominack, Board member, stated that he has been a member of the Historic Review Board approximately 10 months. He said he previously served on this Board many years ago. Since he has been on this Board, he believes there is a recurring problem that

needs to be addressed not only by this Board but also by the people who are submitting projects.

Mr. Lominack said there are three proposed townhouse rows on today's agenda. All three have chosen to cast aside the opportunity to develop good 21st Century urban infill architecture to add to the richness of our Landmark Historic District. This has happened regularly since the time he has been on this Board. He is of the opinion that when taking the total district as a property, building new buildings that attempt to deceive the viewing public into thinking they are of another period is a distinct violation of the intent of the Secretary of Interior's Standards, specifically Standards 3 and 9. If one assumes that a Landmark Historic District, because it is a designation including the entire district, is an inclusive property or historic site, then the new buildings that look like they were of an earlier era create a false sense of historical development. He said that his partner refers to it as "faux old."

Mr. Lominack said he does not know if this is a short-coming of our ordinance, a misunderstanding of the intent of the ordinance, a fear of doing something new or just the easy way out. But, he sees it as a disservice and as disrespectful to the important historic buildings within the district to not add new structures that reflect the best of the 21st Century contemporary architecture to the mix. After all, those now historic structures were once new, too. He said his guess is the problem of the shortcoming of the ordinance which really has no section that addresses non-large scale new construction and leaves much to interpretation. In fact, the ordinance can easily be interpreted as providing a prescription for doing copies of older buildings rather than appropriate new buildings.

Mr. Lominack said, they, as a Board, have a responsibility to not only protect our past architectural history, but also to insure our future architectural history. While we have been pretty successful in the first of these, they have been less successful in the second. He stated that he believes they need to correct this before it is too late, if it is not already too late.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Ramsay if the Board would discuss Mr. Lominack's statement now.

Ms. Ramsay said that the Board would discuss the statement later.

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

2. [Petition of Nathan Godley | 13-004373-COA | 322 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Column Details](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report- Column details.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [9-11-13 Board Decision.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the column details because it meets the design standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

3. [Petition of Margaret Adler | 13-005183-COA | 7 East Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use fascia sign, for the business located at 7 East Broughton Street, as requested because it meets the sign standards and is visually compatible, with the following conditions:

1. The existing sign face approved by staff on October 8, 2013 [File No. 13-005182-COA] must be removed following the installation of the principal use fascia sign. - PASS
2. Paint the discolored area on the façade where the “Tea Room” sign was removed.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

4. [Petition of Eric Meyerhoff | 13-005273-COA | 223 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 223 MLK Jr. Blvd 13-005273-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation - 223 MLK Jr. Blvd. 13-005273-COA.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use sign at 223 MLK Jr. Blvd. because it meets the standards and is compatible in design with the surrounding structures. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

5. [Petition of Michael J. Rhee | 13-005417-COA | 25 W. Broughton St. | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 25 West Broughton Street 13-005417-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation - 25 West Broughton Street.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use sign at 25 West Broughton Street as requested because it meets the standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

6. [Petition of Lott + Barber | 13-005461-COA | 214 Drayton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the paint color change, the relocation and illumination of the existing sign, and the installation of the new sign because the project is visually compatible, and meets the sign standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

7. [Petition of Eric O'Neill for Greenline Architecture | 13-005462-COA | 10 East Taylor Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Ortho-Zoning-Imagery -5462.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps -5462.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Board Action:

Approval of the light monitor to the non-historic addition of 10 East Taylor Street with the condition that the fiber cement siding and trim have a smooth finish because it is visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

8. [Petition of Monica Mastrianni | 13-005463-COA | 219 East Gaston Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for a seven foot (7') high wood fence at the lane, a nine foot-six inch (9'-6") high fence at the west property line, screening for the service panel, and a gravel parking area at the lane with the following conditions:

1. Submit the proposed paint color selections for the fenced to staff for final review and approval. - PASS
2. Ensure that the proposed gravel parking area on the lane side of the fence is installed a minimum of 18 inches from the lane.
3. Screen the trash/recycling area at the lane side of the proposed fence and submit to staff for final review and approval.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

9. [Petition of Doug Bean | 13-005464-COA | 304 East Broughton St. | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 13-005464-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 13-005464-COA.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use signs as requested at 304 East Broughton because they meet the standards. - PASS

Vote Results

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

10. [Petition of Doug Bean | 13-005465-COA | 215 W. Liberty St. | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use sign as requested at 215 West Liberty Street because the sign meets the standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

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

11. [Petition of Dominic Ross | 13-005490-COA | 100 E. Bryan St. | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use projecting signs as requested at 100 East Bryan Street because they are visually compatible and meet the sign standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

12. [Petition of Dominic Ross | 13-005492-COA | 100 E. State St. | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use projecting sign as requested at 100 East State Street because it is visually compatible and meets the sign standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

13. [Approve Agenda](#)

Board Action:

Approval of Agenda for Meeting of November 13, 2013 - PASS

Vote Results

Motion:

Second:

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

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

14. [Approve October 9, 2013 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [10-09-2013 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve October 9, 2013 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Nicholas Henry

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

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

15. [Petition of Royal Bike Taxi | 13-004868-COA | 321 West River Street | Alteration](#)

Board Action:

Continue to December 11, 2013. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

16. [Petition of Becky Lynch, Lynch Associates Architects, PC | 13-004879-COA | 546 East Harris Street | New Construction Part 2 Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal packet- narrative and specifications.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Ortho-Imagery -004879.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps -004879.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction, Part 2 Design Details of a single family residence and carriage house at 546 East Harris Street. The property is located on a vacant lot bound on the east and west by the existing buildings, by East Harris Street on the south, and by East Liberty Lane on the north. The building is oriented to face East Harris Street as do the other existing building within the block face.

Ms. Harris said that the Board approved Part I, Height and Mass on October 9, 2013 with the following conditions to be resubmitted with Part II, Design Details:

1. Provide additional dimensions on the portico projection;
2. Provide clarification as to how this building will connect, it at all, to the adjacent building to the west;
3. Restudy the horizontal alignment of the building to the adjacent buildings;

4. Revise the roof shape of the carriage house to be flat with parapet; and
5. Relocate the condenser units within the courtyard or screen from view.

Ms. Harris passed the revised model to the Board that showed the recommended changes. She reported that staff recommends approval for Part 2, Design Details with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit:

1. Color samples;
2. Ensure the hardi plank has a smooth finish;
3. Replace the square window on the front façade with a window that meets the 5:3 ratio;
4. Ensure the fire rated windows use ceramic glazing as opposed to wire glass;
5. Ensure the stoop is constructed of stucco. If piers are utilized, infill between the piers should be recessed; and
6. Extend the stair railings to enclose the stoop.

Dr. Henry asked if there is space between the new and old building.

Ms. Harris answered that she believes there is six inches between the new building and old building. However, the petitioner will be able to address this question. She does not believe that the two buildings will be touching each other.

Dr. Henry asked that regarding the roof, he does not understand the triangle point of it.

Ms. Harris explained that it is a fire wall.

Mr. Lominack asked why staff interpreted the square window over the door as not being an accent window.

Ms. Harris answered that this is a good question. The petitioner believes it is an accent window and she has been looking at the ordinances for guidance to see if accent windows are defined. Ms. Harris said from a common sense perspective [this is her own personal sense perspective and the Board may disagree with her], but she thinks of an accent window as one that accentuates a particular architecture feature or exists where a regular window may not exist. For example, going up a stairwell, etc. This was not the case with this window. Therefore, staff felt that it did not meet the intent of an accent window.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Lynch came forward and thanked the Board for considering their project today. They have no problem complying with staff's recommendations submitting color samples, the hardi plank will be smooth, they are happy to use ceramic glazing for the fire rated windows; they clarify that the stoop base will be constructed of stucco and the decking will be wood as well as the stairs. Ms. Lynch said they are happy to extend the stair railings to enclose the stoop. They have not done so as it was not required by code, however, they are happy to do so for visual compatibility.

Ms. Lynch said the only item they would like the Board to consider is that they actually intended for the square windows as Mr. Lominack indicated to be an accent window. She understood that there are different definitions that defines an accent window. However, they meant for it be just a design feature that was typical of the rest of the designs;

something to just give it a little bit more visual interest. She said they feel that the design is stronger with it being a square window. Obviously, they can comply and make the window a 5:3 ratio window, but they feel it would be a little less interesting and would, therefore, like for the Board to consider the option of keeping it as a square window.

Mr. Lominack asked Ms. Lynch if she would consider putting another control joint on the right-hand side of the square window and door.

Ms. Lynch said yes. They were trying to decide on the portions of the control joints. If this is something that the Board feels strongly about, they have no objections.

Mr. Engle said he is not as concerned with the square window because as he scales and reads it, it is about two or three inches too low to meet the horizontal on the buildings to the left. Maybe if it was kicked up so that it was on the same horizontal line as those three double sashes on the adjacent building, it would not be quite as jarring.

Ms. Lynch explained that they have a ten foot floor-to-floor dimension on both floors. They feel this is pretty generous for a house of this character. Actually, as they discussed briefly at the last meeting, the house immediately to the left has windows that are a little higher, but the house next to this has windows that are a little lower. They feel that not all the windows on the street will be lined up exactly. However, they tried to address the fact that originally they had shown them to be 8 feet single windows and now they have divided them with a sill that would be more indicative of the proportion of the other windows on the street. Ms. Lynch said they were trying to bring in the portions not exactly, but work with the proportions of the other buildings on the street without feeling that it was necessary to align it directly with the house next door. In a way this would be a little arbitrary because the two sister houses do not line up with each other.

Mr. Engle said it looks like just a two inch bump up would bring this into alignment. Basically, it is aligned with the underside of the sill and not with the void of the sash if he was scaling it correctly.

Mr. Howington asked if the stringcourse projects on the western side as well.

Ms. Lynch answered no. The building is the full 20 feet side-to-side of the property. Therefore, they did not want to extend in anyway either side of the property line. Therefore, it will only be a coursing line on the size of the building for the base, but it will project on the front and back.

Mr. Howington said he was curious as to what color the firewall would be painted. Will it be the same color as the building?

Ms. Lynch answered yes. The parapet wall will be stucco. But, the bay window and front door will probably have an accent color. They will submit all the colors to staff.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked if the stringcourse will be stucco as well.

Ms. Lynch answered yes. It is just a stucco projection about the dimension of a brick.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Roy Sollinger of 544 East Harris Street said he wanted clarification on two questions. He asked if the windows on the east side are on the zero lot line.

Ms. Harris answered that the windows are on the lot line.

Mr. Sollinger asked that the building being constructed at 546 East Harris Street will not touch the residence at 544 East Harris Street.

Ms. Harris answered that this is her understanding.

Mr. Sollinger asked what is the separation.

Ms. Ramsay answered that it has been reported that the separation is six inches.

Mr. Sollinger asked that it will be inches from his property! Okay. Thank you very much.

Ms. Ramsay asked Ms. Lynch if she wanted to respond to the public comments.

Ms. Lynch responded that the easternmost windows are on the property line which is why they are fire rated and the neighboring house is setback six inches from both property lines. Therefore, this is where the gap comes in; but their roof will probably intersect their parapet wall.

Board Action:

Approval for Part 2, Design Details, with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit because the project meets the design standards and is visually compatible:

1. Add control joints to the right of the square window;
2. Adjust the square window height to align with the bottom of the window on the adjacent structure; - PASS
3. Provide color samples;
4. Ensure the hardi plank has a smooth finish;
5. Ensure the fire rated windows use ceramic glazing as opposed to wire glass;
6. Ensure the stoop is constructed of stucco. If piers are utilized, infill between the piers should be recessed; and
7. Extend the stair railings to enclose the stoop.

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington
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
Robin Williams	- Aye

17. [Petition of Penny Johnson | 13-005424-COA | 417 East Taylor Street | Siding Replacement](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Photographs Before Work Began - Provided by Staff.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Ms. Penny Johnson was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to remove all of the asbestos siding and all of the wood clapboard siding beneath. The siding is proposed to be replaced with Hardi Plank Lap Siding (fiber cement siding) with a 5 1/4 inch exposure and "Select Cedarmill" finish (wood grain texture). The existing siding has many holes from former pipes, ductwork, vents, wires, and animals. Ms. Michalak said that the petitioner/owner has begun replacing the siding with Hardi Plank Lap Siding (fiber cement siding) on the rear of the building, which faces East Wayne Street, and is visible from the public right-of-way. She said that on June 12, 2013 the Board approved a stucco privacy wall and staff issued a COA for a variety of exterior alterations including: color change, window replacement, door replacement, gutter and downspout replacement, awning removal, glass replacement, and soffit repair.

Ms. Michalak stated that although certain building materials are prescribed herein, the Board may approve alternative materials that are not listed as prohibited upon a showing by the petitioner that the material or product is visually compatible with historic building materials and has performed satisfactorily in the local climate.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends denial to remove all of the asbestos siding, and wood clapboard siding beneath, and replace it with Hardi Plank Lap Siding (fiber cement siding) with a 5 1/4 inch exposure and "select Cedarmill" finish (wood grain texture) because Hardi Plank is not visually compatible, and does not meet the design and preservation standards. The use of fiber cement siding is prohibited on historic buildings as a replacement for existing wood siding.

Ms. Michalak reported additionally that staff recommends that if the asbestos siding is removed, that the wood siding below be retained and be repaired, patched, and restored where needed.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Johnson said she is the owner of the house in question. She purchased the house in

December, 2012. She did not put asbestos siding on the house, but it was on there when she bought it. She did not paint the house orange. It was painted orange when she bought it. She had every intention of making the house compatible and living happily in the Historic District. Ms. Johnson said, therefore, she is somewhat lost to understanding various aspects of what is going on.

Ms. Johnson said she appreciates the Board hearing her request, letting her ask questions and she will try to respond properly to the Board's questions. She does not know when the asbestos siding was put on the house; her guess is it was put on in the 1940s or 1950s. It is in very bad shape. There are lots of holes, wires, pipes on the outside of the house that are no longer used, and visually the house is no longer attractive.

Ms. Johnson stated that she had some pictures she wanted the Board to see. She stated that she requests a change in her original submission of the hardi plank. She submitted a board that is 5 1/4 inch; however, those boards overlap and are made to do so. The overlap results in a 4 1/2 lap which matches the neighbor's home that is painted reddish and the other home next door to her home painted gray. She pointed out the front view of her home. The house on the left has the same floor plan as the house on the right and her house. This house has asbestos siding also and is in such needed repair that it is under abatement.

Ms. Johnson said she wanted to bring to the Board's attention that this is not a row, but three homes that originally were the same with lap wooden siding. Since she has been here today she has heard that hardi plank is used in the Historic District on occasions for appropriate reasons and appropriate situations. Therefore, she does not believe that this is a product that is new to the Board. It has been used in this climate very successfully for a number of years and she believes it is worth considering use in this case. When she initially applied to do various things and they started taking out the old windows on the rear of the home, they found that the termite damage was very significant. Almost nothing was left. It was amazing how much damage there was that was absolutely not possible to see until something was taken out. Then it became evident of the damage that was there. Consequently, she is fearful and believes properly so that if the asbestos siding is removed [she believes the siding should be removed] there will not be anything there to nail to.

Ms. Johnson said the staff gave her permission to go a head and put the hardi plank up on the rear as far as she needed to because they could see that the bottom of the siding was badly destroyed. They all agreed that it could not visually be seen from the lane. There was nothing to hold the windows up unless they extended that to nail to the studs enough to get to the windows. This is how it happened and was not intentionally that it be visible from the street. Her neighbors appeared to be delighted to have it here; they are not delighted to have the asbestos siding to continue to be here if it can be avoided. Because of the looks of the hardi board that is smooth and because of the reveal that would be the same, in her mind she believes the hardi board would be much more compatible than what now exists. This is the overriding reason that she wants to do it. She is certainly not over-anxious to spend the money, but believes it is necessary to get the result they want. Ms. Johnson said she has lived in Savannah a long time. She was away for 15 years, is now back. She is grateful for what the Historic Review Board does and she wants to do the right thing. The product she wants to use is fire resistant, holds paint much better and longer than old wood. It also fades much less than paint on very old wood.

Ms. Johnson said she believes appearance is very important. Someone mentioned the quality of life for those surrounding and she believes it is very real on her block. The two homes [the home to the left of her and her home] are the only two homes in the block that are really not well restored at this point in time. Ms. Johnson stated that she believes not only for the residents, but for all the people of Savannah they want to be proud of their district and they are proud of their district. They know lots of tourists come here, it is important to the economy and they know that it is important that they have this input for many years; she supports those efforts. Ms. Johnson stated again that she has noticed that hardi plank is used in the Historic District and she would like equal treatment in this regard. She has listened very carefully in both the federal and the local ordinance and it is her opinion that this Board has the power to decide if the Hardi Plank can be used in certain situations. She does not believe that her alternatives are pleasing to any of them. The most obvious that would be pleasing to many people in the community would be simply to change the City ordinance and allow City Council, this Board or somebody to use modern materials, when appropriate, to enhance the Historic District. If this is allowed, she does not believe that they would end up with repairs that has to be done. The look is not good and she does not believe that it shows our city to its best advantage and it certainly does not make the residents living in those homes feel as if they are doing the right thing. Therefore, she would like to see the ordinance changed.

Ms. Johnson said she has been told that she can delist her house from being a rated structure, but she does not know what all this implies as she did not buy the home because it was a rated structure. She is not expecting anything that it is now rated versus that it may not be rated in the future or she can just do nothing. However, she does not think this is a good alternative.

Mr. Engle said he does not believe that anyone told Ms. Johnson that she has to keep the asbestos siding.

Ms. Johnson said if she removes the asbestos siding and if everything underneath is rotten and has to repair what is there, she would have a mess.

Mr. Engle said it is highly unlikely that everything under the asbestos siding would be rotten. He explained that the Secretary of Interior's Standards are fairly explicit of replacing in-kind and Ms. Johnson is making the assumption that she is going to take off all the historic siding and replace it with the material that did not exist. This is not replacement in-kind. Mr. Engle said Ms. Johnson may only have to replace about four or five boards here, which is a typical situation.

Ms. Johnson said this is what they believed would happen on the back, but it did not.

Mr. Engle said if the asbestos siding was not here, it could have been better expected to see that termites were there.

Ms. Johnson said the same thing applies to the sides of the house now.

Mr. Howington asked Ms. Johnson if she is against wood siding.

Ms. Johnson answered no; she likes wood siding.

Mr. Howington stated that he is a fan of Hardi siding in most situations. The Hardi board is allowed on new construction and it is allowed in the Historic District and they heard during an earlier petition that it was allowed on a new construction and more modern interpretations that are new. However, the ordinance explicitly states that Hardi siding cannot be used on Historic structures and, therefore, to vote against this would put this Board in a bind for future situations where they would end up with Hardi siding on every possible historic structure or other situations.

Mr. Howington told Ms. Johnson that he empathizes with her and understands where she is coming from. He believes the Hardi siding is a good product, but the Board is in a situation where it is not appropriate for a historic building. The embodied energy of the wood siding is consistent with the historic wood structure. But, the hardi plank goes against the ordinance and the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Therefore, to vote favorably for this would be voting for things in the future that could cause situations that would not be good.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated they agree with staff that it is not appropriate to use Hardi Plank siding in this manner on a historic building to wholly replace the historic wood siding with the cementitious material. It does not meet the ordinance. If the asbestos was to be removed in-kind, full Hardi Plank replacement is not acceptable.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said the historic siding on this building may be fine and to approve the entire replacement without knowing this fact would go against the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked if the entire building is historic.

Ms. Michalak answered that in accordance with the adopted map, the entire building is contributing.

Mr. Lominack asked if the Zoning Board of Appeals would need to approve a variance for the petitioner to use the Hardi Plank.

Ms. Harris explained that the Zoning Board of Appeals could grant a variance from the specific standard, but it would still need to come to the Historic Review Board first to make a finding of fact that it is visually compatible and that they would support it or not support it to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Engle said the bottom line is with the Landmark District the Historic Board of Review's purpose is to preserve it. Preservation means replacement in-kind. He said if they were to allow to this, he guarantees that within twenty years there would not be a building with historic siding on a building. The hardi plank looks different; it takes paint differently, reflects differently and it is not the same thickness as it is half the thickness of wood siding. Therefore, the shadow lines are different. This is just not the same material

and it can be picked out a block away.

Mr. Merriman agreed with Mr. Engle and said there is no substitute for wood. Wood has a beauty all of its own.

Mr. Engle explained that wood siding takes a responsibility; this Board has been through this issue many times and many applicants have been denied in the past. There is only one case that he is aware of where a building was delisted. The building was listed at the owner's request when the MPC did not want to list the building historical because they did not feel the building had integrity. The owner came back three years later and decided he wanted to delist the building and City Council approved it. To his knowledge, this is the only time this has ever happened.

Board Action:

Deny the removal of all the asbestos siding and wood clapboard siding beneath to replace it with Hardi Plank Lap Siding (fiber cement siding) because Hardi Plank is not visually compatible, does not meet the design standards, and does not meet Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2, 5, and 6. The use of fiber cement siding is prohibited on historic buildings as a replacement for existing wood siding. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

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
Robin Williams	- Aye

18. [Petition of Harley Krinsky | 13-005451-COA | 411 West Congress Street | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Zoning Administrator Determination.pdf](#)

Mr. Tim Gordon was present on behalf of the petition.

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

approval for the installation of signs for the business located at 411 West Congress Street. She said that staff was contacted regarding several signs that were installed at the social club without a Certificate of Appropriateness. Ms. Michalak said the Zoning Administrator provided a determination for each of the signs, requiring that the additional principal use projecting sign, the principal use fascia sign, one announcement sign, and the banner be removed. The building identification sign and the one announcement sign were permitted, but required a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval of two building identification signs, one announcement (menu) sign, and one supplemental identification sign as requested because they meet the sign standards, preservation standards, and are visually compatible with the conditions that the principal use fascia sign on the wall in the courtyard, all banners, and the second announcement (menu) sign under the grilling area be removed, and the existing secondary freestanding sign pole be removed.

Dr. Henry stated he believes six signs are here now. How many signs will remain?

Ms. Michalak pointed out the signs that will remain.

Mr. Merriman asked that the sign with seven on it, did the Board approve it or not.

Dr. Henry said Mr. Goins took out three of the seven signs. The signs need to be brought into compliance or removed. Is the staff on the same page as the Zoning Administrator?

Ms. Michalak answered yes; this was staff 's initial determination as well. The applicant wanted an official determination. The Zoning Administrator made the same determination in writing and basically pointed out the signs that could not exist. The Zoning Administrator also in his determination pointed out the signs that could remain, and advised the petitioner that he needed to apply for the signs.

Dr. Henry asked how many signs will remain here?

Ms. Michalak answered that five signs will be here. They all are permitted by the Sign Ordinance.

Mr. Engle asked that normally don't they try to coordinate the appearance of the signs.

Ms. Michalak answered that when they are finished, they will be coordinated. The logos and the colors will be the same.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Gordon came forward and introduced himself.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval of two building identification signs, one announcement (menu) sign, and one supplemental identification as requested because they meet the sign standards, preservation standards, and are visually compatible with the following conditions:

1. That the principal use fascia sign on the wall in the courtyard, all banners, and the second announcement (menu) sign under the grilling area be removed. - PASS
2. That the existing secondary freestanding sign pole be removed.

Vote Results

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Robin Williams

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
Robin Williams	- Aye

19. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 13-005456-COA | 0 Alice Street | New Construction Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction Part I, Height and Mass, of five attached row houses at 0 Alice Street, between Jefferson and Montgomery Streets, and Alice and Gaston Streets. The buildings are oriented to front Alice Street. The proposed row houses will be two stories tall. As part of this development, the parcel will be subdivided into five parcels. She passed the model to the Board for their review.

Ms. Harris said a project for this site was reviewed by the Board on July 10, 2013 which at that time consisted of four detached single-family dwellings. At that time, the petitioner requested a continuance in order to restudy the Board's concerns which primarily focused on building form and the identical configuration of the buildings. On August 14, 2013, the Board reviewed a revised proposal for the site which included two detached two-story single family dwellings and one attached duplex. This application was denied primarily

because of the building form.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass for five attached row houses at 0 Alice Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part 2: Design Details:

1. Reduce the height of the parapet wall and simplify the gable element to be visually compatible;
2. Increase the foundation and floor to floor heights to provide greater verticality to the buildings, if the parapet wall is reduced;
3. Eliminate the transom windows on the first floor, north façade and enlarge the 24 inch wide window to 36 inches wide, or change to a door opening;
4. Add an additional window per floor on east and west facades.
5. Utilize the three bay pattern on the rear of the interior buildings, similar to or matching the eastern and western buildings;
6. Provide more substantial columns on the front porches and revise the roof shape to have a less steep slope, or eliminating the railing;
7. Center all rear stoops and reduce the mass of the rear portico roofs;
8. Incorporate gates along Gaston Street;
9. Ensure that the string course and coping is continuous (consider either eliminating the pilasters or stopping them at the bottom of the stringcourse) and eliminate the triangular caps on the pilasters;
10. In Part 2: Design Details, provide additional details regarding the fence, access to parking, and electrical meter locations.

Dr. Henry said this proposal is an improvement. However, staff has made many suggestions. This is a lot.

Ms. Harris said she believes that most of the staff's recommendations could be incorporated in the design detail. It is always a "grey" area where Part I, Height and Mass, start and Part II, Design Details, begin. She feels that many of the staff's comments could be addressed in the Design Details part of the proposal.

Mr. Howington asked if there are any examples of the tripart of the three windows on the ground floor. He realizes that the transom above was mentioned, but it seems conflicting to him as this is not a bay window, not a storefront, and is not actually what they will see on 1800 and 1900 buildings.

Ms. Harris answered that she does not have a specific example in mind, but felt that it is visually compatible.

Mr. Engle asked staff if they were okay with the four-over-two; one-over-one; and four-over-two.

Ms. Harris said she tried not to get into too much of the design details, but addressed it where she could do so, recognizing that this is a design detail part of the proposal.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay stated that Ms. Maggie Ward, Dave Moore, his client and the client's attorney, Mr. Harold Yellin, were accompanying him at today's meeting. Mr. Shay said he would

like to respectfully agree to many of the things that are included in the staff's recommendations, but not all of them. He wanted to remind the Board that today they are looking at Part I, Height and Mass. They welcome the opportunity for the Board's input, but they do not want to be denied the opportunity to research that in the Design Details where it is properly presented and approved.

Mr. Shay said he wanted to present to the Board some other buildings that are in their ward or adjacent ward, and therefore meets the definition of visually related. All of these are contributing structures, and although none of them are identical to the condition he will present today, he would respectfully point out that this area does not have a lot of fabric left. What is left is very worthy, but he does not have hundreds of examples to choose from. He pointed out a building that is nearby. This building has an upper story that is residential; the building is brick and has a vertical expression with pilasters that interrupt the stringcourse. They are actually flush with it in some areas; it also has some articulations that goes above the parapet. Some of this might have been chimneys at one time. At least one looks like it has a flue cap. But, he does not believe that all of them were functioning chimney flue. They believe that this is important.

Mr. Shay stated that when the Board looks at the photograph, he wants them to consider that when they think of the parapet, even they do not know where the roofline is behind that, think of the parapet as being the visual expression that goes from the stringcourse up to the top of the coping. It is not from where the ceiling is or even where the roof is in the room behind it. Immediately adjacent to the proposed building, a little one story building is here. Mr. Shay said he points this out to only say what he found was that the idea of articulating the parapet instead of having it level and flat is actually the norm in this area and not an exception to the rule.

Mr. Shay said another building that he found particularly instructive is nearby and has on the upper floors residential and also has an articulated parapet. In this case, the pilasters look like they support the stringcourse more like a classical building wanting to do, but it is interrupted. The designer had some fun with it and interrupted and articulated it with some false chimneys and added a gable from the center. He said that they are not saying that they want to copy this, but he just wants the Board to know that in the area towards where these buildings are visually related, there are contributing historical structures which use some of the same kinds of techniques. He said also two blocks away is the closest where he can actually find actual row housing. It is only a pair of buildings that you can see that in this particular case it has an articulated parapet and it is difficult to discern where the roofline or where the ceiling line of the space on the top floor is, but reads as the parapet is the distance from the corbeling to the coping.

Mr. Shay stated that when they submitted this petition, they made a line on their plan that said "roof" as if the roof was flat behind the parapet elevation. They did a building section that showed that the roof was sloped. But, the line that they showed was actually a little bit lower than what the lowest portion of the roof is. He does not know if it had a dimension over five feet, but he believes this could have mislead staff; but, they did not say that the parapet was five feet tall, they only wanted to make mention to say that there is the top of the parapet and this is the top of the roof from this end of the building. The back side shows that the roof actually goes all the way down. Therefore, they are asking that they not have to play games with how high the parapet is. The expression that they have presented to

the Board today does in fact have a distance from the bottom of where the corbeling begins to the top and it is not outlandish. It is only about three feet and this is the visual expression of the parapet regardless of where the roofline is behind it or where the ceiling line is behind that.

Mr. Shay said on the issue of the window that is over the stoops in the front. They wanted to do something to call attention to the fact that it is not a standard one, two, three window rhythm and to compositionally offset the fact that this is a variation in the one, two, three rhythm. It is also from a functional standpoint that the window opens into a master closet. Therefore, they want something that is a little narrower. But, if the Board tells them that they want them to make the window three feet wide so that it does not look as an outlier, they do not have any objection to this, but he would respectfully like to hear the Board's thoughts on this as well as staff's thoughts. He said on the rear of the building, he believes he was able to do a bad drawing of what he now understands after having heard staff explain it; what the idea was for the rear of the building, the bookends [he calls them] have one, two, three - one, two, three below it and the center sections have four windows above it and this is very important to the functionality of those units. Mr. Shay said because in floor plans and in exceeding to this Board's desire that they do a row house rather than what his client really wanted to do, whereas before they had units that had windows on the side, front and back. They were either detached or in duplexes, but now that they become row houses, there will be no windows on the side. The floor plan shows on the upper floor, his client would like to have a three bedroom dwelling. On the ends, they can do a bedroom on the side because there is a place for a window. When you go up to the second floor in the middle, he does not have this option because bedrooms have to have windows. Therefore, there are two bedrooms side-by-side in the back and they are already very narrow. They are only a little over ten feet wide and this is marginal, but he believes it would still be great for a lot of people. However, as the Board sees, this leaves them with four windows along that end as opposed to three. Mr. Shay said that three windows would be difficult to match up.

Mr. Shay said if he understands the staff's recommendation instead of having the windows vertically aligned as they proposed that they do three wide with four above. He believes this will look fine and they do not have any objections to this. He wants the Board to let him know if they concur with this view before they make the change.

Mr. Shay stated that the horizontal or vertical expression of the building is vertical is 22 feet wide and 28 feet high, plus or minus an inch or two. They believe the pilasters that divide the façade into clearly discernible units add to this. They believe that removing those would cause it to be much less vertical expression. They also used the transoms deliberately to increase the vertical expression by having more emphasis on the lower levels so that your eyes would be drawn up and to clearly differentiate between the height of the windows on the ground floor and on the second floor. However, if it is the Board's strong belief that those transoms are somehow making this building be incompatible, they would not propose to lower the head height; but they would simply eliminate the transoms and make the windows tall.

Mr. Shay explained that on the side elevations, he understands that the staff's desire is to have another row of windows there. But, he has a functional issue with this on the second floor. He supposes they can add windows in there that really are not windows. They would look like windows from the outside, but do not function as windows on the inside. Mr.

Shay stated, however, he does not like doing this. They could add openings that he has used on other projects in order to be able to deal with this issue. It looks like a window was there once and has been bricked up. He believes this adds to the confusion that Mr. Lominack seems to be concerned about as you are making it look like there was something there a long time ago, but then got bricked up. Mr. Shay said he wanted to point out that earlier [he knows this is not a precedent], the Board approved a petition that only had two windows on the whole side. Therefore, the requirement that there be a minimum spacing between windows sometimes hold and sometimes does not. However, they will defer to the Board's judgment. If it is their judgment that they have to add windows on that side, then he will assure the Board that when they come back for Part II, Design Details, they will look at something that looks like a window. Mr. Shay said he does not know if it would actually open it into the shower stall on the inside of the building, but they will do whatever they can to accommodate the Board's desire in this regard. He said in looking at the staff's report, it says over and over that the standard is met.

Mr. Shay said with regards to the fencing, if it is the Board's desire that they be made to add gates in the opening, they will do so. The City's Traffic Engineer had some problems with it. But, they will straddle this issue as best they can. The Engineer is concerned that people might have to navigate and stop traffic before they will be able to open the gates and get in and out. Gaston Street is one of the main thoroughfares that I-16 drops off traffic in this area. However, if it is the Board's decision that this is the way the project needs to go, then let him know so that he can go back to the Traffic Engineer and let him know that the Historic Review Board said they have to have it. They will figure out a way to navigate this forward. The site plan does show where they suspect the mechanical units will be located and where the electrical meters will be located. Over and over, the staff's report says that these are things that generally are presented during Design Detail. But, they appreciate the fact that they are getting heads up on these so that when they come back for the design details they can assure that the standards are met.

Mr. Shay stated that he believes he has covered the staff report. He said that Dr. Henry is right that there are a lot of conditions in the staff report. Almost all of the conditions need to be addressed in Part II, Design Detail. Mr. Shay said that the visual expression of this is without a doubt vertical where the finished floor elevation is on the inside of the building is difficult for him to actually visually express. They have chosen to show the Board a vertical composition and they prefer not to add height to rooms on the inside of the building which has nothing to do with the expression on the façade. As he has said, if it is the Board's considered opinion that the transom windows are incompatible, then they will certainly eliminate them. They prefer not to add the additional window per floor on the east and west façade, but if it is the Board's considered opinion that the buildings are incompatible unless they do that, then they will certainly do that. They are willing to use the three bay pattern on the rear of the interior buildings, the ones that he presented to them today, that would allow them to still have ample windows in those bedrooms that are upstairs, but go to a three rhythm on the ground floor. They have no objections, whatsoever, to providing more substantial columns on the front porch, but clearly this is a design detail. They are happy to do that. Study all rear stoops and reduce the mass of the rear portico roofs, they are willing to do so and he has expressed this to the Board. Incorporate gates along Gaston Street; they are willing to do that, but he would like for the Board to specifically state that so that when he goes back to the Traffic Engineer he can say that he "has to." He said ensure that the stringcourse and coping is continuous; he has

presented examples that are within the area where pilasters are on the facades of the buildings are; in fact, at least in the same plain as the coping. Mr. Shay said they would like to explore this further in the Design Details. He said clearly in Part 2: Design Details that they will provide additional details regarding the fence, access to parking and electrical meter locations.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Shay if he has considered using segmental arched windows on the front elevations.

Mr. Shay stated that he could not say that they have looked at this, but if it a condition of the Board's approval, then obviously this is something that they will look at.

Mr. Engle said the windows are reviewed in Height and Mass. If Mr. Shay goes back and look at any of those windows examples, they all show segmental arched windows. He stated that the funny looking segmented arch windows that you see all over town where they are actually rectangular sash, but it is segmentally arched opened.

Mr. Shay said this is certainly something that they will look into. He is hopeful that they will not have to mimic everything, but this is something that seems reasonable.

Dr. Henry said Mr. Shay said the window looks into the shower of the adjacent window. He asked him if he was talking about the fourth windows on each level?

Mr. Shay answered yes. If they were to add a fourth window on the second floor because the bathrooms are on this side, then if glass was in it, it would actually look into a shower stall.

Dr. Henry said he asked this question because he has a bath tub that does exactly this and he is four feet from the other house. But, they put in shutters that open from the bottom and top and this works well. He said he realizes that Mr. Shay has few examples in this particular neighborhood. He asked Mr. Shay what are the addresses of the examples that he showed.

Mr. Shay answered that off hand he does not know the residential street addresses, but they all are within two blocks of their project.

Dr. Williams asked if the material will be brick.

Mr. Shay answered that all the buildings are brick on the exterior.

Dr. Williams asked if the top of the parapet will also be brick.

Mr. Shay answered yes.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Shay if he is willing to eliminate the balustrade on the front elevation stoops.

Mr. Shay answered yes.

Dr. Williams said the pilasters on the upper elevation look wider than the ones on the

lower elevation. Is this intentional or is it the drawing?

Mr. Shay answered that it is not intentional. But, given the opportunity to get into the design detail, the logic width is one foot-four sixteen inches because it would be two full width of brick.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board will consider this height and mass because it shrink wraps a part of the buildings.

Mr. Shay said he is willing to accept that as a condition of the Board's approval.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Shay what is the inspiration of the three part window. The other examples shows the storefront and the ground floor. He said that Mr. Shay talked about the verticality of the buildings, but those seems to be horizontal. There are two windows on the main front elevation.

Mr. Shay stated that they wanted to have as much glass as possible given the fact that the units are 22 feet wide and a little more than 40 feet deep.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with all of staff's recommendations; specifically the recommendation to consider simplify the gable element of the parapet. She stated that they are okay with an articulated parapet, but whether it is restudied possibly through the shape of the gable. The design appears to be other patterning with brick on the front. Restudying the detailing may help with the simplification of how it is visually understood.

Ms. Meunier said the HSF also agrees with the recommendation to either enlarge the 24 inch wide window over the door or change to a door the balustrade that was discussed by Mr. Engle. She wanted it to be confirmed whether the pilasters are true party walls that run all the way through or whether they are just accentuated on the front and back. She said the HSF's suggestion is to make these for Part II look more functional as opposed to decorative, particularly how it is read with the cap on top of the pilasters. Some of the other examples shown appeared functional like they might have been chimney caps and so forth. Therefore, their suggestion is that this be looked at.

Ms. Meunier said the HSF agrees with the recommendation to center the stoops as shown by the petitioner. They also recommend for Part II the tripart type window that was discussed simply to keep the same window pattern configuration in that central window instead of having one-over-one. Ms. Meunier said she maybe incorrect as to how she is reading this, but she guesses that if the railing remains that indoor on the portico only have vertical pickets of balusters as opposed to the horizontals.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Shay if he wanted to respond to the public comment.

Mr. Shay stated that they have already expressed their willingness to look at some of the detail elements on the parapet. They have agreed that they will be satisfied with a wider window over the stoop. He said they thank the Historic Savannah Foundation for the four-

over-three comment. They believe this is a good solution and they will study the pattern of the mullions very carefully on the windows when they come back for the design detail. Mr. Shay said they accept the constructive criticism that they just heard.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Lominack said there seems to be a real problem between what is height and mass and what is detail. It appears that if something comes in without the detail, then questions come up about all these things that have little or nothing to do with height and mass. But, when it comes in with the detail, they get hung up on detail and not really on the height and mass a lot. Mr. Lominack said he does not know the solution to this, but it is a real problem.

Mr. Lominack said Mr. Shay spoke several times about the verticality expression. He said he believes also that the things Mr. Shay has agreed to such as removing the balustrade and putting a wider window up there would also help the vertical expression a great deal. If he had one comment to make, he believes it would be just simplify the entire expression of the building; he believes it would be a much better building.

Dr. Henry said regarding Mr. Lominack's point about height and mass versus detail design, he believes when the motion is made, they need to be careful about separating what is design details and what is height and mass.

Board Action:

Approval of New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass for five attached row houses at 0 Alice Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part 2: Design Details:

1. Utilize the three bay pattern on the rear of the interior buildings, similar to or matching the eastern and western buildings, or a similar solution as presented at the meeting;
2. Provide more substantial columns on the front - PASS porches and eliminate the railings;
3. Center all rear stoops and reduce the mass of the rear portico roofs;
4. Incorporate gates along Gaston Street; and
5. Restudy the design of the pilasters, stringcourse and coping.

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

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
Robin Williams	- Aye

20. [Petition of J. Corde Wilson | 13-005459-COA | 544 East Liberty Street | New Construction Townhouses: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerials.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Compatibility Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Context Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Mass Model.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Rendering.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Project Description.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

Mr. J. Corde Wilson was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass, of seven attached multi-family townhomes with carriage houses for the vacant property located at 544 East Liberty Street. The townhomes are four-stories high and the carriage houses are two stories high. She said that a variance to allow for a zero setback for structured parking within the ground floor of a carriage house, facing the lane, along Houston is requested. The standard requires structured parking within first story of a building to be setback a minimum of 30 feet from property lines along all public rights-of-way, not including lanes. The petitioner attended the October 10, 2013 Site Plan Review Meeting. She said that no comments received at this point affect the design of this project.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval of Part I, Height and Mass with the following conditions to be reviewed by the Board with the Part II submission:

- a. Reduce the floor-to-floor heights of all main buildings, carriage houses, and the parapets on all buildings to the greatest extent possible to reduce the overall height of all the buildings.
- b. Eliminate or minimize the attic vents proposed above the cornice in the parapet wall at the top of the building.
- c. Add windows to the main house and the carriage house on the Houston Street façade to meet the “distance between windows” standard.
- d. The roof pitches for the sloped roofs behind the parapets were not provided. Reduce all roof pitches in order to lower the parapet height, therefore, lowering the overall height of both the main and carriage buildings.
- e. Provide additional information regarding the garage apron location. If the carriage houses are to be at the zero lot line at the lane, the apron must be located within the garage.

f. Provide HVAC unit screening.

Ms. Michalak reported additionally that staff recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals of the 30 foot structured setback parking variance required under Sec. 8-3030(n) (14)b. to allow a zero setback in this corner lot condition.

Dr. Williams asked if this area is zoned for three stories.

Ms. Michalak answered that the area is zoned for four stories.

Mr. Engle said the height is what is allowed to be built, but it is not a requirement upon this Board.

Ms. Michalak answered that there is not a foot height limit. There are minimum to floor-to-floor heights, which the petitioner well exceeds each level including the parapet.

Mr. Engle said there is no historic building on the model that is compatible to height and mass. Is this correct?

Ms. Michalak answered correct.

Mr. Engle wanted to get the facts straight; he said that the Board is not under any obligations to approve a four story development even though the petitioner is allowed to do so.

Ms. Michalak explained that there are four story contributing row structures in adjacent wards, but not in this ward. There is very little historic fabric in this ward which is why she looked to the adjacent wards.

Mr. Merriman said he agrees totally with Mr. Engle. However, the Height Map says that a four-story structure can be here. If someone wanted to build a four story structure here, what would be the argument against it?

Ms. Ramsay explained that four stories could be here, but as she understands staff's recommendation, the petitioner has gone to the maximum with four stories. The staff's recommendation is to reduce the floor height and, therefore, reduce the mass.

Ms. Michalak said it depends on how they look at it also. The contributing buildings in this ward has very low floor-to-floor heights. Historically, they are not as massive, but the two buildings next to this has eight foot ceiling heights. However, she was not suggesting that eight foot ceiling height be here, but these very high floor-to-floor heights make the mass of this building tower over the other contributing structures in this ward.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Wilson stated that he believes he can address staff's concerns and the Board's concerns about the four stories and so forth. They went to the Site Plan Review Meeting with the City's Engineer a few weeks ago. Some concerns were raised that there is inadequate storm water piping in the area, which causes the area to over flood. The City Engineer is encouraging them to look at their raised basement. Therefore, they are

proposing to eliminate the ground floor basement unit and lower the first floor to three feet off grade. This will lower the height of the building five and one-half feet which should eliminate a lot of the concerns about the height without reducing the floor-to-floor height. Mr. Wilson said they want to keep the ten foot ceiling on the first floor and nine feet ceilings on the other floor. Other than this, they have no problems agreeing with the staff's recommendations.

Ms. Ramsay told Mr. Wilson that the design details will totally change the front of the building, the curb, stoop, and so forth. She informed him that the Board cannot request a continuance, but he could do so.

Mr. Wilson said it would still be the same elements and design. They will leave the two windows and the door underneath the stoop on the daylight basement and lower the stoop height to three feet. They will lose the curb element and go off to the left-hand side without having to make the turn.

Mr. Howington said the Board needs to see the drawings. He has a concern about the floor-to-floor height. The first floor is shorter than the second floor. A duality is going on here with the differentiation between the first floor and the second floor. Mr. Howington explained that the duality is that it is top-heavy on the second and third floors in the elevations. The space between the windows on the second, third and parapet is very top-heavy. Therefore, the duality is that this should be reversed so the weight is on the bottom of the building and it lightens up as it goes higher.

Dr. Williams said he did not see dimensions. He asked if the first floor should be shorter than the second floor.

Mr. Howington said the second floor is actually taller than the parlor floor. It is a duality of being very top heavy when it should be more bottom heavy.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Wilson if the roof pitch can be reduced. If so, it would allow a little more saving on the parapet.

Mr. Wilson said they will work on the recommendation that says to reduce it as much as possible. Originally, they tried to design these buildings with a pitch roof instead of a flat roof. The Storm Water Department wants them to collect all their storm water in the courtyard. Because of the inadequate drainage here, Storm Water wants them to maintain their storm water on site.

Ms. Ramsay informed Mr. Wilson that in cases such as his where there is so much to change, the Board cannot request a continuance, but that he can ask for a continuance.

Mr. Wilson said the changes that he will be making are in keeping with the suggestions by the staff. He would ask that it be approved with the staff's recommendations.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board has not seen how Mr. Wilson will handle the front of the building. When the building is lowered, the mass of the front will be changed along with other things. She said she was speaking for herself, but she could not vote favorably on it knowing that it will be reduced. There are too many factors going into this.

Ms. Ramsay explained that Mr. Wilson has to come back for Part II, Design Details anyway.

Mr. Wilson, for clarification, asked if Part I and Part II could be heard at the same time.

Ms. Ramsay answered yes, provided that all the information is submitted.

Ms. Harris suggested that if the Board is amenable to the structured parking variance, make a motion on that portion so it could go forward.

Mr. Engle said he is a little nervous combining Part I and Part II on a massive project such as this. If it was a single townhouse or something of that nature, he would not have a problem, but basically they are looking at 14 residences as the carriage house will be a residence, too. He was not sure he could accept Part I and Part II as a combination.

Ms. Ramsay said it is a possibility to combine Part I and Part II if the petitioner gets all the information together and it is correct. She asked Mr. Wilson if his request is still to continue the Part I, Height and Mass.

Mr. Wilson answered yes. They will resubmit the plans along with the other design details.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they are happy to see that the height will be reduced. The HSF believes that four stories would not be visually compatible with the height that was proposed. They agree with eliminating the vents in the parapet and obviously with the condition that says "lowering the slope of the roof and, therefore, lowering the height of the parapet."

Ms. Meunier said regarding the rear elevation, they think there is a lot of space between the windows. The HSF realizes that it is not clear presently as what the floor-to-floor heights are, but the space between the windows on the rear and potentially enlarging the windows need to be restudied.

Ms. Meunier said regarding Part II, Design Detail, there appears to be some discrepancy between the transoms over the doors on the front. The elevation shows a rectangular transom and another drawing and rendering show a fan light. The shape of the opening is in Part I and the fan light versus the rectangular opening should be clarified.

Ms. Michalak stated that staff asked the petitioner to simplify their front entrance prior to coming. Therefore, this is the intention of rectifying that.

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

Mr. Wilson said they will work with the transoms over the door either way. At this point, he does not know which way it is being suggested that they do them, but, however, if they want them, just let them know.

Board Action:

1. Continue the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of seven (7) attached multi-family townhomes with carriage houses for the vacant property located at 544 East Liberty Street for the applicant to consider the following:
 - a. Restudy the floor-to-floor heights; the 3rd floor should not be taller than the 2nd floor.
 - b. Lower the pitch of the roof behind the parapet walls on both the main buildings and the carriage houses.
 - c. Restudy the distance between the 3rd and 4th floor windows on the rear façade.
 - d. Restudy the overall height of all of the buildings.
 - e. Eliminate or minimize the attic vents proposed above the cornice in the parapet wall at the top of the building. - PASS
 - f. Add windows to the main house and the carriage house on the Houston Street façade to meet the "distance between windows" standard.
 - g. Provide additional information regarding the garage apron location. If the carriage houses are to be at zero lot line at the lane, the apron must be located within the garage.
 - h. Provide HVAC unit screening.

2. Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals of the 30 foot structured setback parking variance required under Sec. 8-3030(n)(14)b. to allow a zero setback in this corner lot condition.

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

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
Robin Williams	- Aye

21. [Petition of Cowart Group, P.C., Architects | 13-005467-COA | 307-311 East Huntingdon Street | New Construction Townhouses: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Mass Model.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Historic Building Map - Stephens Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Historic Savannah Book - Stephens Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [11-12-13 - Public Opposition Email.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Streetscape Photos.pdf](#)
Attachment: [11-12-13 - Public Opposition Email 2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

Mr. David Kelly and Mr. Gerald Cowart of the Cowart Group and one of the property owners, Ms. Susan Meeks, were present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass, of three attached two-family townhomes for the vacant properties located at 307, 309, and 311 East Huntingdon Street. The townhomes are three-stories high. A variance from the 75 percent lot coverage development standard is requested for each of the three attached two-family townhomes is requested. The lot coverage is proposed to be 83 percent, which includes the proposed rear decks. The General Development Plan was submitted to the City on October 22, 2013. No comments received impact the design of this project.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for Part I: Height and Mass with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II: Design Details for Board review:

- a. Provide exterior elevations for the east and west facades.
- b. Revise the front entry to be a low stoop to enter on the first level to be more compatible with similar contributing buildings in this ward.
- c. Revise the rear deck to be full width, two or three story rear porches that are much shallower to be more compatible with similar contributing buildings within this ward.
- d. Redesign the roof to be a low hipped roof with deep overhanging eaves to be more compatible with similar contributing buildings within this ward.

Ms. Michalak reported additionally that staff recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a lot coverage variance to allow 83 percent lot coverage for each of the three attached two-family townhomes.

Ms. Michalak informed the Board that on November 12, 2013 she received two emails from neighbors. She said she does not believe that the neighbors are opposed to the entire project, but their major concern is with the high stoops and the stairs encroaching on the public right-of-way. One neighbor also had a concern that the lot coverage should be limited to the 75 percent permitted and the entire building including the stoop should be built off of the public right-of-way as the other contributing are within this block.

Mr. Engle said the staff is recommending variance approval. He asked, however, with all the changes, will the variance approval be necessary?

Ms. Michalak answered that the variance approval may possibly not be necessary.

Dr. Williams said this is in a transitional spot. The areas west of this is loaded with high stoops.

Ms. Michalak said she agrees that the area is traditional, especially architecturally it is a very traditional area.

Dr. Williams said that Price Street is the area where the buildings drop down closer to grade even at Liberty Street. The ones closer to Lincoln Street are in a grey zone. Therefore, he believes that there are nearby buildings that are contributing and some are noncontributing.

Dr. Henry said the lot coverage of 83 percent concerns him. If the large deck size is reduced, would this eliminate the problem?

Ms. Michalak answered that potentially it would eliminate the problem.

Dr. Henry said he believes it should be 75 percent lot coverage.

Ms. Michalak said based on the staff's recommendation to change all of this, she believes it would be reduced below that. But, it depends on what the decision is.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Michalak to pull up the low stoops again on the screen. He believes the rows are on Habersham Street.

Ms. Michalak said this is around the corner from the petitioner's property.

Dr. Henry said, however, if they look at the actual block, they are far more elaborate houses and they are talking about that block.

Mr. Howington said the staff's report says that the proposed building height is excessively tall with the amount of scale surrounding contributing buildings. However, staff did not list this as one of their conditions. He asked staff if they still feel the same that the building height is excessively tall.

Ms. Michalak said this was under roof shapes. She explained that basically what staff said is that with the parapet wall and the shed roof, they recommend a change in roof shape. They believe that this will reduce the height. This is one of staff's recommendations.

Dr. Henry asked staff to explain again what the neighbors are objecting to.

Ms. Michalak explained that it seems that the neighbors are objecting to the extra lot coverage and the high stoops encroaching over the public right-of-way. She said the neighbors stated that they may not be able to attend the meeting today. She said, however, if any of them are present they will be able to speak when the Chair calls for comments from the public. But as she has said, it appears the neighbors have a problem with the lot coverage. Ms. Michalak stated that contributing buildings stoops are the private property.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Michalak if staff has recommended to the Zoning Board Appeals that this be disregarded as appropriately they could be on the public right-of-way.

Ms. Michalak answered that staff did not make the recommendation that the stoops be set on private property. It is very common all over the district for stoops to be there.

Dr. Henry said half of his front columns are on public property.

Dr. Henry said personally, he likes the high stoops. He believes the high stoops are more appropriate for this block.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Kelly said he put some pictures of adjacent properties within the area in the Board's packets. He pointed out the Carpenter Italianate low structures, the noncontributing building, and the structures around the corner on Habersham Street. Mr. Kelly said he believes the structures are all up at least 7 feet with one of the wooden ones 6 feet. But, they all are definitely off of the ground.

Mr. Kelly said they have agreed with a lot of the staff's recommendations and are willing to do several things. They noticed a mistake in their calculations. The lot is actually 61.9 feet and if they reduce the deck, they will get down to about 81 percent. Therefore, a variance for the lot coverage would be very small.

Mr. Kelly stated that they agree that the building they designed is a little Georgian for the area. They looked around the neighborhood and tried to add a little bit of Victorian detail and increase the verticality of the building. They have taken almost a foot out to help the stoop be lower. They added some detail at the top. It is brick covered in stucco to echo what goes on across the street. Mr. Kelly said they would like to keep the parapet roof because of a similar problem with the Storm water retention. They are hopeful of taking the water in the back and do a storm water retention in the courtyard. A hip roof here, will not work very well.

Mr. Kelly said they changed the door to reflect the Victorian look. They are not happy with how the deck worked out in the back. They would like to go back and restudy the deck and possibly reduce it as staff has recommended to be consistently ten feet off the back; and then do a little roof awning above it. He said they do not have a problem doing this. He said they believe the fence is appropriate. They can probably do some divisions for stucco expansions with the side elevations. Mr. Kelly said other than this, they believe that their scale is good and they would love to get the Board's comments.

Mr. Kelly stated that he wanted to point out that the parking is a peculiar situation. On the Site Plan the parking lot that exists behind the lot is a shared community lot. Therefore, everybody got two spots. So, they have to build to the sidewalk in order to allow for access to get back to the lots. Therefore, where their fence exists, they are allowing for a gate to be there. He said if they add the parking space, it would increase their lot coverage.

Mr. Engle asked staff if they had the elevations of the project that was approved for the site one and one-half years ago. Many of the present Board members were not on the Board then, but the Board reviewed this site approximately one and one-half years ago at great length during several meetings.

Ms. Michalak showed the Board the elevations that were approved for the site earlier. She said the petitioner came twice for Part I.

Mr. Howington said the earlier information is not relevant.

Ms. Ramsay said it is just for information.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that she believes a lot of the comments that the HSF had has been addressed. The HSF believes that it should be a more Victorian Italianate style to be in keeping with the neighborhood. She said that in terms of the stoop, they do not think that it necessarily has to be a low stoop as they believe that there are many examples on this street and more so across the street of existing high stoops. Therefore, they believe the stoops could go either way. She believes all the other issues have been addressed. The HSF is okay with the massing; they initially were in favor of a flat roof or a low hip roof with brackets, but they believe that a parapet with a Victorian detailing would be okay.

Ms. Mary Ellen Toliminack came forward and stated that she and her husband, Todd, live across the street, diagonally on the corner of Huntingdon and Habersham Streets. She said quite a few of her neighbors were present, but she is presently the only one left. Ms. Toliminack said they are happy that someone seems interested in their neighborhood. They like this design better than the one they saw approximately one and one-half years ago. However, they agree that they would like to see more Victorian details as well. She is not sure whether she likes the flat roof, they can look further at this. They like the idea of having the back yard decks. However, they were confused as to how this affects the parking because parking is becoming an issue here. She said sometimes they have to go around the block several times to find parking, especially now with the Law School on Abercorn and Huntingdon Streets. They have heard that within several months, there will be 400 more students here. She asked the Board if parking is something that this Board deals with.

Ms. Ramsay advised Ms. Toliminack that the Review Board does not address parking.

Ms. Toliminack said they agree that it is not such a big deal to have the low front stoops. She said as Dr. Henry pointed out, she, too, likes the high winding stair look. She has this in her house. Her stairs are circular, but do not encroach on the public right-of-way.

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

Mr. Cowart came forward and said he wanted to comment about the roofs and the parapet wall. They recognize that this is a transitional area and understand that the Victorian detail has a little more vertical character than the Georgian detail that they introduced. He said the parapet wall, because it is a row of three, allows them to slope the roofs to the rear and because the parapet wall goes all the way around, it allows them to obscure the heating and air conditioning equipment on the rear of the house. It also gives them the ability to have their fireproofing between units. It allows them to collect the rainwater and put it in a subterranean holding area in the courtyard.

Mr. Cowart said he wanted to also mention something about the lot coverage. He said

this parcel of property was granted a special zoning condition. There is a common parking lot and in exchange for the common parking lot, the lot sizes were reduced to their very minimum. There is a component of that common parking lot that is open space and is allocated towards these lots. They have six parking spaces behind their actual building lot that are dedicated to these lots. Mr. Cowart explained that if the lots had not been re-subdivided and a common parking area created, they would have a 90 foot deep lot. They literally have another 20 foot open space that is connected to these minimum size lots, the 20 by 60 lots.

Ms. Susan Meeks stated that she and her husband recently purchased the three lots. She thanked everybody for their time today. Ms. Meeks said they are very excited about building in this particular area. This is their first project and they have put much thought and effort into this project. They appreciate the help of the staff and the comments that have been received. It is also exciting to see neighbors here today that are eager and interested in continuing the enhancement of downtown Savannah. Ms. Meeks thanked the Board for their comments regarding the details. She is very pleased with the renderings that they have today showing the Victorian elements to consider in the transitional nature.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Lominack stated that looking at the photographs, he could not see how anybody could design something for this site without getting some kind of inspiration from the next door buildings and the buildings across the street. He said that he sees a total absence of recognizing that the buildings exist.

Ms. Ramsay said at the beginning of the meeting, Mr. Lominack made a passionate statement for more 21st Century architecture. The Board had two projects today that were duplicative of historic precedence.

Mr. Engle said he does not necessarily agree with Mr. Lominack's earlier statement, but he is in full concurrence with the statement he just made. The last time the Board saw this, they were copying Price Street, just moving it around the corner. It was rejected because the houses on this block are elaborate, Victorian with overhanging roof lines and bays. The houses on Price Street do not have this. But, now basically they are getting a Georgian. You can change the window shapes, but it does not change the fact that these buildings do not have anything to do with everything else in the block. Mr. Engle said he has a problem with this. He also has a problem with the 83 percent lot coverage.

Mr. Lominack said he could personally see a modern building which took inspiration from Victorian details occurring on this property.

Mr. Engle said he does not disagree with what the Secretary of Interior's Standard encourage, but a lot of people just want a modern house.

Dr. Henry said he is in full concurrence that the lot coverage should be 75 percent.

Dr. Williams said staff recommended lowering the height issue. He believes that there is precedence directly across the street with the neighboring photograph that illustrates that

in half of block there are elevated houses. Dr. Williams said, therefore, on the issue of elevation, the proposal seems to be compatible with the neighboring buildings. He believes buildings that are in dialog with their context, but not necessarily copying what is there. Therefore, he believes that there is certainly more room for dialog to take place beyond elevation. There is room for this design to capture the exuberance of the area.

Mr. Engle said the Board might want to ask the petitioner if he wants to work on this some more. Presently, he is not ready to vote on this.

Ms. Ramsay informed Mr. Cowart that the Board cannot ask for a continuance, but the Board could hear a continuance at his request or as has been pointed out, the Board could vote to approve or deny the project as presented. Presently, they are only on Part I, Height and Mass.

Mr. Cowart confirmed that they are on Part I, Height and Mass. The details that are being discussed are a part of Part II.

Ms. Ramsay informed Mr. Cowart that what the Board looks at is the Shrink wrap of the exterior. Therefore, the stoop would certainly be a part of what the Board is hearing now, as would the cornices, roof shape, and deck. Therefore, from this the Board asks that on Part I, Height and Mass, in addition to what drawings the petitioner wants to provide, to provide something that shows height and mass and have a checklist on what is included. These are Part I issues that the Board has discussed.

Mr. Cowart requested a continuance.

Board Action:

1. Continue the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of three (3) attached two-family townhomes for the vacant properties located at 307, 309, and 311 East Huntingdon Street for the applicant to consider the following:
 - a. Restudy the design of the entire project to take inspiration from the high-style Victorian designs around them without copying an historic building.
 - b. When restudying the design, preference would be to stay within the 75 percent maximum lot coverage. - PASS
 - c. Provide exterior elevations for the east and west facades.
2. Continue the recommendation to the Zoning Boards of Appeals for a lot coverage variance to allow 83 percent of coverage for each of the three (3) attached two-family townhomes.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

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
Robin Williams	- Aye

22. [Petition of Dawson Architects | 13-005470-COA | 135 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Amendment to New Construction Hotel](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Green screen specification.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting an amendment to the previously approved Certificates of Appropriateness for a six-story hotel, located on the vacant parcel at 135 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (508-512 West Oglethorpe Avenue). She stated that there are some small changes that affect Part I and Part II.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for amendments to the previously approved Certificates of Appropriateness with the following conditions:

1. Reduce the height of the parapet to the four (4) foot maximum permitted by the standard.
2. Provide a "green screen" color selection to staff for review and approval.
3. Provide a pergola color/stain selection to staff for review and approval.
4. Signage must be submitted for review and approval by the Board.
5. Construct a sample panel on-site for review and approval by staff, in accordance with the adopted Sample Panel Guidelines.

Mr. Lominack asked staff if they had the elevations with the larger windows from the previous submittal.

Ms. Michalak answered yes and showed the Board the proposed and the previous elevations.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Deacon stated that they have gone into more development with the project. Some things have changed with the floor plan. Therefore, it affected the entire building. The changes to the footprint are mostly the results of refinement of their structural system. They also had to add a certain number of ADA accessible units to the property. Consequently, this affected the shape of the footprint and the rear part of the building. She said they also eliminated a stair at the northwest corner of the building in order to simplify the shape of the building, especially on the elevations of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and Alton Street.

Ms. Deacon said some of the changes made were the result of changing the type of PTAC unit. This reduced the sizes of their windows. With the reduction of the sizes of the windows, they ended up wanting to reduce the proportions of the building overall so that the look of the building was similar to what was previously presented. She said another change that they encountered as they got further into the design is that their green roof system which they needed in order to have their six-story in this area added an additional 16 inches above the structure of the building. This was not something that they had fully taken into account. The reason their parapet is four feet -eight inches is because they have to accommodate the depth of their green roof system. But, they also need to provide the minimum guardrail height of three feet -six inches around the perimeter of the building or they would have to add an additional rail of some sort to the edge of the building.

Ms. Deacon stated that they would like to leave the parapet in the proportions that they are now. They understand that they need to meet the standards. If this is something that is critical to the Board, they propose changing the banding height at the top of the building from four feet - eight inches to four feet so that the expression of the parapet is at four feet rather than four feet -eight inches.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Deacon if they are willing to move the stringcourse up.

Ms. Deacon answered yes and explained that they would not be changing the actual parapet height, but the expression of the parapet so that it would reflect a four foot height.

Mr. Lominack asked if the roof plane shows a parapet and a border of gravel.

Ms. Deacon answered yes.

Mr. Lominack asked if it is two or three feet wide.

Ms. Deacon said this is something that was suggested by both the manufacturer of the green roof system and their landscape architects. She said in terms of green roofs, it is good to have. If gravel is there rather than the growing medium, it is much easier to access.

Mr. Lominack said he was wondering if there is some opportunity with the gravel and the landscaping that is occurring around it, which he is not sure what it is, looks like a grass area and a planting of some sort between it and the gravel. Is there some leeway here as far as how high the parapet needs to be in order to comply with the guardrail requirement?

Ms. Deacon explained that the growing medium is something that can be moved. They are already accommodating the slope of the roof. She said she believes, therefore, in trying to work with that height in addition to working with the slope, might be somewhat difficult.

They prefer to play it safe and ensure that they have three feet-six inches above the highest part of the roof edge. She said, however, the ordinance makes reference to visual expression of heights. Therefore, she believes that if they can do this with banding, then they would prefer to do it that way.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said if he understood, the parapet will be four feet and not four feet-eight inches. He asked that if they do one thing is there a chain of events that other things will follow that need to rise accordingly to keep everything in proportion. He does not believe that they would want too much distance between the window top and so forth. It is important for them to know this now before they say yes that is fine. He does not want another problem to be created that they will need to also address.

Mr. Carey said that when Mr. Lominack asked to see the former version with the larger fenestration pattern (windows) and the most current elevation, that's when it struck him that this is a substantial change. He asked, therefore, is this worth looking at more closely because he believes those two versions next to each other are an important consideration. He said also he trusts that they are still within the solid-to-void ratio with the new version.

Ms. Ramsay invited the petitioner to respond to the public comments.

Ms. Deacon stated that as she said initially, their first preference is for the Board to approve their elevation as presented with the four feet-eight inches parapet height, although it does not meet the ordinance standard. If they do raise the banding higher, their height would still be ten feet-four inches, which would be higher than the other floors below it. She said that the fifth and sixth floors are both ten feet-four inches. However, she does not believe that this would drastically change the proportions of the building. Ms. Deacon said they are open to suggestions, but their first preference is to have the elevations approved as they have been prepared in terms of comparing the first elevation, the previously approved elevation, to the current elevation this is just a common refinement that happens in design development. They have done their best in trying to keep the essence of the design that was previously approved.

Mr. Engle asked if the lintels on the balcony on the east side are drawn wrong.

Ms. Deacon answered yes; they are deeper than the others. They should match the other ones.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Howington said he has the same concerns regarding the parapet height. This will make the distance between the top and the band in his opinion probably be too large. He said that from the ground, he does not think that eight inches would be noticed. This is not an issue for him. He knows why the petitioner changed the windows, but he likes the first submittal better. The ones presented look a little out of scale, but he does not know if there is another option between the fourth floor height.

Dr. Williams asked if the whole façade is on the table. He said the wall mounted lights seem rather small and inadequate. He said that an opportunity is here to have something more exuberant and larger scale.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the Board has already approved the lighting and signage.

Ms. Michalak answered that the Board has not approved the signage, but it was a condition of Part II that staff approve the light fixtures. Therefore, she has approved the light fixtures.

Mr. Howington said light fixtures now with the pilaster gets lost in the balusters. Whereas, the other balusters might have been more appropriate.

Dr. Williams asked if the pilasters changed.

Ms. Michalak answered yes. The wider ones were previously on the ends of the hotel.

Dr. Williams said but suddenly it has changed. He would, therefore, say that the wall sconce light fixtures be restudied to be more significantly with the design that makes a statement and submit to staff for review and approval.

Ms. Ramsay said as the Board is changing the size of the pilaster, the light fixtures could be a condition of their approval.

Mr. Engle said in reference to the windows, he believes that the gray color would make a great difference. If the gray is treated as part of the sash opening instead of the decorative detail, it would make the windows seem bigger as now they do appear to be small.

Board Action:

Approval for amendments to the previously approved Certificates of Appropriateness for a six-story hotel, located on the vacant parcel at 135 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (508-512 West Oglethorpe Avenue) with the following conditions:

1. Restudy the wall sconce light fixtures to be significantly larger with the design that makes a statement. Submit to staff for review and approval.
2. Provide a “green screen” color selection to staff for review and approval. - PASS
3. Provide a pergola color/stain selection to staff for review and approval.
4. Signage must be submitted for review and approval by the Board.
5. Construct a sample panel on-site for review and approval by staff, in accordance with the adopted Sample Panel Guidelines.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

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 - Abstain

Robin Williams - Aye

23. [Petition of Gary Sanders, Architect | 13-004354-COA | 42 East Bay Street #155 | After-the-Fact Rooftop Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial - Before.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial - After.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

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

NOTE: This item was moved from #16 on the agenda to the end because the petitioner was not present at the beginning of the meeting.

Mr. Engle left the meeting at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Sanders was present on behalf of the petition

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for the installation of a rooftop addition on the building located at 42 East Bay Street. The two existing cupolas and a roof hatch were removed in the process. Four skylights, a deck, and two condenser units were also added on the roof. The deck, skylights and condenser units are not visible from the public right-of-way. The rooftop addition is not visible from East River Street. A railing for the roof deck is proposed to be added. The existing rooftop equipment to the southwest of the rooftop addition is not on this property's roof and was not installed by this petitioner.

Ms. Michalak stated that this project was continued at the petitioner's request from the September 11, 2013 Board meeting. The petitioner has made some changes to the design. Staff performed preliminary research in an attempt to date the two existing cupolas that were removed from the roof of this building. No COA approvals exist for the two existing cupolas. SAGIS aerials do show the two structures before removal and Google Earth

shows the current rooftop addition. Therefore, it is not known if the two existing cupolas were original to the building, historic or otherwise.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval of the rooftop addition on the building located at 42 East Bay Street because it is designed to appear as a mechanical penthouse and is, therefore, visually compatible.

Dr. Henry asked what happened with the windows.

Ms. Michalak answered that the windows that were installed previously do not meet the Standards.

Dr. Henry asked that the windows that the Board sees today if they will be removed or if they are now being proposed.

Ms. Michalak answered that these are windows that are now being proposed. Therefore, no windows will be visible from the public right-of-way.

Dr. Henry asked how could someone do the past work without checking with someone before it was done. This is a business and the person should have known to get prior approval before doing the work. But, he knew that his question at this point was irrelevant; but, nonetheless, it is still irritating.

Ms. Ramsay asked the petitioner to come forward and make his comments.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Sanders came forward and stated that the owner, Mr. Bill Stewart, was accompanying him and wanted to speak to the Board. Mr. Sanders said they have modified what exists here. They made windows and clad them with metal and removed the overhangs to minimize the visual impact. The building is painted gray. They need a convenient roof access.

Mr. Stewart said that he and his wife, Judith, are the owners. Mrs. Stewart is present also. He said that it has been an education sitting through the last several hours of the meeting. Since they moved to Savannah in 2000, they wanted to live in the Historic District and in 2008 they had the opportunity to do so. Although in 2008, with the downturn of the economy, it has been very slow for them to build this. Mr. Stewart apologized for the after-the-fact error. However, he wanted to ensure the Board that he and Mrs. Stewart did not have an intention to circumvent the Board. In fact when the error was made, they brought Mr. Sanders on board to redo the drawings and had him submit the application to the Board and report the variance.

Mr. Stewart said he wanted to give a little background on the cupola and why they built it out as they did. He explained that shortly after they bought the property, a rainstorm was here and they got a call from one of the neighbors who owns space below them. They had flooding down the walls into their antique store. They went on the roof and found that there was blockage in one of the drains. Once blockage was in the drain, the water bypassed and somehow came down the bricks. Every month they checked to be sure that the floor drained and that the building was clear. They had a 30 foot ladder here and went through the

hatch to check this. Over the years, they decided that they needed an easier egress to be able to check this as they go forth. Mr. Stewart said they got some funding, had their permit open to continue to build out. Their roofer who knew that they were going to redraw and make some changes downstairs and also build out a cupola that they could egress, went beyond scope with this. Mr. Stewart said he was out of the country for about one month. Therefore, this got beyond their control.

Mr. Stewart apologized again about this not being brought before the Board, but they were hoping that the Board evaluate this based on the requirements. He said again that they are pleased to be a part of the Historic District.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry asked staff to restate what the Standards say about additions to roofs.

Ms. Michalak stated that the Standards say that additions to roof shall not be visible from the front elevation. She said staff response was that they recommend approval as the rooftop addition is minimally visible from East Bay Street and is not visible from East River Street. The windows are no longer visible and the walls are clad metal so it is designed to appear as a mechanical penthouse. Ms. Michalak said this is why staff is recommending approval.

Ms. McClain said the exception is that it appears to be a penthouse.

Ms. Michalak said this is why staff recommends approval.

Mr. Howington said it is not really a penthouse.

Board Action:

Approval of the rooftop addition on the building located at 42 East Bay Street because it is design to appear as a mechanical penthouse and is, therefore, visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle - Not Present

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Nay

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

24. [Petition of Lance Cohen | H-130514-59340-2 | 409 West Congress St. | Staff Approved - Windows](#)

Attachment: [COA - 409 West Congress Street H-13-59340-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 409 West Congress Street H-13-59340-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of T. Joe Duckworth | 13-005056-COA | 601 East Broad St. | Staff Approved - Foundation Piers](#)

Attachment: [COA - 601 East Broad Street 13-005056-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 601 East Broad Street 13-005056-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Jamie Durrence | 13-005074-COA | 12 West Liberty St. | Staff Approved - Windows](#)

Attachment: [COA - 12 West Liberty Street 13-005074-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 12 W. Liberty St. 13-005074-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Carlos Asensio for Noble investment Group | 13-005106-COA | 301 East Bay St. | Staff Approved - Rehabilitation/Repairs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 301 East Bay Street 13-005106-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 301 East Bay St. 13-005106-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Kathy Ledvina | 13-005112-COA | 143 Houston St. | Staff Approved - Plywood Siding](#)

Attachment: [COA - 143 Houston St. 13-005112-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 143 Houston Street 13-005112-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of James Johnson | 13-005113-COA | 100 Bull St. | Awning Signage](#)

Attachment: [COA - 100 Bull Street 13-005113-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 100 Bull St. 13-005113-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Minnie Poole for Coastal Canvas Products, LLC | 13-005123-COA | 19 West Broughton St. | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 19 West Broughton Street 13-005123-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 19 West Broughton St. 13-005123-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Jon and Michele Land | 13-005151-COA | 514 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Color Changes](#)

Attachment: [COA - 514 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-005151-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 514 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-005151-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Margaret Adler | 13-005182-COA | 7 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 7 East Broughton Street 13-005182-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 7 East Broughton Street 13-005182-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Bill Coggins | 13-005193-COA | 313 Berrien Street | Staff Approved - Fire Wall Extension](#)

Attachment: [COA - 313 Berrien Street 13-005193-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 313 Berrien Street 13-005193-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Martin Smith for SCAD | 13-005330-COA | 216 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Repair and Rehabilitate Marquee](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 216 East Broughton Street 13-005330-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [COA -216 East Broughton Street 13-005330-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Mike A. Foran | 13-005340-COA | 3 West Liberty Street | Staff Approved - Color Changes](#)

Attachment: [COA - 3 West Liberty Street 13-005340-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 3 West Liberty Street 13-005340-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Suzanne Schulz | 13-005454-COA | 540 East Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Small Fence](#)

Attachment: [COA - 540 East Taylor Street 13-005454-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 540 East Taylor St. 13-005454-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Suzanne Schulz | 13-005455-COA | 542 East Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Wood Fence](#)

Attachment: [COA - 542 East Taylor Street 13-005455-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 542 East Taylor Street 13-005455-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Algar Thagne | 13-005477-COA | 4 West Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Guardrail](#)

Attachment: [COA - 4 West Taylor Street 13-005477-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 4 West Taylor Street 13-005477-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of James Devine for Bob's Your Uncle/Fannie's Your Aunt | 13-005532-COA | 305 & 307 East River St. | Staff Approved - Face Change Existing Signs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 305 & 307 East River Street 13-005532-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 305 & 307 East River Street 13-005532-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Petition of Jamie Durrence | 13-005582-COA | 12 West Liberty Street | Staff Approved - Light Fixtures](#)

Attachment: [COA - 12 West Liberty Street 13-005582-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 12 West Liberty Street 13-005582-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 11-13-13.pdf](#)

Ms. Ramsay said the staff has submitted their written report on work performed without a certificate of appropriateness to the Board.

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Items Deferred to Staff 11-13-13.pdf](#)

Ms. Ramsay said the report on items deferred to staff was included the Board's packet.

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

43. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, November 21, 2013 at 3:00 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

44. [Next Meeting - Wednesday December 11, 2013 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

45. [Nominating Committee](#)

Dr. Henry reported that the Nominated Committee recommended Mr. Keith Howington as Chair and Ms. Ebony Simpson as Vice-Chair for 2014.

Mr. Howington asked if the chair can make comments.

Ms. Ramsay advised him to take a more active role.

Board Action:

Approval of Keith Howington as Chair and Ebony Simpson as Vice-Chair for 2014. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Not Present

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
Robin Williams	- Aye

46. [Discuss Meeting Time Change](#)

The Board decided to keep their meeting time at 1:00 p.m.

New Business

47. [Discuss energy efficiency in historic buildings](#)

Ms. Ramsay appointed Dr. Williams, Mr. Merriman, Mr. Lominack and Mr. Howington to research the window energy efficiency in historic buildings and make a report to the Historic District Board of Review.

Ms. Ramsay said that Mr. Lominack made a statement at the beginning of the meeting. She asked the Board for comments regarding this.

Dr. Henry said he agrees with Mr. Lominack. He said there should be sections of the ordinance that specifically address modernism and 21st Century architecture.

Mr. Howington said he, too, agrees with Mr. Lominack. But, they cannot control what the petitioners want.

Dr. Henry said he believes that there is a myth in the public that the Board does not look at modern projects.

Mr. Lominack said he believes it is important for the Board to use architecture as a record of history. He believes that it does not get done enough, and when it does get done, it is done poorly. He agrees that a myth is in the public.

Mr. Howington said he wanted the Board to be aware that 114-116 West Congress Street that earlier housed "Sorry Charlie's" was damaged. He said he was a part of a meeting because a potential client is moving into the building, but does not own the building. The previous owner, Michael Brown, still owns the building. The building has been falling into disrepair for several years. The

City requested that a demolition permit be put on the building not for demolition, but in order to speed up the process of getting a lift and scaffolding on the street to provide protection for the public. The street is presently closed, but the City is doing this to get the street reopened.

Mr. Howington said all this is contingent upon a structural report being done. He stated that he has talked with Ms. Harris about this.

Mr. Merriman asked if the Review Board would have to approve the demolition in the Historic District.

Mr. Howington said it is not a true demolition permit, but a stabilization permit in order to get the scaffolding, get things in motion to reopen the street.

Dr. Henry said he likes the idea of having a straight elevation of just Height and Mass with recommendations just for this.

Ms. Harris said the application maybe revised. The applications have the list of standards which apply. At the beginning, they ask for a general development plan, any variance request, a site plan which is to scale showing any parking areas; fencing; lot area coverage, dimension elevations showing the height and width; projections, windows and doors depths; offsets and open recesses clearly showing vertical and horizontal relationships, exterior floor-to-floor heights. It also says "outline location of all doors, windows and other façade openings."

Ms. Harris said she believes that with the outlined openings is where they are getting more detailed that the Board is responding to. She said they can stick closer to this and ask the applicants to only show outlines as she believes this would help. The applications do stipulate that while renderings are not required, they are desired.

Mr. Lominack said he believes there is a way to deal with this; even with the ones they looked at today regarding the elevation. He said all these things sort of relate to each other. However, the parts that are subject to review with Part I are highlighted.

Mr. Howington said he does not want to discourage the petitioner for not including more detail. They, as a Board, should be able to look at the list and distinguish what is Height and Mass.

Ms. Ramsay said she believes they could do both. If the petitioner wants to do one that is outlined and another that has whatever they want to put on it.

Mr. Howington said he does not believe that this should be a requirement.

Mr. Lominack said the project that his firm presented last month, took the

entire elevation of the building and highlighted [actually shaded] what was not a part of that application. But, all the information that it related to were still there. This just made it clear what was not being presented for discussion. He said on a drawing, this is easy to do.

Dr. Henry said they need to do whatever is easy for the applicant and also whatever is clearer for the Board.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked do they specifically ask for the height of the building such as the elevation in relation to the buildings next to it. She said sometimes the Board sees this and sometimes they do not. This would be helpful.

Ms. Michalak said the staff does their best to try to ensure that everything is covered, but sometimes, they do miss something. She did not notice that the two side elevations were missing until she completed the review because there was nothing to review on that side. Ms. Michalak said she believes that with the Huntingdon Street project it would especially would have been helpful to have this. Since it has been continued, she will ensure that this is included.

Mr. Carey extended an invitation to the Review Board to attend HSF's Annual Meeting on Thursday, November 21, 2013. The president of the National Trust, Ms. Stephanie Meeks, will be the keynote speaker. The meeting is free and open to the public. At 6:30 p.m., they will have a 30-minute business meeting. At 7:00 p.m. Ms. Meeks will speak and then they will have a full reception. The meeting will be held at the Beach Institute on the corner of Price and Harris Streets.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

48. [Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Ms. Ramsay adjourned the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen I. Harris
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem