



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

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

OCTOBER 9, 2013 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Linda Ramsay, Chair
Ebony Simpson, Vice Chair
Reed Engle
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Keith Howington
T. Jerry Lominack
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Members Not Present: Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian
Marjorie Weibe-Reed

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

1. [Petition of James Ervin | 13-004349-COA | 125 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval for the installation of one (1) principal use projecting sign and window signs for the new business, "City Coffee," located at 125 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard with the condition that - PASS

the principal use projecting sign be relocated to be 10 feet clear above the sidewalk to meet the sign ordinance.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

2. [Petition of Greenline Architecture | 13-004461-COA | 606 Turner Blvd. | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

Approval for five (5) traffic signs for the Embassy Suites three level parking garage located at 606 Turner Boulevard as requested because they are visually compatible and are exempt from the sign ordinances. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

3. [Petition of Tommy Rosson, Coastal Canvas Products | 13-004608-COA | 41 Drayton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [HBR Application for Sign - COA 083013.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the requested projecting principal use sign and awning at 41 Drayton because the proposed signs are visually compatible and meet the sign and design standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle
Second: T. Jerry Lominack
Reed Engle - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
T. Jerry Lominack - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

4. [Petition of Commonwealth Construction | 13-004866-COA | 612 Drayton Street | Alterations](#)

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

Board Action:

Approve the petition for work on the eave corbels and a color change for the property located at 612 Drayton Street because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the preservation standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle
Second: T. Jerry Lominack
Reed Engle - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
T. Jerry Lominack - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

5. [Petition of The Nelson Group | 13-004869-COA | 219 East Gaston Street | Fence](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval for the removal of a knee wall and the installation of a new fence at the front of the property located at 219 East Gaston Street because - PASS the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

6. [Petition of Oglethorpe Associates | 13-004870-COA | 605 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Aerial View.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

Approval for a sign package at Embassy Suites located at 605 West Oglethorpe Avenue as requested because the signs are visually compatible and meet the standards in the sign ordinance. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

7. [Petition of Cogdell & Mendrala Architects | 13-004875-COA | 134 Houston Street | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval for alterations and an after-the-fact freestanding principal use sign for the property located at 134 Houston Street with the following conditions:

1. Rebuild the brick fence to enclose the HVAC units located at the southeast corner of the main building. Submit the design to staff for final review and approval.
2. Submit color selections for wood doors and stoops to staff for final review and approval. - PASS
3. Add bases to the stoop newel posts. Submit the design to staff for final review and approval.

NOTE: This approval does not supersede any/all other City requirements. The sign must also be approved by the departments listed above, and receive encroachment and sign (building) permits from the City.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle
Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

8. [Petition of Lakhman Matadin d/b/a Frozen Paradise | 13-004877-COA | 641 Indian Street | Fence](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval of the fence at 641 Indian Street with the condition that the fence be painted or stained, and that the finish for the fence be submitted to staff for review prior to construction. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

9. [Petition of Jackie Schott | 13-004901-COA | 14 West Liberty Street | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

Approval to install three (3) non-illuminated, freestanding, traffic-control guidance signs for the public parking lot (three vacant lots) located at 13-14 West Liberty Street as requested because the work meets the sign standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

10. [Petition of Jackie Schott | 13-004902-COA | 660 East River Street | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

Approval to install four (4) non-illuminated, freestanding, traffic-control guidance signs for the public parking lot (a vacant lot) located at 660 East River Street as requested because the work meets

the sign standards and is visually compatible.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

11. [Approve Agenda](#)

Board Action:

Approve the agenda for Meeting of October 9, 2013 - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

12. [Approve September 11, 2013 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [09-11-13 MINUTES.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve September 11, 2013 Meeting Minutes - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack	
Second: Keith Howington	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

13. [Petition of Megan Nelson | 13-003576-COA | 301 Williamson Street | After-the-Fact Fence/Wall](#)

Board Action:

Continue to November 13, 2013. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle	
Second: Nicholas Henry	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

Board Action:

Continue the petition to the November 13, 2013 meeting. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle	
Second: Nicholas Henry	

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

Board Action:

Continue to November 13, 2013. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

16. [Petition of Hill / Gray Seven, LLC | 13-003840-COA | 540 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Alterations, Addition, Fence, and Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Architect's Response Letter.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Drew Hill was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of alterations and signs for the building located at 540 East Oglethorpe Avenue. She reported that this petition was reviewed and continued at the September 11, 2013 Board meeting for

the petitioner to consider some items. The petitioner has responded to the items.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval of alterations and signs for the building located at 540 East Oglethorpe Avenue because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the design standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Hill came forward, thanked the Board for hearing their petition and introduced himself. He said he had no comments.

Dr. Williams stated that there is no plan showing how the awnings would look.

Mr. Hill said the awnings would be a one foot in-depth metal awning.

Dr. Williams asked if the roofing material would be sheet metal.

Mr. Hill answered yes.

Mr. Howington asked what would the seam from below look like.

Mr. Hill answered that it will be metal as well.

Mr. Engle stated that he believes the petitioner responded to the Board's concerns quite well regarding the mid-century architecture as compared to their original submission.

Mr. Hill said he agreed with all the Board's comments that were made at the last meeting.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Hill if he would be amenable to the knee wall fence coming up to the height of the the window sills. Is there a reason why you selected the present height?

Mr. Hill said he would not be opposed to this if this is what the Board wants. He explained that the reason they went a little lower is partly because of the aesthetics and the secondary reason was for safety. They wanted to make it as open as possible. Their employees come to work very early and leave late. If the Board wants the knee wall fence to come up to the same height as the sills of the windows would not be a problem for them.

Dr. Williams said during the discussion, they will discuss the knee wall.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation said they believe the design has improved and is more keeping with the mid-century spirit of the building. The HSF commended the petitioner and the Board for their comments of the previous meeting to have the result they see today. She said additionally they agree with Dr. Williams's comment about raising the knee wall to create a line of continuity so that the wall will be the same height as the sill of the windows.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle stated that in response to Dr. Williams comment, they previously approved two other commercial properties on Oglethorpe Avenue. One of the locations was the Brasserie and the other was the rehabilitation of the old lumber yard site. He explained that in both cases, the wall below the iron fence was 36 to 42 inches tall. This has been the Board's general standard in the past because it screens the car, but does not screen the people. Therefore, you are not compromising safety with having 36 to 42 inch height. Mr. Engle said he is not sure how high the window sill is. Is it about 36 inches?

Ms. Michalak answered that the window sill is three feet high.

Mr. Engle said the 36 to 42 inches have been the typical size of the iron fences. He agrees that the Board should ask for it to be 36 inches with a cast stone cap on it.

Mr. Lominack said a question came up about the awning regarding how the top and bottom surfaces are treated. He realizes the Board was given a verbal response to this, but he believes it would be important for them to get a good detail of the canopy. This could be reviewed by staff, but this is just to ensure that it is a finished looking canopy.

Mr. Engle asked if there is no section here at all.

Mr. Howington answered no. The section does not show what is on the other side.

Board Action:

Approval for the alterations and signs for the building located at 540 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Raise the fence knee wall height to 36 inches - PASS to match the height of the water table on the adjacent building.
2. Provide staff with details for the metal canopy; indicate materials and design of canopy roof and ceiling.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Keith Howington

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

Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

17. [Petition of Matthew Allen for J. Leander, LLC | 13-003855-COA | 502 East Oglethorpe Street | New Construction Garage: Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Aerial - Facing South.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Mass Model.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs and Renderings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Specifications.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details of a garage at the lane. The accessory structure is proposed at the rear of the property and will provide two garage openings off of the lane.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details of the proposed garage at 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue as requested because it is visually compatible and meets the design standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Allan came forward and introduced himself.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for New Construction: Part II, Design
Details of the proposed garage at 502 East
Oglethorpe Avenue as requested because it is
visually compatible and meets the design standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Ebony Simpson
Reed Engle - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

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

18. [Petition of John Clegg, Barnard Architects | 13-004353-COA | 225 East Huntingdon Street | New Construction Carriage House, Part I: Height and Mass and Part II: Design Details, Porch Addition, Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

Mr. John Clegg was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting Part I and Part II New Construction approval for a two story apartment and add a two-story screened porch on the rear of the existing residence, add an accent window on the east façade and alter the fence on the east property line for the property located at 225 East Huntingdon Street. On September 11, 2013 the Board approved the demolition of the non-historic garage at the lane because the structure possessed no known historical or architectural significance, is less than 50 years of age, and is not eligible for historic designation. The Board also voted to recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) of the 30 foot structured parking setback variance required under Sec 8.3030(n)(14)b. to allow a zero setback in this corner lot condition.

Ms. Harris stated that additionally, the Board continued the petition for the two-story garage apartment for the property located at 225 East Huntingdon Street to address the following:

- a. Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids
- b. Proportion of Openings
- c. Windows and Doors
- d. Carriage House Roof Shapes
- e. Scale of the Structure
- f. Directional Expression of Front Elevation

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends the following:

1. New Constructions Parts I and II: Approval for two-story garage apartment for the property located at 225 East Huntingdon Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit:
 - a. Redesign the openings on the lane (primary) façade so that the centerlines align to meet the standards.
 - b. Increase the size of the fenestration on the second floor of the south façade to meet the standards.
 - c. Install windows on the east façade rather than recessed indents.
2. Alterations to Existing Building: Approval for two-story porch addition and window on the east façade with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit:

- a. Follow Preservation Brief 22: The Preservation and Repair of Historic Stucco to include an analysis of the existing stucco and match the composition and finish.
 - b. Inset the door frames three inches.
 - c. Inset the windows to match historic window insets.
 - d. All porch elements are wood.
3. Fence Alteration: Approval for fence alterations on the east property line with the following condition to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit:
- a. The gate is iron.

Mr. Engle said it is great to say Preservation Brief 22, but they revised the entire standard on masonry and stucco. The petitioner is required to put up a test sample panel.

Ms. Harris said staff's recommendation would be amended to include that the petitioner put up a test sample panel.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Clegg stated that they agree with the staff recommendations with the following clarifications. He explained that on the second floor windows facing the lane on the carriage house, they want the maximum height to be set at four feet. They are trying to accommodate some cabinetry on the inside of the building. They have countertops at four feet; the window sill will be right under the counter. This is the reason they want to limit this to four feet. He explained that the elevation facing Lincoln Street, they tried to reduce the mass of this by switching to a hip roof and decided on stucco; the recesses are shown to emulate windows and they feel this is appropriate. They have seen this done before. Mr. Clegg showed the Board some images of a carriage house on the lane in the same block they are in. He pointed out that on the left at the top, the Board can see the recessed there. The windows on the back are four feet tall. They are suggesting that their window also face the lane.

Mr. Clegg said they feel strongly about the recesses, but they are willing to concede and look further at the window; they will consider closed shutters that will be set in the recessed. The shutters will match what will be used on the porch. The shutters will be fixed and will not be operable. This will give the appearance of windows facing Lincoln Street. He has with him today the PVC products that will be used for the porch. They are solid and cost more than wood. They are durable and require less maintenance. Once they are painted, you would not be able to tell that they are not wood. However, as he said, if it is important, they will be happy to concede this and use wood instead.

Mr. Clegg stated that regarding the gates, they feel strongly that the wood gates are appropriate and they have done this before, but they are willing to concede this and work with staff to develop metal gates that will be appropriate.

Dr. Williams said Mr. Clegg said he would paint the PVC. Does this not have adhesion problems? It feels slick to him.

Mr. Clegg said the manufacturer has recommendations on priming and painting. They have used this before with success.

Dr. Williams asked how would the paint on this hold up better than on wood.

Mr. Clegg stated that it does not have to do with the paint, but with the durability of the product.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation stated that they agree with all of staff's recommendations for the carriage house. They believe that the size of the window openings on the second floor of the south façade needs to be increased to meet the standard and all openings designed so that the center lines are aligned. Ms. Meunier said they also agree that windows should be installed on the east façade rather than recessed indents. The HSF prefers closed shutters as opposed to indents. They suggest that shutters be included on the rest of the window openings on the carriage house.

Ms. Meunier said regarding the porch addition, they feel that while the overall massing of the addition is in scale, the massing of the porch members and detailing, particularly the columns, should be made heavier and not so slim and delicate in order to be more in keeping with the style of the house and the details of the front porch. The HSF agrees that all the porch elements should be wood. They do not agree with the addition of the round oval window on the east façade. They do not feel that it is appropriate or necessary to puncture the façade with this accent window and remove existing historic material to do so.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Clegg if he wanted to address the public comments.

Mr. Clegg stated that the size of the columns on the rear porch are ten inches at the base and eight inches square of the second floor. Although, they may seem slender this is not the primary façade of the house. Therefore, they thought it would be okay to be a little different than the front. He said if they limit the height of the windows on the area to four feet, this would still work for them. He explained that the oval window will provide daylight to an interior stair that presently has no daylight. They did not want to put a rectangular window here because it would seem false and there was not really enough wall to work with; therefore, the oval window is an accent window. It is different from everything else, but they want all the details to match the existing. Therefore, in theory, maybe years from now it will look like an original window, but obviously different.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he agrees with the Historic Savannah Foundation comments on the accent window. He believes the accent window is inappropriate as it becomes a singular feature on the elevation and is not historic. A window never has been in this stairway. A skylight might be a better approach. He said he believes the window draws your eyes right to that window.

Mr. Engle said in terms of the carriage house fenestration, he would propose an alternative which is to have rear windows on the second floor and closed shutters on the first floor. It is not uncommon on primary elevations and on carriage houses that the first floor windows have an infill over the years. But, the second floor windows are usually still

functional. If it is a question about safety or concern about visibility into the first floor, the cars and so forth, they can work with shut shutters and have the second floor to be actual windows. This is a primary elevation on Lincoln Street and everybody that goes by here will see it. Mr. Engle said, therefore, he believes it needs character and this just does not have character. If there is a four foot window on the lane he is less concerned about that, but he agrees with the comment that if they are going to put shutters closed, then there should be shutters at least on the Lincoln Street elevation. He is not sure about the lane.

Mr. Engle said he mentioned the stucco patch because it is critical that the stucco be right on the main house. A test sample patch needs to be seen. He wanted to remind the Board that a couple of years ago they had an issue with stucco that was atrocious. Therefore, at this point they changed the standard and character.

Mr. Lominack said he agrees 100% with the staff's comments about the carriage house. He believes that to add shutters over a recessed fake window is perpetuating a falsehood. It is either a window or not and if it is not going to be a window, then make it a wall. Mr. Lominack said he agrees that windows are the firm solution. Regarding the accent window, if light is needed, he believes it would be much better on the wall perpendicular to the east wall rather than on the east wall of the building.

Dr. Williams said regarding the proportions of the columns and post on the rear porch in response to Historic Savannah Foundation's comments, he said just looking around, there are buildings downtown with this similar vintage and multi-level galleries or porches on substantial houses. Dr. Williams said a good example of this is 3 West Gordon Street. This building has a multi-storied gallery and proportions of these posts are very similar to those that are proposed for this project and the house is similar vintage. Therefore, he would be inclined to say due to the nature of the structure at the back, that the current proportions are appropriate as are the heavy proportions on the first floor and slightly narrower on the second floor would be in keeping with rear galleried porches, at least some of them.

Mr. Howington stated that he agrees with all of the comments. He did like the solution that Mr. Lominack stated about bringing the window to the back, if possible. Mr. Howington said he also concurs with the columns on the back of the porch being in proportions. In the past, the Board has approved H B and G columns as they are solid PVC composite. They are durable and structurally sound. When they are painted, you cannot tell the difference. Due to the fact that this will be a new porch, he believes this needs to be distinguished as well. He said that at least the columns need to be distinguished. He agrees with what has been said about the windows on the carriage house.

Dr. Williams asked if all of the columns will be wood.

Mr. Clegg answered that all of the columns are H B and G. Everything else is wood with the exception of the two components as shown.

Mr. Howington asked if the railings would also be a composite system as well.

Mr. Clegg answered that the railings would be wood.

Mr. Engle said there is enough space for a door on this elevation; he does not understand why a rectangular window could not go up above here. He is not only concerned about adding an accent window, but is concerned about adding an oval where there is none in this building. A smaller rectangular window could go here with the right proportions and there is more than enough room for it as a door is below it. It should be able to be aligned with the door. The oval window bothers him, too.

Ms. Ramsay explained that she believes the question is does the Board wants this to come back to staff or come back to the Board.

Dr. Williams said he believes the petitioner needs to be asked if he is in agreement with moving the window around.

Mr. Clegg stated that they are not opposed to eliminating the oval window, moving it around the corner and make it a smaller size. They can work with staff to do this.

Mr. Howington said another concern was if windows are put on the ground floor you are looking into a garage. Would shutters be more appropriate?

Mr. Engle said it could be just a blank wall or the recessed.

Mr. Howington said the recessed was presented for putting windows on the second floor.

Mr. Engle said there are many examples in town of first floor recessed windows that are filled in; this has happened over the years.

Mr. Howington said he can think of carriage houses along Lincoln Street and most of them have windows on the second floor.

Mr. Lominack asked Mr. Clegg how much distance is between the sill of the windows on the second floor of the carriage house and the floor on the inside.

Mr. Clegg answered that the countertop is three feet. Presently, the sill is sitting on top of a four inch back splash. Therefore, it will be sitting on top of the countertop at three feet.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Clegg if the interior height of the second floor is nine feet.

Mr. Clegg answered yes.

Dr. Williams stated that he believes the perception is that given the width of the façade, obviously if the windows had shutters on them, it would increase their size, but generally they seem small; especially when you look at the door. In other words, the door seems strangely large or the windows seem strangely small. However the petitioner finds a solution, rather coming down or going up, he believes that larger windows maintain proportions; there is the issue of the windows being centered over the center lines. It appears that the petitioner has some wiggle room.

Mr. Lominack said with the building not be built and the kitchen is not built either, there

are a number of ways that the kitchen could be done and allow the larger windows. He was not getting into the interior specifically, but this appears to be the best solution.

Dr. Williams said whatever solution the petitioner chooses for this elevation, the windows should be consistent.

Mr. Engle said an elevation of this width should minimally have three windows.

Dr. Williams said maybe a solution without necessarily increasing the height would probably be to have one of those windows as paired windows.

Mr. Clegg said they certainly want to work with staff, but the owner wants the Board to consider the windows facing Lincoln Street as being either recesses or shutters.

Board Action:

Approval for New Construction Parts I and II for a two-story garage apartment; two story porch addition and window; and fence alterations on the east property line located at 225 East Huntingdon Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit:

1. Redesign the openings on the lane (primary) façade so that the centerlines align to meet the standards.
2. Increase the size or quantity of the fenestration on the second floor of the south façade to meet the standard;
3. Install windows on the east façade rather than recessed indents; - PASS
4. Follow Preservation Brief 22: The Preservation and Repair of Historic Stucco to include an analysis of the existing stucco and match the composition and finish;
5. Install a four by four test panel for the historic stucco patch for staff review and approval;
6. Move the oval window proposed on the east façade to the south façade and choose a square or other geometric shape;
7. Inset the door frames three inches;
8. Inset the windows to match historic window insets; and
9. Change the gate material to iron.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

19. [Petition of Thomas Hoffman | 13-004366-COA | 452 Price Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Mr. Brian Martine was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a second-story, rear addition for the property located at 452 Price Street. This petition was continued from the meeting of September 11, 2013 for the petitioner to consider the following:

1. Differentiate the proposed addition from the historic building by either using a contemporary design or referencing design motifs from the historic building. The addition should not copy the historic building, which creates a false sense of historical development.
2. The re-designed addition should remove as little historic material as possible, including the rear wall of the historic main building.
3. The re-designed addition should be as reversible as possible.
4. Add windows on the Gaston Street façade of the addition and provide a photograph of that side of the building from the public right-of-way.
5. Ensure that the plans and elevations are in agreement with each other.
6. Revise the addition's roof shape.

Ms. Harris stated that the petitioner submitted a revised version of the drawings which included a window on the Gaston Street façade. When staff reviewed this during their case distribution with the Chair (Ms. Ramsay) it came to view that this side of the building is on the property line and, therefore, cannot have the window on the property line. Therefore, the application was revised to review the original submittal without the window.

Ms. Harris said that staff feels that with the submitted revisions that the preservation standards have been met. The proposed addition removes as little historic materials as possible and is differentiated from the old for use of the front gable roof shape and can be restored in the future.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the petition for a second-story, rear addition for the property located at 452 Price Street because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Martine, one of the owners, stated that Mr. Hoffman was not present today due to being out-of-town. Mr. Martine said they are in agreement with the staff's recommendation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Lominack stated that he believes saving the little roof where the first was located does not look good.

Mr. Howington agreed with Mr. Lominack. He said he appreciates the petitioner's effort to separate the existing from the new, but he believes there is another way to do this by changing the pattern of the solid band course another way. Mr. Howington said he would be in favor of eliminating the partial roof.

Ms. Ramsay said she believes the question would be is the Board willing to let staff work this out with the petitioner.

Mr. Howington said he would be willing for staff to work this out with the petitioner. He said he also appreciates that the petitioner changing the roof shape. Mr. Howington said he does not know how the Board feels about this, but he is acceptable to either.

Mr. Lominack stated that he likes this one better.

Mr. Engle said if they are going to eliminate the roof eave, then they should shift the spacing on the siding above so that it is clearly evident that it is a different period.

Ms. Ramsay explained that what is being said is that the petitioner remove the little roof band and work with staff to come up with a solution that would differentiate the new construction from the existing construction.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for addition at 452 Price Street with the condition that the proposed existing roof elements on the existing first floor be eliminated, and that the second story addition be - PASS differentiated from the first story through a change in siding dimension or other detail to be coordinated with staff.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

20. [Petition of Neil Dawson, Dawson Architects | 13-004872-COA | 609 Abercorn Street | Rehabilitation and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Ortho-Imagery -004872.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps -004872.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Historic Building Map #1536.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to rehabilitate the north façade of the Chatham Apartments.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the proposed alterations to 609 Abercorn Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to a building permit being issued:

1. Inset the proposed storefronts four inches.
2. Provide manufacturer information on the proposed storefronts.
3. Provide a color for the precast parapet cap.

Dr. Henry asked staff if they have photos of the original 1951 building.

Ms. Harris said she was unable to locate the photos, but, perhaps, the petitioner was able to locate some photos. She did not do extensive research, but just looked at the information that they had in their files.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson said they looked for some historical photographs, but were not able to find any pertaining to the building.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Dawson if the interior use of the floors actually have any openings.

Mr. Dawson answered yes; the floors have already been modified on the interior. Therefore, adding the windows would be disruptive to the interior of the building at this point. It would be almost as disruptive as ripping off the partition.

Dr. Williams asked what do the lines represent where the windows were located.

Mr. Dawson stated that he imagines they will have control joints where the windows were. There is probably some kind of construction joint that they will have to maintain. He said frankly if the Board looks at the front elevation, a few elevations have been infilled already. The result would be a similar treatment to what already exists on the side of the façade.

Dr. Williams asked if these are inset.

Mr. Dawson answered that they are not inset. They are basically flushed. He explained that the slab element projects slightly from the building face . Therefore, what they are doing in their proposed detail as shown on page 2 is that they anticipate where the piece jets out beyond the face of the building, will have an aluminum piece of stucco that will match the fascia on the front of the building and aligns with it at the same depth. This would allow them to construct a new veneer wall below this and still maintain the relationship that exists on the front of the building.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for alterations to 609 Abercorn Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to a building permit being issued:

- Inset the proposed storefronts four inches. - PASS
- Provide manufacturer information on the proposed storefronts.
- Provide a color for the precast parapet cap.

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

21. [Petition of Gerald D. Cowart | 13-004876-COA | 322-324 East Broughton Street | Rehabilitation](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- application and description.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- photographs and notes.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Drawings- Site plan and floor plans.pdf](#)

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

NOTE: Ms. Simpson left the meeting at 2:40. Ms. Ramsay explained that another Board member would be arriving on or about 3:00 p.m. Therefore, the Board would take a recess until that Board member arrives so as to give them a quorum.

Mr. Merriman arrived at 2:45 p.m. The Board reconvened.

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for the rehabilitation, exterior alterations, and additions to 322-324 East Broughton Street, known as the Berrien House. On January 9, 2013, the Board reviewed the project and approved the exploratory demolition (including selective stucco removal) and lowering of the ground floor. During the selective stucco removal process, the petitioner determined that the stucco was not stable and posed a danger as they moved forward with structural repairs and lowering the building. Therefore, on July 12, 2013 staff approved the removal of the remaining stucco.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the rehabilitation and additions to 322-324 East Broughton Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to permitting:

1. Eliminate the ovolo molding on the front doors to avoid conjectural elements;
2. Select a simplified chimney cap to avoid conjectural elements;
3. Provide stair detail to staff for review and approval;
4. Eliminate the recessed gate beneath the porch and create a wall of continuity;
5. Provide a section through the fence.

Dr. Henry asked if the staff's recommendation regarding "provide a section through the fence" was pertaining to the electrical.

Ms. Harris explained that a new fence is along the Habersham Street side. Staff is asking that a section be provided through it.

Dr. Henry asked staff how did they come to the conclusion that the ovolo on the front doors was conjectural. If the ballroom doors have it, then to some degree the front doors could also.

Ms. Harris stated that it could, but it could just as easily not. Therefore, this is why without definitive proof, photograph or some kind of physical evidence that it existed,

staff felt it was a conjectural element and a very specific architectural detail. In order to keep it a more simplified design, staff recommended that the molding be eliminated.

Mr. Merriman asked if the molding is oval shaped or the panels are raised in an oval shaped manner.

Ms. Harris explained that ovolo is a new term for her. She explained that the "ovolo" [pointing to a section] refers to this molding.

Mr. Engle said the ovolo is often used as a chair rail. He could not think of any cases where he has seen it used as an exterior molding.

Ms. Harris stated that she tried to research whether the ovolo molding was used as a typical detail on the exterior, but she was unable to find any documentation either way. However, she believes that Mr. Engle's comments support the assumption.

Mr. Engle said that the Standards frown upon mass removal of all siding. Is there any reason staff recommends approval of the removal?

Ms. Harris explained that she has taken a site visit on the building and was able to observe the condition of the siding. The deteriorated condition necessitates the removal of the siding, but reuse wherever possible. Therefore, in order to remove the deteriorated portions, replace and leave certain ones in place, would have created an entire patchwork over the building which would have been difficult to maintain.

Dr. Williams said he remembers where the Board has had a situation with a brick wall, pointing and other issues where they advocated more patchwork solution as opposed to wholesale. He said he was thinking about the building on Habersham and East Gwinnett Streets where the Board advocated a more selective. Therefore, it seems inconsistent to him that they would, in this case, embrace the idea of a wholesale removal of historic fabric from this location.

Ms. Harris explained that it is on a case-by-case basis based on the condition of the existing siding. In this case, staff felt that this was warranted, but it is not necessarily a recommendation for removal of all siding.

Dr. Williams said judging from the photographs which are a fairly high resolution, it appears that it is mixed. But, the Board will discuss this further in their discussion comment section.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cowart came forward and said that Mr. Andrew Jones, the owner, will assist him in answering questions of the Board. He explained that Mr. Jones has been involved with the research of this building. Mr. Cowart stated that as staff reported, they are asking for the final approval of restoration of the exterior of the building and the two additions, front portico and the rear porch.

Mr. Cowart, in addressing staff recommendations, said they are prepared to provide a stair and fence detail. He said pertaining to the gate, they have a condition where they need to

locate the electric meters and the disconnects. They have chosen to relocate them on the courtyard side of the building. The power company wants to have access to the meters; therefore, they cannot put them inside of a locked gate and they want security for the courtyard. Their proposal is not perfect, but satisfies both needs. Mr. Cowart asked the Board for some discussion pertaining to whether or not the porch would continue the wall of continuity or represents enough energy to be the wall of continuity. They are not excited about moving the meters and disconnects to the Habersham Street elevation. He said their proposal is to recess the gate enough to get the meters exposed.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Cowart if there was a reason why he could not put a gate that opens on line with the porch so the utility reader could come inside and read the meter. A security gate could be on the inside as Mr. Cowart has shown.

Mr. Cowart answered that there is no reason other than the fact that they would create a place where undesirables could hide. When someone comes in late at night, they could be startled by someone in the space between. This is one of their considerations.

Dr. Williams stated that the electrical meter readers do not need access.

Mr. Cowart said the electrical meter readers want access. He explained that if it is an existing condition where it is behind a courtyard, there are plenty examples where if there is a new situation, they want access to the meters. But, the other component is the access to the disconnects that the fire department wants. Their discussion, however, led to the supposition that if something is on fire, the fire company will come through the gate whether it is closed, locked or whatever. He said he had a discussion this morning with the electrical engineer and it is possible to locate the meters on Habersham Street. However, they feel that this is a less desirable solution than recessing the gate. They are prepared to add the second gate, although it is also less desirable, the second gate is not lockable.

Ms. Ramsay informed Mr. Cowart that her thought on this is if he did this, he might want to consider iron gates or something that you could see through so he would not have the situation that he has described.

Mr. Engle said this would give Mr. Cowart the wall of continuity.

Mr. Cowart stated that there are many cases where the wall of continuity is discontinuous where there is an opening in the gate or in the fence for human passage. In this case, they would not be far from that with the addition of the porch lintel and rail that is above; certainly extends the wall of continuity to building to the outside edge of the porch. Therefore, he was asking for some clarification of the definition of wall of continuity and the degree of construction that satisfies this requirement.

Mr. Cowart said in the case of the chimneys, they proposed a pointed arch design for the caps. They find that chimneys with caps are very common and a chimney without caps is less common. Therefore, in terms of simplifying the chimney cap, they feel that a cap on the chimney would be as common, if not historic, as anything else in the historic district. They would like to offer an option of round top caps versus the pointed arch caps.

Mr. Cowart said regarding the front doors, the ovolo molding is an applied molding onto a flat panel. In the case of the doors they have that are existing on the interior, they have a number of these style doors primarily at the ballroom level. The ovolo molding is actually an applied lead molding, it is not a little piece of wood. Therefore, its durability is high. He explained that the reason they did this was to add significance to the front door. In their discovery, they found very significant cornice and interior moldings inside the door.

Mr. Cowart commented that regarding the siding, Bob Ciucevich has advised them of their tax credit application. This is a tax credit job and they are following the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Mr. Ciucevich is keeping them in line.

Mr. Ciucevich stated that he believes it was the method in which the siding was going to be addressed. A better way to state it, is hopefully they were going to keep intact the original clapboard and move forward the clapboard that they were able to salvage from the rear and side elevations. This is standard practice that he has used before with the Historic Preservation Division on successful tax credit projects. He said that the Park Service actually recommends as a part of the Secretary Interior's Standards to use those when you have a situation such as this where you have intact fabric off later buildings you bring it to the prominent façade. This is what they are attempting to do here. He said whether or not they have to remove that clapboard from the façade and perhaps catalog it, is another issue. But, moving forward the original fabric from the façade in the rear is a common practice that is acceptable.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Ciucevich, for example, if the side elevation was theoretically in great shape on one of the other facades, would he take it off or was he saying he would only remove the siding that needs to be repaired.

Mr. Ciucevich clarified that he was not only talking about this situation. He explained that usually what they would do is that if you had a primary façade and in this case they are talking about the façade of the building on Broughton and Habersham Streets, you would remove that rear façade if it was not intact.

Ms. Ramsay asked if all the windows will be repaired or replaced?

Mr. Cowart answered that the windows are going to be replaced. They do not have any windows. They have provided staff with a photograph of the existing conditions and they do not have any windows that they can restore.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the windows on the west elevations will be required to be one hour protected?

Mr. Cowart stated that windows will not be replaced on the west elevation because the wall is required to be a one hour wall.

Ms. Ramsay said windows are shown on the top floors on the west.

Mr. Cowart said that if they are more than ten feet above the adjacent building, they are allowed to have a certain area of windows. He said the two windows in the garret meet that requirement until they get to the code officials. Therefore, they may not be able to have those windows.

Ms. Ramsay explained that the windows could be one hour protected or a one hour wall could be put in front of them. But, she does not want to see windows go in there because it is not just the windows, but the framing has to be one hour.

Mr. Cowart said he will research this further.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Cowart what evidence do they have that staircases were going up on both sides to the porch.

Mr. Cowart answered that they have physical evidence.

Dr. Williams asked that the evidence be presented.

Mr. Jones pulled up a ground floor view on the screen and said they did some excavations here.

Mr. Cowart explained that this would be the southeast corner of the portico. It aligned with a framing member that they would up on the parlor level. It corresponds with the depth of the portico. He said outside this photograph at a distance of approximately 15 feet, they found a landing stone where the original stair would have landed. Mr. Cowart said moving to the opposite end of this photograph, it was actually taken before they went some 15 feet in that direction to find that footing or that landing stone. What they found here was a combination of rubble that matched the construction of this footing and the material that was exposed here. This is the limit of the physical evidence that they found.

Mr. Jones said, however, it is interesting to see and to compare that there is a stoop currently in one house with a stoop on one side. The Barnard house is a wood clad house and has a double stoop.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Jones what evidences are there since this one does not have a porch, roof or columns. Do you have evidence that there was a porch roof?

Mr. Jones answered that there is historical evidence. He said [pointing to an area] that the center of the house is here and this side has the original wall. The ceiling was extended to add the columns. In the original house, things were just moved around. He said they think this is the porch column looking at the conditions from the 1850s with similar patch work adding or extending to the left and putting in some pipe columns.

Dr. Williams said the original proposal was to take this back to a much narrower period of historic significance. He said the petitioner is selectively removing parts of this building's historic. Obviously the back was turned into a double house. It was then subsequently turned into a store. But, on the back of the house, there is a complex story and it is not entirely clear from the packet. For example, the cladding where it is being proposed to open up the lower floor, but not the upper floor on the side of the rear gallery. What is the justification for removing some of the cladding but not others?

Mr. Jones explained that they can show some material details from the original shed. He said [pointing to an area] that the ceiling lines are here. The current division was here and a

very low porch would have been here. This was open, but it is hard to see as there is a little corner piece and one is up here. In other words, when they added the extension, this was continuous and does not appear to be back here. They are irregular and sloppy when compared to the rest. They do not know exactly when it was built, but they know the room was there. Therefore, this is the most likely case.

Dr. Williams said his point is, it is there and perhaps was done poorly, but, it is there. How do you justify removing one section of the cladding? He is concerned about selective history. Once they get around to the north elevation, he will be equally demanding and wondering why they keep or change certain features. The complexity of the building, are they making it a pure 1840 or 1860 house is less compelling and less interesting than a building that tells a complex story.

Mr. Jones said when they get to the north façade, they will see that they are doing exactly that, trying to tell the complex story. They believe that it is more likely as the wall turns that it is more cladded here and there is the open porch. Personally, he prefers to have an open porch all the way up and down. But, they believed that since they were continuous, there must have been a reason. Mr. Jones said these would have been sleeping porches. But, upstairs he does not want his neighbors across the street to look at him.

Dr. Williams said what is being proposed is to have a clapboard part of the elevation above an opening which is unconventional. If Mr. Jones was building a new house, he would have an open porch, but he has purchased a house that has this condition.

Mr. Jones said if the decision is to keep all the clapboard all the way down, personally he has no objections.

Mr. Cowart added that in the study of the siding, they found siding from at least three different eras. Therefore, replacement and reuse of the siding in the area of the lower porch of discussion, that siding is of the oldest variety and is clearly reused in that location.

Mr. Engle asked what nails are holding this in place?

Mr. Jones said they have studied the nails and sidings. The oldest nails they have seen are in the lower sections of the siding where there are no changes.

Mr. Engle said he was asking about where the porch was enclosed. What nails are holding that reused siding?

Mr. Jones said he was not sure as they have not pulled any of this up on the corner.

Mr. Engle said this is highly critical; it could easily have been here for 150 years.

Mr. Jones said he believes the enclosures were mainly used for bathrooms.

Mr. Engle stated that what Dr. Williams has said is absolutely correct according to the Secretary of Interior's Standards. To take this out and put in nice even siding is creating a false sense of history.

Dr. Williams said the petitioner is proposing to just remove it and have it open.

Mr. Engle said this has been here for 150 years. This is problematic because there will be an open porch and yet, they are keeping changes that are later than when that porch was enclosed. Mr. Engle said he is afraid that something is being created that never existed at one point in time.

Mr. Cowart said they do not know this for sure.

Mr. Engle said this is the problem.

Mr. Cowart said what they do know is that the lower porch was enclosed at a different time than the upper porch enclosure. They are assuming that this was done later. He will look at the nails and date them for the Board, but they are going to be older than 50 years, before the stucco. In fact they do not know what the function of the space was, but it was and is presently enclosed.

Dr. Williams said he believes that regardless of its function and regardless of what happened, it is what it is. It is an historical feature and this Board is charged with the responsibility of not only compatibility of the structures, but being good stewards and making sure that changes to buildings meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Mr. Engle said this is a restoration and all has existed at one contemporary period. You cannot say that this window was not here then, but this door was. The Board needs to see consistency and if it has to be a little later, then that's the way it goes.

Mr. Cowart said they feel that they have offered the Board that consistency with the period of significance. They have tried to stay true to that 57 plus years of period of significance.

Mr. Engle stated that usually they have the end of the period of significance is what the building looks like, not anywhere within that 57 years. The porch and stoop are being reconstructed; therefore, all of it is not restoration. The standards are very different on reconstruction than they are on restoration and are more stringent in many cases.

Mr. Merriman asked if the shutters on the front elevation will be operable.

Mr. Cowart answered yes.

Mr. Merriman asked if the shutters will be large enough to cover the entire opening where the large window and the two small windows are located.

Mr. Cowart answered yes. They are intended to be bi-fold shutters that will cover the entire opening. He said the Board might have noticed that the size of that shutter times two does not cover the entire window; he believes this was caught late by Historic Savannah; they will modify the size of the shutter.

Mr. Jones informed the Board that he has a lot of factual materials that might be useful to them in their discussion.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Jones if they are proposing to open the rear galleried porch the entire width.

Mr. Jones answered yes and said based upon Ruger in 1871 saying that this is an "open porch." He said in the rafter tails sticking out, they can see where the rafter tails were cut in the center for the porch. The rafter tails is where the bedrooms were added and they are continuous. If it was continuous means that the second floor porch was up at the time the bedrooms were added.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said he would make a couple of comments and try to answer some of the questions for the period the HSF owned this building. Mr. Carey said at the outset, they hold an easement on this building as it was one of their Revolving Fund properties. He guessed the course of the HSF's ownership expands 15 years or more. They have in some cases reactively and in some cases proactively made some repairs to the building in the interest of protecting it. Mr. Carey said in response to Dr. Williams's questions regarding the north elevation, the entire wall was rebuilt. They rebuilt it approximately four years ago because it was about to fall onto the courtyard. Prior to this, they made some interior and exterior changes. He said that the HSF is joining with Quatrefoil Consulting and advising on the tax credits. They are trying to work this project through the Secretary of Interior's Standards so that it can earn the credit, which for them is important that they get the stamp of approval from both the state and National Park Service.

Mr. Carey said he believes they have to be careful when using the word restoration or rehabilitation. Some of this is actually a reconstruction. He said the owner is fully vested in this project, not just financially, but he is a very responsible, conscientious owner who is assisting greatly with the research and wants to do the right thing. He said that he does not believe that it is a matter of picking and choosing periods for convenience sake. He believes the owner is really trying to do an honest effort for the best restoration in terms of trying to bring a building back to a period in time and do a respectful restoration so that as a community we can appreciate a building that we ordinarily do not see any longer. He does not believe that in Savannah we have a lot of good restorations. Therefore, this project maybe the closest that they will get on one of the most important buildings. Mr. Carey said it has arguably been said that this is the most important "unrestored" building in Savannah. But, now they have the opportunity to restore it and also has an owner who is committed to do so.

Mr. Carey said the HSF supports the plan and their Architecture Review Committee met with the architects and the owner yesterday and made constructive comments, most of which were supportive including chimney caps and entrances in the front. He said they discussed the siding. Right from the beginning it has less than 50% of its siding; there is nothing on the west wall; nothing on the north wall; there is damaged siding on the east wall; and on the south, primary façade. Mr. Carey said he believes as Mr. Ciucevich pointed out, the consolidation of that when you are assessing what you have and salvaging what you can and are really trying to respect the primary façade, is an appropriate treatment to try to move some of it around; whatever is on the west will be all new; and nothing on the north. Therefore, in really trying to put the best face forward, the most historic in a way is

in the terms of materials. Mr. Carey said, therefore, the HSF is comfortable with the siding approach. Mr. Carey said they [the Review Board] at this point has already made a decision to allow the building to be lowered. Therefore, they have already chosen a path of restoration. If they would have said "no" it needs to stay where it was lifted in 1917, then they would be on that track, but they have said that this is a restoration and they are trying to approach it that way. They have a period of significance and he believes that all the things that have been put forth fall within that period and certainly within the period of restoration.

Mr. Carey stated again that the HSF supports the plan as submitted and they certainly understand some of the challenges, but they recognize that the owner is willing to be flexible. Ultimately, he does not believe that they would want to deny the opportunity to come as close to this restoration as they can. This is a rare opportunity that they have to be able to treat a building such as this. This is not a museum building, but it is on a very prominent corner where a lot of people can see, appreciate and learn from.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Lominack said he believes they have gotten too wrapped up in definition of words. They probably have zero restoration projects happening anywhere in the purest sense of the word. The decision was made by the owner and the architect and he believes that it was endorsed to a certain extent by the Review Board when they agreed to lower the building. This was a part of the transition of the building from the day it was built until this day. The same thing could probably be said about the back being torn off as it, too, was a part of the transition. He said once the decision was made to take it back to that point, he gets the feeling that the owner and the architect have done a great deal of research and have probably found as much information as they can find to be as true to adaptive restoration of that building as can possibly be done. Mr. Lominack said he would hate to see them get wrapped up in semantics rather than in the end result. He said he believes the project is moving along quite well.

Dr. Henry said he is in complete agreement with Mr. Lominack. He commended the architects and the owner. In his opinion, this is an outstanding job. Dr. Henry said he has read the updated notes and the Board agreed that the period of significance was 1820 to 1856.

Mr. Engle said this still does not resolve the question that they are talking about removing fabric which could be 150 years old and not replacing it with something when it still is contemporaneous with other things they are keeping. He said he has no problem with the front elevation and Habersham Street as he believes all the documentation is there; but he believes there are problems with the back.

Dr. Henry asked when was the shed added.

Mr. Jones said from the inventory, they know what the rooms were on the ground floor. There are no enclosed rooms in the back or on the next floor. There is nothing in the inventory for little rooms back there.

Mr. Engle said all this means is that they did not have furniture in there to inventory.

Mr. Jones said they probably had 200 chairs. There were at least 16 children and beds were everywhere. Every place is jammed pack and the closets are filled with books and discarded political figures.

Dr. Williams stated that fundamentally the choosing of the periods of significance is an arbitrary operation regardless of what may have been said at some previous meeting. As far as he is concerned, it is not as if the building ceased to exist. Dr. Williams said he understood the motive to take the building back, especially when they have features which may or may not have existed with the so called period of significance. The siding could have been there and they have acknowledged that. He was only making the point that they have existing historic fabric that is being proposed to be removed. It may have existed during the so called periods of significance; it is certainly historic fabric and, therefore, both on principle and in this specific case, they always proceed cautiously when the owner proposes to remove historic fabric which has been a fundamental principle on which this Board operates.

Mr. Merriman said if he understood carefully, there is not enough existing siding that is in good enough shape to reuse everywhere. What they were talking about is taking everything that is good and at least try to make one good façade out of it. They will be removing it from one area, but it is going back on the building. He said even if it existed in the same period or not, it all will still be there if it is possibly able to be reused.

Mr. Lominack said it appears that there are some members of the Board who are speculating on what was there as much if not more than the architect and the owner. He said he guessed the next option would be to do nothing. The rear of the building has gone through several evolutions and its current evolution is wrapped up in the building of plywood and wood. Should they leave it this way? Mr. Lominack said he does not think they should leave it as such; he believes that when they get into the unknown somebody has to make a valid judgment as to which is the best solution. It may or may not be a 100% right solution. He believes they need to move on.

Mr. Howington said he is in favor of what has been presented. Initially he had concerns about the second porch being enclosed. It was clapboard siding on one side and a sleeping porch. He said he agrees that the architect has done his due diligence. They rarely get this amount of research and history. Mr. Howington said he believes the petitioner is presenting what is the best solution. After hearing the argument and he saw the outline of what use to be the back addition and the second floor enclosure, he is in favor of what has been presented.

Mr. Engle said he is in favor of what has been said about the back elevation with the exception of removing the clapboard on the lower porch.

Mr. Merriman told the petitioner that he has to be the most conscientious and most prepared petitioner that he has seen come before the Board with all the information they have presented. This Board does not know if it was there or not there during the period of significance. He, too, believes the petitioner has done a very good job and he is in favor of approving the staff recommendations.

Dr. Henry said the Board is always torn between values, aesthetics and history.

Sometimes they favor one over the other. He said personally he is going for aesthetics in this case.

Mr. Engle said this is not a new building where they are dealing with aesthetics. This is an old building where they are dealing with restoration and reconstruction. Therefore, aesthetics is not the issue. It could be the ugliest building in the hemisphere, but it could be restored correctly.

Mr. Jones said Sanborn in 1888 showed an open porch; in 1898 Sanborn showed an open porch; in 1916 Sanborn showed the addition of stucco. They know the second floor went all the way up because of the roof rafters, but it was not until 1916 that they filled it out probably for insurance purposes to make it a masonry building.

Dr. Williams said 1888 even shows it was already a solid side of wood cladding.

Mr. Jones said his interpretation is that it was a completely opened porch by that time.

Mr. Cowart said they are trying to do the right thing and on conjectural items, he believes staff's review is for the simplest solution. He said he prefers to move towards something that is more customary for a building of these materials in this period. Pointed arches seems to be the norm for clapboard houses. Mr. Cowart said they can go either way, but he just wanted to say that they were choosing this as they thought it was the right thing.

Mr. Merriman said they do not really know what was up there, but they do have to put something up there.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board could approve for the petitioner to work this out with the staff.

Dr. Williams said he believes that the petitioner has made a compelling case for one or the other and as Ms. Ramsay said, this could be worked out with the staff.

Board Action:

Approval for the rehabilitation and additions to 322-324 East Broughton Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to permitting:

1. Eliminate the ovolo molding on the front doors to avoid conjectural elements;
2. Work with staff to select an appropriate chimney cap;
3. Provide stair detail to staff for review and approval;
4. Work with staff to create a wall of continuity along Habersham Street façade;
5. Provide a section through the fence; and
6. Retain the siding on the Habersham Street

- PASS

façade, the east side of the porch.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Nay
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Nay
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

22. [Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects | 13-004878-COA | 660 East Broughton Street | Rehabilitation, Addition](#)

Attachment: [Ortho-Imagery -4878.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps -4878.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Previous Approval - 12-000827-COA 10-10-12.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

NOTE: Mr. Lominack recused from participation in this petition. He is a principal of the architectural firm that is representing this project.

Mr. Kevin Rose was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for additions and exterior alterations to the Kehoe Machine Shop building at 660 East Broughton Street. This is an amendment to the previously approved scope of work for this project which was approved by the Review Board on October 10, 2012.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the proposed alterations and additions to 660 East Broughton Street because the proposed project is visually compatible and meets design standards with the following conditions:

1. Ensure that only the minimum amount of historic wall along the east property line is removed;
2. Ensure that the door frame for the coiling door is inset at least three inches from the exterior surface of the building;
3. Ensure that the curb cut is the minimum width required for truck access;
4. Ensure that the proposed paving material meets the material standards; and

5. Provide additional information on the kitchen base/vent feature including base width and depth dimensions on the stack and vent to staff for review and approval.

Dr. Henry asked staff if they have a more quantitative idea of how much of the historic wall on the east will be removed.

Ms. Harris answered that the petitioner informed staff that approximately 40 feet of the 300 feet wall would be removed.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Rose came forward and said the 40 feet that they are removing is roughly the height of a foot and half. He explained that when the City figures out what they are going to do with this corner as a realignment will be happening here and there will be different elevation changes, most of this will not be here.

Dr. Williams questioned the diagonal roofline cut.

Mr. Rose said they are basically following the roofline and then cutting back so they will not be in front of the building. He said [pointing to an area] that there will be an open serving area here and much of this will not be seen from the public right-of-way.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said this is exciting. This building is the reason that the Review Board dealt with the ancillary structure as it was not considered historic. Originally, the structural engineer said the entire building would have to be demolished because it was unstable, but a ruling was made that ancillary structures could be considered historic. This is great as a building was saved and it is finally going to have a real viable use. Maybe it will bring in some tax revenue.

Board Action:

Approval for the proposed alterations and additions to 660 East Broughton Street because the proposed project is visually compatible and meets design standards with the following conditions:

1. Ensure that only the minimum amount of historic wall along the east property line is removed;
2. Ensure that the door frame for the coiling door is inset at least three inches from the exterior surface of the building; - PASS
3. Ensure that the curb cut is the minimum width

- required for truck access;
4. Ensure that the proposed paving material meets the material standards; and
 5. Provide additional information on the kitchen base/vent feature including base width and depth dimensions on the stack and vent to staff for review and approval.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

23. [Petition of Becky Lynch, Lynch Associates Architects, PC | 13-004879-COA | 546 East Harris Street | New Construction Part 1](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- photographs roof types.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- photographs rooftop structures.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- photographs site.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 I Height and Mass 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 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 reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass, 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, if at all, to the adjacent building to the west;
3. Revise the roof shape of the carriage house to be flat with the parapet; and
4. Relocate the condenser units within the courtyard or screen from view.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Lynch said they would be happy to offer clarifications and adjustments as recommended by staff including the alterations of the carriage house roofline to comply with the standards and to screen the condenser units from view.

Ms. Lynch said the residence is more contemporary in nature than the other new construction which are more historical replicas on that side of the street. She said that the height and mass of the project are compatible with the historic structures. This project is adjacent to commercial property both on the north and east side and is a transitional lot.

Ms. Lynch stated that the roof projection at the front door is supposed to be seven foot wide in order to continue the roof inside rhythm with the front porch and stoop projection that is here along the street on all the residences. A parapet wall is proposed on the left side of the structure to follow the roofline of the adjacent residence and to provide a fire separation as required by code. The adjacent house is set six inches off the property line and this parapet roof would receive the roofline of the adjacent structure. There will be a six inch gap between the two structures, but they will work with the neighbors to ensure that there are no problems with this.

Ms. Lynch said the roof structure is setback from the front and side elevations. It will be minimally visible from the front and will be no higher than the parapet wall on the left side. She said [pointing to an area] that the screen wall that is shown here at the rear corner of the house is an enclosed two-story porch. The screening will provide privacy, but will be in the spirit of a shuttered porch.

Mr. Engle said no rails are shown on the front of the stoop. Will there be rails or something that will come in Part II?

Ms. Lynch said the floor height of the building is 30 inches above grade. Therefore, it is not required by code. It was not planned to be a typical porch with columns and railings. She said that obviously there will have to be a stair railing, but not necessarily a stoop railing.

Mr. Engle said he would preface this by saying he is happy to see a modern design and what he is going to say is not questioning the modern design, but his concern is the lack of horizontality with the other building. A mullion is here, but it is not aligning with anything to the west. The spandrels do not align with the headers of the windows on the west. Mr. Engle said, therefore, he was wondering if there is a way that the horizontality that does exist could some how be reflected in the front elevation.

Ms. Lynch answered that the two elements that they integrated and tied in horizontally with the house next door would be the base and the cornice lines. She said also they will have a stringcourse or cornice. However, they can reconsider the windows if this is a concern of the Board in terms of relating to the house next door. Ms. Lynch said that the two elements were meant to continue the line of the adjacent house.

Dr. Williams said there appears to be spandrel panel between the brick and second floor bay window. What is the panel?

Ms. Lynch stated that it will be a solid panel. She would not call it spandrel. They have not made a final determination of the materials as today this is a height and mass submittal. They wanted to get approval of this phase before working out the design details, but it would possibly be wood or metal, but not spandrel glass.

Dr. Williams said there are plenty of opportunities to explore the continuity. One of them that strikes him is that at the base and top, the petitioner has made a strong effort to align it. He applauds the free and modernist vocabulary. However, the individual pane is almost the same height as the sashes on the neighboring windows and with a minor adjustment, the petitioner could possibly get some alignment there.

Ms. Lynch agreed that it is close to aligning, but not quite and they definitely can explore this. She pointed out, however, that the two pair of houses next to one another are new constructions and the windows do not actually line up. Therefore, the Board is seeing the intermediate adjacency in the drawing, but there is a variation as you go up and down the street.

Dr. Henry said he was a little confused about the neighboring property line. He believes Ms. Lynch said they are setback about six inches from the property line. Dr. Henry asked Ms. Lynch if they plan to build to the property line and then negotiate.

Ms. Lynch explained that they are building within their property line. But, it might be in everyone's best interest to actually connect the buildings just on the front to infill the little six inch gap. They do not need to do this as it is not critical to their design, but it is just a question that if there is a six inch gap between the buildings it might be hard to maintain and also it could become a haven for rats, bats, and so forth.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Lynch to explain the model.

Ms. Lynch explained the parapet wall. They were concerned about the roofline intersecting with their building as they are not as tall as the roofline of the house next door. If the gable roof next door would come into their parapet wall, it would follow that line. This would be the only part of their structure that would follow this.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Lynch if she had a problem going with a parapet and a flat roof on the carriage house.

Ms. Lynch answered no. She said in retrospect she was thinking that even if they go with a shed roof parapet, she thought there could be a better solution. Therefore, if it was a sloped roof, they do not have a problem incorporating a parapet roof to tie the structures together.

Mr. Engle said with doing this, the compressors could go on the roof.

Ms. Lynch said this was what she was thinking, too, that the compressors could go on the roof and be screened from view.

Dr. Henry said with a structure on top of the roof would be visible. Will some type of green garden be there.

Ms. Lynch answered yes; a roof garden will be up there.

Dr. Henry was not completely sure of what the Board's rules are about this, but it will be very visible from the street.

Ms. Lynch explained that it will actually be barely visible from the front. There are roof structures throughout the Historic District that comes in many shapes and forms from cupolas, to light monitors, penthouses, and so forth.

Mr. Engle said that the Board's discussion regarding this has been on additions, but this is a new building and, therefore, is a total different ball game.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Cathy Sollinger, neighbor, said their sewer cleanout is on the side next to the new construction. There will not be any breathing room to prevent mold from growing on the side of the house. Ms. Sollinger said their second concern is about the windows and the rooftop garden. They do not feel that this is compatible with the other homes on the street. This construction is disturbing to the current architecture of East Harris Street.

Ms. Sollinger said they want to know how the drainage will be addressed. She said she had pictures that she could show how East Broad and Liberty Lane floods onto this property. They are concerned about how this will affect their property. If the courtyard is raised as shown on the model, how will the drainage affect this. It appears that the drainage will run into her courtyard.

Ms. Ramsay informed Ms. Sollinger that the Board appreciates their concerns, but, unfortunately, this is not within the Board's purview.

Mr. Sollinger said the distance between their house and the house to the west, 542 East Harris Street, is approximately three feet. Therefore, there is enough room in between to do pressure washing and maintenance on that house. But if it is as close as they are proposing on the east side, then there will be a problem to perform maintenance and so forth.

Ms. Ramsay again informed the Sollingers that the Board appreciates their concerns, but people are allowed to build to the property line.

Mr. Sollinger said if they are allowed to build property line-to-property line, how do they access their emergency sewer if they have to pump the line out. Their sewer is located on that side where the house is being proposed to be built.

Mr. Engle said another sewer would need to be put in. However, this is not a fault of the petitioner.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation said she believes that the comments of the HSF have already been stated by the Board. However, she said she has one suggestion that was of concern during their architecture review which is the front façade and the bay window. They share some of the same issues that Mr. Engle has said

about the horizontal relationships. Ms. Meunier said the HSF suggests that instead of having a bay window have two individual bay windows on the west side of the property. This would be more in keeping with the current three bay rhythm that is seen on a lot of those houses. Obviously, they would not have to align exactly with the windows next to them, but this might create a little more horizontality as opposed to the verticality of the bay window. The HSF agrees with the roof on the rear being a parapet roof as the petitioner stated.

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

Ms. Lynch said they definitely are willing to work on the construction issues and they have concerns about the siding on the neighbor's house as well. However, most of the issues are about how the neighbor's house was built in the beginning. But, they are going to address everything within their property line and will do everything they can to work with the neighbors. However, the design should not affect the neighbors no more than any other house that will be built on that lot.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said based on the petitioner's willingness to build a parapet on the back, the only thing they are dealing with now are the void openings. He said he was willing to make a motion to go ahead and approve the project and the openings as long as they come back the next time under Part II and adjust the horizontality in some manner and the Board can review that then as a Part II submission.

Dr. Henry asked if the doors and fenestration would be a part of Part I.

Mr. Engle answered that only the openings would be a part of Part I.

Ms. Ramsay said this could come back as a part of Part II. Part I could be approved with the understanding that it has to come back.

Mr. Merriman stated that what has been brought up about the horizontality and trying to change things to be a little more in line. He said he heard the petitioner say that they are trying to get the foundation and roof together, but what was said about changing the size of the windows.

Ms. Ramsay answered that the petitioner said she would study it.

Mr. Engle said the Board could deal with this as a part of Part II.

Board Action:

Approval for Part I, Height and Mass, 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, if at all, to the adjacent building to the west;
 3. Restudy the horizontal alignment of the building with 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.
- PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

24. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | H-11-4569-2 | 412 Williamson Street | New Construction Hotel: 12-Month Extension](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Extension Request Letter.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for a 12 month extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) issued on November 14, 2012 for new construction of a hotel at 412 Williamson Street [File No. H-111222-4569-2].

- PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Keith Howington

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

Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

25. [Petition of Jean O'Toole, Dewberry Architects | 12-000373-COA | 145 Montgomery Street | Demolition and Part 1 New Construction](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Extension Request Letter.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for a 12 month extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) issued on September 12, 2012 for new construction of the Chatham County Courthouse at 145 Montgomery Street [File No. 12-000373-COA]. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington
Second: Reed Engle
Reed Engle - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
T. Jerry Lominack - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Ebony Simpson - Not Present
Robin Williams - Aye

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

26. [Petition of Don Cogdell | 13-004494-COA | 134 Houston Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair/Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 134 Houston Street 13-004494-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 134 Houston Street 13-004494-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Josiah Jones for Commonwealth Construction of GA., LC | 13-004601-COA | 216-222 Houston Street | Staff Approved - Handrails](#)

Attachment: [COA - 216-222 Houston Street 13-004601-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 216-222 Houston Street 13-004601-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Jamie Durrence for Daniel Reed Hospitality | 13-4614-COA | 12 West Liberty St. |](#)

Staff Approved - Color Change

Attachment: [COA - 12 West Liberty Street 13-004614-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 12 West Liberty Street 13-004614-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. Petition of David McKinley for Coastal Canvas Products, LLC | 13-004692-COA | 202 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awnings and Color Change

Attachment: [COA - 134 Houston Street 13-004494-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 134 Houston Street 13-004494-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. Petition of Mamie Catherine James | 13-004712-COA | 537 East Congress Street | Staff Approved - Color Change

Attachment: [COA - 537 East Congress Street 13-004712-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 537 East Congress Street 13-004712-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. Petition of Michelle Roberts | 13-004713-COA | 120 Drayton Street | Staff Approved - Color Change

Attachment: [COA - 120 Drayton Street 13-004713-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 120 Drayton Street 13-004713-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. Petition of David McKinley for Coastal Canvas Products, LLC | 13-004715-COA | 111 West Bay Street | Staff Approved - Awning

Attachment: [COA - 111 West Bay Street 13-004715-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 111 West Bay Street 13-004715-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. Petition of S. Bart Redmond | 13-004716-COA | 301 West Broughton St. - 4B | Staff Approved - Roof Repair

Attachment: [COA - 301 West Broughton Street - 4B.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 301 West Broughton Street - 4B 13-004716-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. Petition of Doug Patten for City of Savannah | 13-004734-COA | 201 West Bay Street - Barnard Street Ramp | Staff Approved - Installation of Deadman Anchors

Attachment: [COA - 201 West Bay Street 13-004734 Barnard Street Ramp.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 West Bay Street 13-004734-COA Barnard Street Ramp.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Sam Carroll for Carroll Construction | 13-004735-COA | 13 East York Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 13 East York Street 13-004735-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 13 East York Street 13-004735-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Dave McKinley for Coastal Canvas Products | 13-004737-COA | 11 West Liberty Street | Staff Approved - Color Change/Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 11 West Liberty Street 13-004737-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 11 West Liberty Street 13-004737-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Louise Oldach | 13-004808-COA | 212-214 West Harris Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA 212 West Harris Street 13-004808-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 212 West Harris Street 13-004808-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Susan Wagner | 13-004820-COA | Staff Approved - 507 Tattnell Street](#)

Attachment: [COA - 507 Tattnell Street 13-004820-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 507 Tattnell Street 13-004820-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of Paul Robinson | 13-004829-COA | 532 and 534 East Gaston St. | Staff Approved - Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 532 & 534 East Gaston Street 13-004829-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 532 and 534 East Gaston Street 13-004829-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Amended Petition of Josh Bull for Greenline Architecture | 13-004842-COA | 601 East Bay St. | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 532 & 534 East Gaston Street 13-004829-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 532 and 534 East Gaston Street 13-004829-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. [Petition of Minnie Poole for Coastal Canvas Products | 13-004915-COA | 111 West Bay St. | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 111 West Bay Street 13-004915.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 111 West Bay Street 13-004915-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. [Amended Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 13-004983-COA | 115 East Bay St. | Staff Approved - Additions/Wall](#)

Attachment: [COA - 115 East Bay Street 13-004983-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 115 East Bay Street 13-004983-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. [Petition of Rebecca Lynch | 13-004986-COA | 321 East Gaston Lane | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 321 East Gaston Lane 13-004986-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 321 East Gaston Lane 13-004986-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. [Petition of Minnie Poole for Coastal Canvas Products | 13-005015-COA | 228 West Broughton St. | Staff Approved - Awnings](#)

Attachment: [COA - 228 West Broughton Street 13-005015-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 228 West Broughton Street 13-005015-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

45. [Petition of Christopher G. Prosser | 13-005016-COA | 333 Whitaker St. | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 333 Whitaker Street 13-005016-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 333 Whitaker Street 13-005016-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

46. [Petition of Cliff Murse | 13-005021-COA | 509 Barnard St. | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 509 Barnard Street 13-005021-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 509 Barnard Street 13-005021-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 10-9-13.pdf](#)

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Items Deferred to Staff 10-9-13.pdf](#)

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

New Business

49. [Nominating Committee](#)

Ms. Ramsay appointed the following Board members to serve as the Nominating Committee: Mr. Engle, Dr. Henry and Ms. Simpson.

50. [Discuss Meeting Time Change](#)

Ms. Ramsay said she believes the idea is to change the meeting from 1:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. so people would be able to have lunch prior to coming to the meeting.

Mr. Engle asked who proposed that the meetings be changed to 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Lominack said that he suggested it and he believes the staff felt this would give them a little more leeway in setting up for the meetings. He said also there are organizations such as the Downtown Business Association whose meeting day is the same as the Historic Board of Review. Mr. Lominack said he believes that Dr. Williams had some interferences with scheduling classes last quarter. This made Dr. Williams late for the meetings.

Mr. Engle said he prefers that the meeting time remain at 1:00 p.m.

Mr. Merriman said he prefers the 1:00 meeting time, but if it is causing a hardship on some folks, he would not push it.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the time change is being requested because of other

engagements or is it because of the time of the meeting.

Mr. Engle said some Board members are not present today. He suggested that this item be tabled until all the Board members are present.

51. Discuss Policy Regarding Presentations on Revised Submittals

Ms. Ramsay reported that she went to the building on Jones and Lincoln Streets. She reviewed the minutes of the Review Board when this was heard by them. The brick is removed totally from the back of the house. At the first meeting, the representative said steel would be used to keep the historic fabric. However, there is no steel in place. When this came back to the Board, they refuted it because the time had expired. She asked what happens in this case. They cannot allow people to say they are going to put in a material and then not do so.

Ms. Michalak explained that under Items Referred to Staff, it is item #2. She said that the architect responded that during the removal of the lower brick for the modification needed for the upper part of the structure, the upper brick became unstable and was in risk of collapsing. He said that there was not a way to stabilize and support the upper brick while preparing for the modification needed below.

Ms. Michalak said the general contractor has saved and stored all the brick on site. They will use the bricks to replace the areas that are called for in the Board's approval.

Mr. Engle said it is bad that there are no penalties in place to handle this.

Ms. Ramsay said she just wanted to bring this to the Board's attention.

Ms. Harris explained that there has been conversation on the Board regarding when it is appropriate and when is it not appropriate to receive presentations on revised submittals. It was suggested that this be added to the agenda for additional Board discussion to provide clarification on this matter. She said if an applicant was not asking the Board to vote on a revised submittal, but was just asking for feedback from the Board, perhaps this would be acceptable. Ms. Harris said, therefore, staff just wants to get further clarification from the Board so that they can better advise the applicants. She said, for example, today Mr. Cowart was presenting revised designs for the half round chimney caps.

Ms. Harris asked should the revised designs be done on a case-by-case basis. She recalls the hotel project where the architect presented a revised grill design.

Mr. Engle said the drawings are supposed to be published on the webpage for the public to review. Particularly, the Historic Savannah Foundation's Review Committee meets a few days prior to the Board's meeting and they would not have had a chance to look at the revised design. However, the Historic Review Board could make the decision, but they also could get sued because the public would not have had a chance to review the revised design in advance. Therefore, a person or persons may not have come to the meeting because they were not aware of a revised design.

Ms. Ramsay explained that she believes what staff is saying is that the applicant could bring a revised design to the meeting, but the Board would not vote on it at that meeting.

Mr. Merriman said the applicant should not be able to present it that time and would be wasting time as they are not going to vote on it.

Mr. Howington said he believes it is a case-by-case basis. He said that if someone substitutes a chimney cap is different than presenting an entire elevation, floor plans and so forth.

Ms. Michalak stated that what the Board did last month pertaining to this same subject appeared to work in that they discussed whether or not they would review the revised designed at that meeting or not.

Mr. Engle said if it is a staff review, then that is not an issue, but if it is something that needs to come before the Board, then it should be held off until the next meeting.

Mr. Merriman said he believes this would be the best approach as some of the applicants are before the Board every month.

Ms. Ramsay said the public has to see the designs before-hand that the Board votes on.

Mr. Lominack said pertaining to the letter that the members of the Review Board received, he believes that somehow the public needs to be made aware that they are not an arm of the Historic Savannah Foundation.

Ms. Ramsay said that in her opening statement today, she tried to make it clear that the Historic District Board of Review is appointed by the Mayor and Aldermen and, therefore, as a Board they are not associated with any other historic preservation organization.

Mr. Howington said this statement needs to be said at all of their meetings.

Dr. Henry questioned who was confusing the Historic Review Board with the Historic Savannah Foundation.

Mr. Engle said the letter that the Board members received read as whatever the Historic Savannah Foundation wants, the Historic Review Board goes along with it.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

52. 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