



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

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

**SEPTEMBER 11, 2013 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING**

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

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

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

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

**Mr. Thomson** introduced the two new interns who are working throughout the Fall with the Preservation staff to meet their graduate program requirements. They are Ms. Muke Kawasha and Ms. Emily Smith. Ms. Kawasha is in her last semester of the MPA program at Savannah State University and Ms. Smith is in the process of writing her thesis.

**Dr. Henry** said he is always delighted to see MPA students as this is what he taught. He told the interns it is wonderful that they are here. He welcomed and congratulated them.

## II. SIGN POSTING

## III. CONSENT AGENDA

### 3. [Petition of Joel and Erika Snayd | 13-004369-COA | 114 West Jones Street | After-the-Fact Accessory Structure](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

#### **Board Action:**

Approval for the after-the-fact accessory structure on the condition that the roof material be replaced with an approved roof material because it otherwise meets the applicable standards and visual compatibility factors. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Robin Williams

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

### 4. [Petition of Ameir Mustafa, Signs for Minds | 13-004370-COA | 100 Bull Street | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

#### **Board Action:**

Approval of the proposed signs with the condition that the supplemental sign be moved adjacent to the main entrance door to the business. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

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

5. [Petition of Becki Harkness, Coastal Heritage Society | 13-004372-COA | 303 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Rehabilitation/Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Ortho-Zoning-Imagery.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval of the proposed braces. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle  
Second: Robin Williams

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

**IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

6. [Approve Agenda](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the agenda for the meeting of September 11, 2013. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Keith Howington - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

**V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

7. [Approve Minutes of July 10, 2013](#)

Attachment: [07-10-13 Revised Minutes.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the revised July 10, 2013 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Keith Howington - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

8. [Approve Minutes of August 14, 2013](#)

Attachment: [08-14-2013 Minutes.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval of Minutes of August 14, 2013. - PASS

**Vote Results**

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

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

9. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 13-004361-COA | 0 Alice Street | New Construction Two Duplexes: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Withdraw letter.pdf](#)

No action required. Petition withdrawn by petitioner.

#### VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

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

##### Board Action:

Continue to October 9, 2013. - PASS

##### Vote Results

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

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

**Board Action:**

Continue to October 9, 2013. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

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

**Board Action:**

Continue to October 9, 2013. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

**VIII. REGULAR AGENDA**

13. [Petition of Daniel Brown | 13-003791-COA | 406 East Liberty Street | New Construction Carriage House: Part I and Part II](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

Attachment: [Mass Model.pdf](#)

**Mr. Daniel Brown** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I and Part II of a two-story garage apartment for the property located at 406 East Liberty Street. The accessory structure is proposed at the rear of the property and will provide two garage openings off of the lane.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that Part I, Height and Mass was continued at last month's meeting for the petitioner to consider the following:

1. Provide a complete Part I submission, including complete site planning and elevations to illustrate the height and mass of the existing adjacent carports and garages. She said the petitioner has completed this request and the documents are provided in the Board's submittal packets.
2. Consider an alternative exterior material instead of stucco that is more compatible with the main brick building. She said that the petitioner has responded that an alternative material was considered. However, the petitioner has chosen to remain with stucco and images have been provided in the Board's submittal packets which indicate contributing buildings with contributing carriage houses within this ward that have brick main structures and stucco carriage houses.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that the petitioner feels that the difference in the material between the historic main building and the new construction carriage house helps to differentiate the old from the new.

3. Relocate the proposed condenser unit to the ground at the interior courtyard. She explained that the condenser unit has been relocated to the interior court and is no longer visible from the public right-of-way.
4. Clarify any issues regarding the neighboring carport and garage eaves and the eaves of the proposed garage apartment. Ms. Michalak said the petitioner has responded by providing images that show how the wall condition and eaves on the adjacent existing carports work.

**Ms. Michalak** said the adjacent carport and garages do not have eaves that extend past the face of the building; although the property line falls at the center of the existing CMU wall, the eaves overhang the property line. Therefore, when the new carriage house is constructed, the existing metal roofs on the adjacent buildings will be flashed to the side of the new building to prevent roof leaks.

**Ms. Michalak** said additionally, the Board informed the petitioner at the last meeting that he could return today with both Part I and Part II for review.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass, of the proposed garage apartment at 406 East Liberty Street because it is visually compatible and meets the Part I standards. Staff also recommends approval for New Construction Part II, Design Details with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval prior to stamping the building permit drawings:

1. Remove the stucco headers from all the windows.
2. Reselect the garage doors to be one that does not have an embossed wood grain.

**Mr. Lominack** asked, "where will the accent stucco color be located?"

**Ms. Michalak** answered on the sills, headers, and the beltcourse in the center. This will be the darker color.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if this has a different texture.

**Ms. Michalak** said no; just the sample has this; they both will be the texture of the lighter color, the sand finish. She said actually it is called limestone finish, which is similar to sand finish.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Brown** came forward and introduced himself.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Brown if he was in agreement with the recommendations that the staff has made.

**Mr. Brown** answered that he was in agreement with the staff's recommendations.

**Mr. Lominack** said the drawings of the elevations from the lane indicate that the roof overhang is over the property line.

**Mr. Brown** said this is not correct. He pointed out that the property line is actually halfway over the roof. The property line actually meets the eave of their building. The roof structure actually extends passed the property line into Ms. Bigler's property line. They are not asking them to take away the roof.

**Mr. Lominack** asked Mr. Brown if he is building a new wall passed the property line.

**Mr. Brown** said he is building a new wall inside the property line. This is for the benefit of the structure itself because both walls seem to have structural conditions that will not hold this building. Therefore, rather than tear down the wall, affecting the neighbors, they decided to build the walls inside of the property line. They are trying to be good neighbors. From the last meeting, they have had comments from a neighbor about the height of the building. Mr. Brown said they have reduced the roof's slope and the overall height of the building so that there will be more visual access to the existing old jail tower. They are trying do as much as they can for the neighbors.



**Mr. Brown** said they had a question concerning what is happening with the roof coming to their building. He said they are actually allowing the roof to come to the new structure and then flash back from their building onto the existing structure so that they do not have to tear back their roof and cut it back to the property line. He stated again that they are trying to be as good a neighbor as they possibly can to the existing property and not affect them financially by having them change their existing garages.

**Mr. Engle** said he believes the Board asked this question last month. However, he finds the belt course incredibly wide and the fact that the sills are sitting on top of the beltcourse is also an unusual feature. He said he does not understand why there is a double line on the sills.

**Mr. Brown** stated that these are the expansion joints. They actually raised the beltcourse because the Historic Savannah Foundation asked them to make this more proportionate. Therefore, they raised it above what is the true bottom floor so that it will look more proportionate.

**Mr. Engle** said maybe he is not reading it well, but he is also confused about the cornice. Normally, the lower element on the soffit area would step back a little, but both are stacked on top of each other. Maybe he is misreading the drawing on this, too.

**Mr. Brown** stated that one is the cornice and the other is the gutter.

**Mr. Engle** said there is no downspout.

**Mr. Brown** stated that the downspout is on the left side.

**Mr. Engle** said normally the soffit would step back slightly from the eave overhang. But, they are shown here flush in line. They should step in a couple of inches. He said he still does not understand the beltcourse issue. It looks awkward here. How wide is it?

**Mr. Brown** answered that it is 14 inches.

**Mr. Engle** said he has a problem with this.

**Dr. Williams** said both of the buildings that Mr. Brown is using as an example show a narrower beltcourse. The windows on the farthest building are actually sitting on the beltcourse. He said maybe a solution is regardless to what ends up being proportionate, the sill is the beltcourse. Maybe if the sills are eliminated, the windows could sit on the beltcourse. This would mitigate some of the heftiness.

**Dr. Williams** stated if he understood correctly, the beltcourse will be accented with a different and darker stucco color. Therefore, maybe as shown in the examples, the width of the beltcourse might be less intrusive if it was all one color. He said he, too, was struck by the rather formative beltcourse to a modest building. This could probably be restudied and taken into consideration - the possibility of having the same color as the rest of the building.

**Mr. Howington** asked if the beltcourse continued around the side elevation.

**Mr. Brown** answered yes.

**Mr. Lominack** said on the section, it appears to be 12 inches between the top of the beltcourse and the bottom of the sills.

**Mr. Brown** said the beltcourse was probably not updated on the section. He said, however, they made this change.

**Ms. Simpson** asked what type of door will be used on the courtyard elevation.

**Mr. Brown** said they are thinking about a wrought iron gate. It is not actually an enclosed or conditioned space on this side. He said that they dropped the condenser into the courtyard to not have the visual impediment and effect the neighbors.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Michael LaRue** said he and his wife live at 408 East Liberty Street. Mr. LaRue thanked Mr. Brown for listening to the neighbors' concerns. Presently, their biggest objection is stucco. They have a row of six houses that are all brick and Mr. Brown wants to put in a stucco house here. There are stucco houses across the lane that match the houses that they are attached to on Perry Street. Carriage houses are down the street on Perry Street that are brick in the front and also brick on the back. The visual part that is above the garage line, they would like for the staff and Board to strongly consider having the petitioner do this in brick. Mr. LaRue said in talking with Ms. Michalak, they understand that they cannot do it for historical purposes because it implies it has historical value, but it would certainly aesthetically look a lot better connected to the row of six houses and would set a precedent if anybody else wanted to do it. They would all have the same standard to apply to their carriage houses.

**Mr. Bill Moedell** came forward and said that he resides at 404 East Liberty Street. Mr. Moedell said the project should not be completed. He, too, thanked Mr. Brown for all the concessions that he had made. But, it is not consistent with the area and is not visually compatible. As the Board has seen in the model, it is basically a sore thumb sticking up. Aside from the quality of life issues [he knows that this is not the purview of this Board], but he is asking the Board to consider that this is not compatible with the area; it is not consistent with the area; and is not visually compatible.

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said overall, they believe that the detailing and the proposed materials compete too much with the main house. It does not compliment it. Although it is new construction and should be differentiated, they believe it should relate and be more compatible with the main structure. Ms. Meunier said they would prefer to see the building be brick similar to the main house. Now, of course, the brick does not need to completely match the main house. This could be differentiated as well.

**Ms. Meunier** said they are in agreement with some of the comments Mr. Engle has made. They believe that the beltcourse is too wide. It should definitely be a little narrower or just remove it. They agree that it should be the same color stucco as the rest of the building.

**Ms. Ramsay** invited Mr. Brown to respond to the public comments.

**Mr. Brown** said they are in agreement that they can reduce the beltcourse as needed. They will make the stucco the same color throughout. Mr. Brown said they are not in agreement with the brick. They still want to move forward with the stucco. With compatibility, they can look at it from house-to-carriage, but they can also look at it within the ward. They do have examples of brick and stucco within the ward [they are not talking about within the adjacent ward] but, a half block down the street.

**Dr. Williams** said it appears on the model that the beltcourse is both narrower and lower than in the current set of drawings.

**Mr. Brown** said he talked with the staff concerning whether they need to recreate the model for this continuation and staff said they were okay to leave the model from the last presentation. He said he apologized that they did not create a new model for that.

**Ms. Simpson** stated that if the staff told Mr. Brown this, what he has is fine.

**Mr. Howington** said he is still a little confused on the soffit. From the drawings he is not sure where they stop. There is a heavy box soffit at the top, but the model shows this more successfully.

**Mr. Brown** said they designed it this way, but if the Board likes the look of the model they can change that detail to be consistent with the model.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said as much as he would love to see this brick, it is perfectly acceptable by the ordinance that it be stucco. However, he sees five things that the Board should request as a part of their motion.

**Dr. Henry** said that he made a proposal to the Review Board before he became a member about carriage houses. He asked if there is a rule that indicates that there should be compatible materials for carriage houses.

**Ms. Harris** explained that there is no rule that says the carriage house has to match the main house. However, the visual compatibility factors regarding the materials do apply. Therefore, the question before the Board is whether stucco is a visually compatible material with brick.

**Mr. Howington** stated that the ordinance says that the exterior walls in relationship of materials, texture and colors of the façade of the structure, shall be visually compatible with the predominate materials, textures and colors used on the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.

**Mr. Lominack** said he was concerned about the lack of agreement between the wall section and the elevation. He believes the Board needs to see this again. How does the Board ensure that the petitioner does the things that the Board has stated?

**Mr. Engle** said the Board has already advised the petitioner of what needs to be done.

**Ms. Harris** explained that anytime the Board wants to do a conditional approval, which is reasonably common when the petitioners come in to have their construction drawings stamped, staff goes over all the decisions and checks to be sure that the conditions have been met before the drawings are stamped as approved.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes that the documents that are approved need to be in agreement with each another.

**Mr. Engle** said this would be included in the motion.

**Ms. Simpson** asked if the Board was in agreement with the stucco.

**Dr. Williams** said the Board cannot prescribe the materials. They can evaluate whether the proposed materials is or is not visually compatible. Mr. Engle has already made a proposal that he believes it is compatible.

**Dr. Henry** said he is in agreement with the stucco.

**Board Action:**

1. Approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of the proposed garage apartment at 406 East Liberty Street because it is visually compatible and meets the Part I standards.
2. Approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details of the proposed garage apartment at 406 East Liberty Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval prior to stamping the building permit drawings:
  - a. Remove the stucco headers from above all windows. - PASS
  - b. Reselect the garage door to be one that does not have an embossed woodgrain.
  - c. Remove the belt course.
  - d. Simplify the eave detail to be more like the mass model: reduce its dimension and provide a "step-back."
  - e. Select only one stucco color instead of the two that are proposed.
  - f. Ensure that the final drawings, to be submitted to staff for final review and approval, are in agreement with each other.

**Vote Results**

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

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

**NOTE: Ms. McClain arrived at approximately 1:45 p.m.**  
**Mr. Merriman arrived at approximately 1:55 p.m.**

**Mr. Andrew Hill** was present on behalf of the petition.

**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. The General Development Plan was submitted to the City of July 22, 2013. Several comments were received and are stated in staff's report that has been submitted to the Board. Traffic Engineering has requested that the petitioner ensure the minimum drive aisle for 60 degree parking is 18'.

The General Development Plan for this project was received by Street Maintenance on July 22, 2013 and has been conditionally approved. Stormwater Management and Park and Tree have reviewed the plans and have submitted their comments which are also included in the staff's report that was forwarded to the Board.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that the staff recommends approval of 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 prior to applying for the building permit:

1. Change the color of the proposed TPO roof from white to a more neutral color that will blend in with the building.
2. Provide clarification on the height of the mechanical screening. Ensure that it will screen the entire unit.
3. Increase the distance from the bottom of the light fixture to eight feet clear above the

sidewalk.

4. Ensure that the new doors on the north (lane) façade are inset not less than three inches from the face of the building.
5. Ensure that the proposed four inch setback for the new glass block windows on the Houston Street façade matches the setback of the existing glass block windows on the East Oglethorpe façade.
6. Reduce the height of the "walk-under canopy" addition on the Houston Street façade to be more subordinate to the main structure.
7. Relocate the entrance to the parking area to be from the lane instead of Huston Street and provide a continuous fence along Houston Street.

\*If the above condition is met, the following conditions will not apply:

- Provide a continuous wall of enclosure along Houston Street in front of the parking area (examples: sliding gates, more fence section, etc.).
- Ensure that the sidewalks extend across the entrances driveways on Houston Street, and serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

**Dr. Henry** said that the staff has made several conditional recommendations. As a matter of fact, staff has made more recommended conditions on this remodeling than they have made for a hotel.

**Ms. Michalak** said there are seven conditions and a lot of the conditions are related and contingent on the other. She said several of the others are very small. This is why staff recommended approval, but it is at the Board's discretion.

**Mr. Lominack** said staff's report recommends changing the roof, but, the roof is not seen from the ground.

**Ms. Michalak** said the roof can be seen from the lane. It is a short building. Staff thought white would be too prominent.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the gates are allowed to be opened into the lane where the dumpsters are enclosed.

**Ms. Michalak** said she believes this would be a code issue. Traffic Engineering would need to answer this question.

**Mr. Engle** said it is an eight and one-half feet wide gate. It opens into the lane.

**Dr. Williams** stated that regarding staff's comment about the main entrance into the building should be on Oglethorpe Avenue and not on Houston Street, does the ordinance say that in situations such as this that the main entrance should be on Oglethorpe Avenue?

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes and said typically, this would apply to new construction. However, this is an existing building and staff is recommending approval because the petitioner did try to accommodate the standard by adding entrances along Oglethorpe Avenue that do not exist. The existing main entrance of the building currently faces Houston Street. The petitioner tried to meet the standard even though it is an existing building.

**Dr. Williams** asked if this was a new construction would the petitioner have to put the main entrance on Oglethorpe Avenue.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if the petitioner is removing a part of the building.

**Ms. Michalak** said the petitioner is removing 23 feet on the Houston Street side, but this is where the original main entrance to the building is located.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the petitioner will be restoring the tree lawn once they eliminate the Oglethorpe Avenue entrance.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that she does not know.

**Mr. Engle** said it is shown as a continuous tree lawn.

**Ms. Michalak** said this is a question that the petitioner can answer. However, she believes this was a part of the site plan review comments.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the Board is allowed to address the tree lawn.

**Ms. Ramsay** answered no.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Hill** came forward and introduced himself and stated that John Kola of Alex Rouse Architects was accompanying him at the meeting today. He said that he will answer some of the questions, but Mr. Kola will answer most of the architectural questions.

**Mr. Hill** said they do not have a problem with conditions 1, 2, 3, and 4. However, he thought they had shown the window inset on their plans as shown on sheets A2 and A5. He said a tree survey was done and this is the only tree on Houston Street. The curb cut is to the left of the tree. The only item they would have trouble with is item #7. He said that they are doing a dialysis facility. One of the initial things they looked at was the parking. A parking analysis has been done in order to get into compliance with the required drives. They were only able to come up with eight parking spaces when accessing the parking from the lane. There is more than 11,000 square feet, so he decided to cut the building back about 23 feet off of Houston Street side where the parking is currently located. He said this would help them to put in additional parking as the City zoning requires 14 spaces. The only way they are able to get the required parking spaces was to cut the building back and then cut the entrance. Presently, they have Oglethorpe Avenue as a curb cut; Houston Street is a curb cut and there is no curb cut for the lane, but it is completely opened. Mr. Hill said they tried cutting Houston Street, but they would only have gotten about 11 spaces. This would make them not in compliance. He said the only way they could do it was this layout, which is the most efficient.

**Mr. Hill** said he was arguing that they have no choice but to do it this way. It will be tough

to develop this property without doing it this way. They are cutting back the building, cutting access points. The dumpster location is required to face the lane. They looked at possibly doing it closer to the building, but it would impede the windows. The City's Sanitation Department has reviewed it and has told them that it is in compliance.

**Mr. Hill** said initially they received a lot of comments on the site plan, but most of the comments were standard comments. He said all they did was a general site plan and they did not label water size, water lateral, or the pipe sizes. Therefore, Water and Sewer listed all of their standards. This is the reason for so many pages of comments. They are in agreement with putting in some kind of gate that will be visually compatible. Mr. Hill said they are requesting that they be allowed to keep the gates open during business hours as ambulances often comes here to drop off patients. If the gates are closed, it will impede their business.

**Ms. Simpson** asked that the sidewalk be addressed.

**Mr. Hill** said currently a sidewalk is here on Houston Street. They are leaving the sidewalk.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation** said they agree with all of staff's recommendations. However, overall, they think that the detailing and design of the building could be more simplistic and similar to the era of the building as well as what is currently there. In this case, they are not looking at new construction, but alteration of an existing building. In the simplification, they suggest possibly removing the canopies, look at different lighting, removing the detailed cornices and parapet cap, reduce some of the definition of the pilasters, and make them the same color as the rest of the stucco.

**Ms. Meunier** said if canopies will be used, the HSF prefers to see something more like the continuous cantilever canopy that is currently on the building. It is more reminiscent of the era of the building. They prefer to see center doors on the Houston Street elevation. They prefer to see parking accessed on the lane, but they understand that this might not be a possibility.

**Mr. Hill** said they would argue that it is in compliance with mid-century architecture. He said as the Board can see by the bottom right picture, pilasters already exist here. They come out about five inches and they are not changing this. He said the cornices and pilasters are typical of mid-century buildings.

**Mr. Kola** said the reason they want the canopies is because this is a dialysis center where patients are treated. If the Board looks at the floor plan where all the glass is shown, this is where all the patient stations will be. This, of course, will block a little of the light shining in on the patients.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the patients could be protected from the sunshine in a different way such as using shades on the inside.

**Mr. Kola** said that shades or blinds could be used, but in terms of aesthetics and appearance they felt the canopies would be more suitable.



**Mr. Hill** said this was previously a brick building and they believe that a skin was applied which makes it look like blocks are on top of it. Therefore, they believe that the continuous awnings were added at a later time. Therefore, they are changing the way the awnings are, but are just putting new awnings here.

**Mr. Engle** said that he does not see the pilaster continuing up above the height of the window as compatible. The only problem he has is this building is essentially horizontal and the pilasters are interrupting the horizontality. He personally likes the awnings and they are all over town. They are quite consistent with the design. However, he thinks that the pilaster interrupts the flow of the horizontality. The pilasters should stop at the height of the window. Therefore, he believes that this is a weak point in the design. This is not consistent with mid-century.

**Mr. Lominack** said pilasters are now shown, they are just a piece of the wall.

**Dr. Williams** stated that in the drawings, the pilasters and cornice that the petitioner has, particularly on the color illustration, shows them as white and rising the full height of the building. Would you simply be recoloring the existing piers and then trace the color out through the existing wall or would you be building a cluster on the face of the existing one?

**Mr. Kola** answered that they will take out the entire elevation and put in a new wall. They will put in new block windows to match. Presently, they are in bad shape as most of them are broken and some missing. Therefore, they decided to do a whole new elevation to make it better.

**Dr. Williams** said given the spirit of the building, he agrees with his colleagues that although essentially new construction will be built, the petitioner is obviously picking up on the character of the existing building and retaining parts of it. Therefore, as Mr. Engle has said, the spirit of the building is essentially horizontal. He agrees that the canopies are being individualized over the windows. It appears that several members of the Board believes this is a part of the character of the building. However, the pilasters and cornices that are being presented really looks like a 1980s post modern building.

**Mr. Kola** asked Dr. Williams if he was recommending stopping them at the top of the block windows.

**Dr. Williams** said the way it is handled at the Houston Street entrance, the pilaster stops at the block windows. He said whether it is left as white or another different color surrounding the stucco and remove the cornice. This is more in keeping with the existing character of the building. Dr. Williams said if he was to walk by this building, he would think that it is a 1980s post-modern, not a mid-century modern. The pilaster and cornices especially with their simplified details as they are presented, sort of abstracted to block-classicism. They all are typical of the 1980s post-modernism. They are certainly not typical of the 1950s. Dr. Williams said he is not sure of the date of this building.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes it is 1947.

**Dr. Williams** said 1947 would not have been difficult. The simple line of the cornice is

more in keeping with the character.

**Mr. Kola** said they do not have a problem changing to match the top of the block windows. They are trying to update this building, but are not trying to change the style. However, they are trying to dress it up.

**Mr. Lominack** said the style of the building is being changed.

**Mr. Kola** asked, " does this mean they cannot change anything? Do they have to do the exact same building and just stucco it?"

**Mr. Hill** said he would argue that they can add features to a noncontributing building. If not, they would not be able to put in windows.

**Mr. Kola** said they are trying to upscale the appearance of the building.

**Mr. Lominack** stated just as the HSF said, the building needs to be simple. The decorations that are being applied to the building appears to be causing the problems. The good features are the way the awnings are handled.

**Mr. Engle** said this building may not be listed, but they are looking at a building that is almost 65 years old. Therefore, it well-passed 50 years old and they should be respecting the historic character that is here, even if it is not listed. He said that when he looks at sheet A-3, he sees the simplicity of the entrance. There is no pilaster and he will not deal with the cornices as without the pilaster he does not see that the cornices are problematic. A large parapet is needed to screen the roof.

**Mr. Engle** said he believes they went through this where Polk's was across the street. Polk's initially wanted to make it a kind of neo-colonial revival temple. But, this is mixing metaphors. They are looking at a 1950 building and, as Dr. Williams has clearly stated, it is coming out as a 1980s restoration. However, the Board needs to respect what is there.

**Mr. Kola** asked if they got rid of the pilasters or lowered them and kept the cornices would this be acceptable.

**Mr. Loominack** stated that he did not believe that they could judge changing one element and everything else would be fine as they all relate to each other.

**Dr. Williams** said in order to help give the petitioners guidance, in case this petition comes back to the Board, he would follow up on Mr. Engle's comment. He said to answer the petitioner's question, he believes moving in the right direction would be to take the entrance as a guide. What profile does it have? How does it meet the course above the windows? One of the beauties of 1950s modernism that this mostly captures a kind of delicacy towards simplicity and post-modernism is very chunky and heavy. He believes if you use the molding that is above the block window and imagine something maybe even delicate as that as the cornices would be more in keeping with the spirit of the building.

**Dr. Williams** said he agrees with Mr. Engle that post-World War II buildings have a lot of catching up to do in terms of what is listed and what is not. The City only allows certain

opportunities for those things to get listed. Therefore, who knows whether in the future that this building would be listed if it is not touched. If the changes could be as respectful as possible to that character, it would certainly spark a positive response from this Board. Dr. Williams said they have mentioned the canopies, the glass block and he would add to this that the lights shown in the detail looks compatible.

**Ms. Ramsay** informed Mr. Hill and Mr. Kola that the Board cannot continue a project without their asking that it be continued. She said she believes that the petitioners understand that some issues of design need to be addressed before the Board can vote favorable on this petition.

**Mr. Howington** complimented the petitioners. He believes that they looked at the ordinance and decided on the visual compatibility that this Board has talked about, other than the heavy-ended details. He believes that the petitioners have met most of the ordinance, with setting the windows back, and the drawings are presented well. Mr. Howington said, however, he agrees with his colleagues and would like to see some simplification of the details and he would definitely like to see the entrance come to a more simple canopy. The awnings over the windows are successful.

**Mr. Kola** asked if the Board would vote on any of the other items.

**Ms. Ramsay** replied no. The Board votes on the total petition as submitted.

**Dr. Henry** stated that he, too, would love to see that this is brought back as close as it was to the 1947 version; but not replicated. He said he agrees also with most of the points made by the Historic Savannah Foundation. It would be nice to center door and he is not sure about the canopies. However, simplification strikes him as being sound.

**Mr. Kola** said they were not aware that they needed to come close to exactly what is here.

**Ms. Ramsay** informed Mr. Kola that they do not have to come closely to what is here, but as presented takes the spirit away from the building. As the Board members have stated, it is a horizontal building, but by putting the pilasters at the top, it has been made a more vertical building. Ms. Ramsay explained to the petitioners that they do not have to go back to exactly what it was. A false sense of history would be given to what was existing by applying that kind of decoration.

**Mr. Hill** requested a continuance.

**Board Action:**

- Approval to continue the petition for alterations and signs for the building located at 540 East Oglethorpe Avenue to consider the following:
1. Change the color of the proposed TPO roof from white to a more neutral color that will blend in with the building.
  2. Provide clarification on the height of the

mechanical screening. Ensure that it will screen the entire unit.

3. Increase the distance from the bottom of the light fixtures to eight feet (8') clear above the sidewalk.
4. ensure that the new doors on the north (lane) façade are inset not less than three inches (3") from the face of the building.
5. Ensure that the proposed four inch (4") setback for the new glass block windows on the Houston Street façade matches the setback of the existing glass block windows on the East Oglethorpe façade.
6. Reduce the height of the "walk-under canopy" addition on Houston Street façade to be subordinate to the main structure.
7. Relocate the entrance to the parking area to be from the lane instead of Houston Street, and provide a continuous fence along Houston Street. - PASS  
\*If the above condition is met, the following condition will not apply:
  - Provide a continuous wall of enclosure along Houston Street in front of the parking area (examples: sliding gates, more fence section, etc.).
  - Ensure that the sidewalks extend across the entrances driveways on Houston Street, and serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.
8. Reduce the additional decoration applied to the exterior even further, including: the pilasters, canopies, cornice, and change the walk-under entrance addition to a metal canopy.
9. The mid-century spirit of the building is no longer apparent with this design. Appears more as a 1980s Post-Modern style building.
10. The new pilasters that continue all the way up the façade interrupt the inherent horizontality of the building's design. Simplify the pilasters and stop them at the top of the glass block windows.
11. The cornice design, like the proposed banding, needs to be more delicate.
12. Center the entrance door on Houston Street.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Reed Engle

- Aye

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

15. [Petition of Matthew Allen | 13-003854-COA | 411 East Perry Street | New Construction Garage: Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Mass Model.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [File No. H-11-4526-2 - Previous Approval.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction Part II, Design Details of a one-story garage for the property located at 411 East Perry Street. The accessory structure is proposed at the rear of the property and will provide two garage door openings off of the lane. The existing fences on the east and west property lines will remain. She stated that at the August 14, 2013 meeting, Part I, Height and Mass for this project was approved with the condition to add a fence along the lane, flush with the façade of the garage, at the east side, where there is a side yard setback, to create a wall of enclosure along the lane. Ms. Michalak said this condition has been met.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for the New Construction: Part II, Design Details of the proposed garage at 411 East Perry Street as requested because the project meets the standards and is visually compatible.

**Dr. Henry** stated that he was not sure whether it was this project, but the Board has talked about the design of garage doors.

**Ms. Michalak** said that the specification for these garage doors is included. They are actually wood, stained medium cedar with flat panels.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Michalak if the doors meet staff's approval.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes. The doors are very nice and they meet the standard.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Allan** came forward and stated that he is the petitioner.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**Board Action:**

Approval for New Construction: Part II, Design  
Details of the proposed garage at 411 East Perry  
Street as requested because the project meets the - PASS  
standards and is visually compatible.

**Vote Results**

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

16. [Petition of John Clegg, Barnard Architects | 13-004353-COA | 225 East Huntingdon Street | Demolition and New Construction Carriage House, Part I: Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Aerial - Facing North.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to demolish an existing garage and for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of a two-story apartment in its place for the property located at 225 East Huntingdon Street. (She passed the model to the Board members for their review). Alterations and additions are indicated for the main building in the submittal packet, but that portion of the project has been continued to a later Historic District Board Review (HDBR) meeting.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval for demolition of the non-historic building at 225 East Huntingdon Street because the structure possesses no known historical or architectural significance, is less than 50 years of age, and is not eligible for

historic designation.

**Ms. Harris** further reported that staff recommends to continue the petition for the two-story garage apartment for the property located at 225 East Huntingdon Street for the following to be addressed:

- 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** said that staff also recommends that the petitioner be permitted to return to the next meeting with both Parts I and II for review. While materials are part of the Design Details submittal, the petitioner has indicated that the proposed materials will be lap siding. Staff would recommend consideration of a masonry material similar to the main structure.

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

**Dr. Henry** said he was a little confused about the height. It looks very high, but he realizes that it is in a four-story zone. Doesn't the ordinance address height of carriage houses?

**Ms. Harris** said the ordinance does allow for two-story carriage houses, but there is no maximum feet that a carriage house can be. Therefore, they would want to look at the visual compatibility of the height in relationship to other structures that are subordinate in height and mass to the main structure.

#### **PEITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Clegg** said to answer the question of height, the ceilings are 9 feet tall on both floors. A suggestion was to make the roof a hip roof instead of a gable roof which they believe will help to reduce the appearance of the height of the structure. He said they agree with this. They believe the comments from the staff are reasonable and they would like to revise their submission in preparation for next month's meeting.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Clegg if he considered putting some type of foundation or base on the building. Basically, the structure is sitting right on the ground. The main building appears to be a 30 inch base. The house has such a significant foundation.

**Mr. Clegg** said this is a good comment. But, the Board will see on the right that there is a tall base, about 5 feet high and they are considering changing this to stucco in accordance with staff's recommendation. Maybe they can create a smaller base of about 30 inches or so to relate to the main house.

**Mr. Engle** said some of the verticality needs to be cut-down also.

**Mr. Lominack** said he does not agree with the staff's recommendation of the hip roof. He

believes the gable roof is a much better solution.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Henry** said he believes this is an improvement and he agrees with the staff's recommendations.

**Mr. Engle** said he agrees with staff. The roof is fine either way, but he believes that clapboard is not consistent or compatible with the main building. Therefore, it should be a masonry appearance and have fenestration on the sides. It needs the solidity of stucco.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the roof will come before the Board next month.

**Ms. McClain** asked which roof shape would be compatible.

**Ms. Harris** said all the buildings in the lane are noncontributing.

**Ms. McClain** stated that the Board could vote on approving the demolition.

**Ms. Harris** explained that staff's recommendation recommends approving the demolition; continuing Part I until the October 9, 2013 meeting, but allow the petitioner to come back with Part I and II at that meeting. She said the Board may want to find out from the petitioner if this is acceptable with him. Also the Board may want to make a finding fact regarding the 30 foot variance request from the structured setback.

**Mr. Clegg** said they would appreciate it if they could come back next month for Part I and II.

**Dr. Henry** asked if stucco would be considered under Part I or Part II.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the stucco is Part II; however, they are continuing Part I and will hear Part I and Part II at the meeting of October 9, 2013.

**Mr. Engle** said at the next meeting, the Board will hear Part I and II. He said he believes that they should give the petitioner a sense of whether they want a hip or gable roof. He said if the petitioner changes from one to the other and the Board does not go along with it, this is a major change and the Board will not be able to approve Part I or Part II.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she thinks the petitioner has to interpret from what he has heard. If the Board takes a poll on every issue that they have a disagreement on, they will be here later than what they are already.

**Ms. McClain** said Mr. Lominack said he did not like the hip roof. He is only one Board member.



**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she believes Mr. Clegg understands that this is just one Board member.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes the roof issue would be premature since there are other changes such as the fenestration solids-to-voids ratios which may have an impact as to whether a hip roof or a gable roof would look better.

**Board Action:**

Approval for demolition of the non-historic building at 225 East Huntingdon Street because the structure possesses no known historical or architectural significance, is less than 50 years of age, and is not eligible for historic designation.

Continue the petition for a two-story garage apartment for the property located at 225 East Huntingdon Street to address the following:

- Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids
- Proportion of Openings
- Windows and Doors
- Carriage House Roof Shapes - PASS
- Scale of the structure
- Directional Expression of Front Elevation.

Staff also recommends that the petitioner be permitted to return to the next meeting with both Parts I and II for review. While materials are a design detail submittal, the applicant has indicated that the proposed materials will be lap siding. Staff would recommend consideration of a masonry material similar to the main structure.

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

**Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle

- Aye

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

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Mr. Gary Sanders** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for the installation of a rooftop addition on the building located at 42 East Bay Street. She stated that the petitioner is not the designer. The petitioner has been involved since the "as build" drawings, specifically for applying for this petition. Ms. Michalak said the petitioner received a building permit in 2008, but apparently this was mistakenly left off the permit. They have been working on this building continuously since 2008.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends after-the-fact denial for the installation of a rooftop on the building located at 42 East Bay Street because the addition does not meet the following standards:

**Visual Compatibility Factors**

1. Proportion of Openings: The windows on the rooftop addition are wider than they are tall, whereas all visually related contributing structures have windows that are taller than they are wide.
2. Rhythm of solids to voids in front facades: The windows on the rooftop addition are wider than they are tall, whereas all visually related contributing structures have windows that are taller than they are wide.
3. Relationship of materials, texture and color: Hardi panels are not visually compatible with the historic masonry building to which the addition is attached.

**Design Standards:**

4. Exterior walls: Hardi wall panels are prohibited in the district.
5. Windows: The windows on the rooftop addition are wider than they are tall, therefore, not meeting the vertical to horizontal ratio. Also, the Andersen 400 series, awning, double-

paned, single lite windows are constructed from the solid vinyl; vinyl windows are prohibited in the district.

6. Additions: The rooftop addition is visible from the front (East Bay Street) elevation.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that upon the petitioner receiving the staff's report, he met with staff and discussed the report. He wants to make some suggestions to the Board as to how they can potentially change the rooftop addition to meet some of the standards.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Michalak to explain the 2008 building permit again.

**Ms. Michalak** said she believes that the petitioner can explain the 2008 building permit issue better than she. She said her understanding is the petitioner received the building in 2008 for interior work and neglected to put the fact that they needed roof access on those drawings.

**Dr. Henry** asked if this was an oversight.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that she did not know, but maybe the petitioner would be able to provide clarification on this matter.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the deck installed.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes and it is not visible.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the deck is sitting on top of the existing roof.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that the roof was replaced. She said it is sitting on the TPO Roof. She explained that basically the scope of what was done is: they replaced the existing TPO roof; built a roof deck; added skylights; added equipment [the equipment is not seen]; and they added this roof access. Therefore, this is what this addition is; there is nothing in there other than a stair to the roof.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the historic standing seam metal roof is no longer there.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes. The aerial shows that this was some type of torched down, rubber/tar roof.

**Dr. Williams** asked if this has the spine of the hip that ran the length of the building. Is the structure of the roof still there?

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes; her understanding is that it was just the materials; therefore, the spine is still there.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Gary Sanders** gave the background of what really happened with this project. He obtained a permit in 2008 for the interior work, only. They had an idea that they thought that they might want to put access up to the roof, but there was simply a roof hatch up there. He said they purposely left that part off of the permit so that they could go forward with the interior work. At that time, they said they would come back to the Board for

anything that would be visible. Mr. Sanders said for some reason, however, the project stalled. They started it and a lot of structural work was done. Some of the trusses were destroyed and they needed to repair them.

**Mr. Sanders** said Mr. Hopkins was present and he did the structural work on the interior. They performed the interior demolition, structural work and it remained stalled. At some point between now and then they decided to replace the roof. He stated that his client, not being knowledgeable, did not understand that he needed to get approval to do the work. Mr. Sanders said he is not sure who designed it. Mr. Sanders said he was called last month to work on this. The building department decided that too many changes were trying to be done on this in order to proceed with their project and it was also too tall. Therefore, he was hired to update their permit. As far as the deck structure, they put two beams up there in anticipation that a deck would go up later. Therefore, the beams were placed, but the roof structure of the building was not compromised. The two existing cupolas that were removed were about four feet tall and six to eight feet wide. They had open louvers. However, they were demolished.

**Mr. Sanders** said it was too precarious for him to go up and inspect this; therefore, he hired someone to go and check this. He said he took a picture of the tag on the windows. The windows may or may not be vinyl clad. He is interested in doing what they can do to make this compliant. They need the access and it seems to work pretty well. It is not very visible and all of the duct work from the adjacent property is in front of it.

**Dr. Henry** asked, "what is wrong with going back to the original trap door?"

**Mr. Sanders** said it is preferable to go up stairs instead of climbing up a ladder and going up a trap door. It is a 22 foot high loft space. The stair would actually have to come off a mezzanine to get up in to the cupola. The door is not full height. As far as personnel coming in and getting in and out, this is probably the minimum.

**Dr. Henry** asked if he was correct in hearing that no one knows who put this up.

**Mr. Sanders** answered that the owner knows, but he (Mr. Sanders) does not know who the contractor was. He said after he clears this with the Historic Review Board, he still has a lot to do to get this approved by the building department.

**Mr. Howington** said Mr. Sanders stated that he was willing to work to make this compatible. To what extent are you saying; to the staff's recommendation?

**Mr. Sanders** said that Ms. Michalak was reading this as a rooftop addition. He said he would be in agreement of getting rid of whatever window they need to get rid of and wrap it with some kind of metal to make it look like it matches the equipment that is right next to it. Mr. Sanders stated that he believes yellow is a primer color, it is not painted, yet. Consequently, he was thinking that if it was painted or with metal would make it look more utilitarian. It stands out a lot because it is yellow and white.

**Mr. Merriman** said the only options are to go back to a trap door or ask that it be changed so that it fits with what the ordinance requires. There are no other options.

**Mr. Engle** said the drawing shows the deck is there, but the railing is not.

**Mr. Sanders** confirmed that Mr. Engle was correct. He said that Ms. Michalak thought it was here, but it is not. He is trying to show what they will do. They will put a railing on it.

**Mr. Engle** said in other words, this will be a roof top deck and not just access to get to the roof.

**Mr. Sanders** said yes. It will have an observation deck. Their equipment is on there, but it is not strictly an equipment deck.

**Mr. Engle** stated, therefore, this was intentionally put up there to provide access to a deck and not just to go up and check on roof leaks.

**Mr. Sanders** said yes.

**Mr. Engle** stated that the design standards state that rooftop additions should not be visible from the front elevation. However, it is visible now and once the railing goes in, it will be even more visible.

**Mr. Sanders** said he does not believe that the railing will be seen.

**Mr. Engle** said the Secretary of Interior's Standards say it is inappropriate to have a visible addition on less than a three-story building.

**Mr. Sanders** said this is a five-story building.

**Mr. Engle** said it is two stories from Bay Street and five-stories from River Street.

**Dr. Henry** asked, "what else is on the roof."

**Mr. Sanders** answered that he personally has not gone up there because it is precarious.

**Dr. Henry** asked if vegetation is up there.

**Mr. Sanders** answered no.

**Dr. Henry** asked if equipment up there.

**Mr. Sanders** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the location could be moved closer to River Street.

**Mr. Sanders** answered possibly.

**Dr. Williams** said this would obviously significantly impact the visibility. You would have to be across the river to see it. It could mean pushing it about 15 or 20 feet to the north.

**Mr. Lominack** commented that he believes they are spending too much time talking about something that is minor and interpreting an ordinance so strictly on something that does not make any difference. He said he personally thinks that they have a pretty good solution. He said to say that it is incompatible and worry so much about something that is hardly visible. It does pick up form; it is obviously an addition. He believes that it meets so much of the criteria that one would look for in a project than sit here and pick on whether the windows meet that 3:5 ratio. It is a penthouse, an addition to the roof; and penthouses are described in the ordinance as containing a stair and elevator. All this has is a stair.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said that they are

not in favor of rooftop additions. Therefore, they agree with the staff recommendations. In their opinion, the addition is not compatible. They circumvented the correct approval and also circumvented the process that could potentially make this compatible. Ms. Meunier said they do not believe that what is currently proposed is compatible and as she has said, they do not agree with rooftop additions. They agree with staff for denial of this petition.

**Mr. Sanders** said he was hoping instead of them going on with the denial, maybe they could have a continuance. The project is currently under construction. This is not something that they put up and are using. He said they can modify this in many ways that the Board might find this acceptable, even if it was removing all of the overhangs, make it tiny, make it disappear, and take the windows off.

**Dr. Henry** said it would satisfy him if it was not seen from the street. Now, how the petitioner does this is strictly up to him.

**Mr. Engle** said the deck is shown 47 feet long and 16 feet wide. This is a gigantic deck. This is 700 square feet. If you have 100 people up there for a cocktail party, it will be visible. It is sticking towards Bay Street 15 feet from the stairway. Is there a way that the roof access could be placed towards River Street and not be visible and pull the deck back so the railings would not be visible?

**Mr. Sanders** said he was not so sure about this. If need be, he could review this.

**Mr. Engle** said the Board would have probably asked for a mock-up initially if this was submitted to the Board.

**Mr. Sanders** said he is willing to do this now. He does not want to move this because it is accessed from a mezzanine. However, he is willing to go through the process and prove that you will not see the rails. He said maybe he is hurting himself because it is yellow. If it was grey metal, it would look like all the restaurant equipment. It will never be pretty up there as long as this stuff is up there. He does not think that this will go away. Mr. Sanders said he would appreciate it if they could leave it where it is.

**Mr. Sanders** asked for a continuance.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said Mr. Sanders must realize that it should not be visible.

**Mr. Merriman** said it would be fine with him for the Board to vote to deny this and then the petitioner could back with a more appropriate drawing that meets the standards and criteria that are set forth in the ordinance.

### **Board Action:**

Approval to continue the petition for the after-the-fact installation of a rooftop addition on the building located at 42 East Bay Street to consider the following:

- The rooftop addition must be redesigned to not be visible from Bay Street. - PASS

- The railing that is yet to be installed for the roof deck must not be visible from Bay Street.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Ebony Simpson

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

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

18. [Petition of Gretchen Callejas, Felder and Associates | 13-004365-COA | 109 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Rehabilitation/Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Application, Project Description, and History Summary.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Preservation Brief 16 - The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors.pdf](#)

**Ms. Gretchen Callejas** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the report. The petitioner is requesting rehabilitation for the historic former Greyhound Bus Station Depot. They are seeking historic preservation tax incentives on this project.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval for the rehabilitation of the historic former Greyhound Bus Depot located at 109 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval prior to construction:

1. All materials, finishes and color selections not provided in the submittal packet are to be submitted to staff for final review and approval.
2. The petitioner is to work with staff while researching for a substitute material for the Vitrolite and Vitrolux panels on the front façade.
3. Locate the dumpster within green screening at the rear of the property to screen it from the public right-of-way.
4. Recess the fence/gate along MLK further into the drive opening to expose the original round window on the side of the curved window.
5. Where intersected by a new driveway, the sidewalk shall serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

**Mr. Engle** said that the virolite is probably, with the exception of the round window, the

most significant thing about this building. He said he is concerned about just carte-blanc approval of a project without knowing what the materials will be. Do we have any feelings as to what the substitution criteria will be?

**Ms. Harris** explained that the petitioner has done a lot of research on this and has samples that she reviewed on site. However, she does not believe that a final selection has taken place, but the petitioner will be able to inform the Board more regarding the substitution materials.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes that it would be appropriate to define the criteria that would be used to guide the staff. For example, how close to the original hue of blue does it have to be or what shade or what shade of white.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Callejas** came forward and introduced herself.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Ms. Callejas if she felt comfortable with the staff's recommendations.

**Ms. Callejas** said they feel comfortable with all of the staff's recommendations. She said regarding the materials, they have done a lot of research. They have talked with a lot of specialists that deal in preservation all over the United States. They have some glass that the previous owner had. The glass has a backing on it and they can peel it right off; so they were not able to use that. But in the Preservation Brief for substitute materials, they talk about vitrolite. They talk about one of the possible substitutions is a tempered glass with a painting on the back, but not a peel and stick, but a real painting. Ms. Callejas said it is their goal to match the samples on site. They will put up a sample next to the old for the staff to compare. They want it to look as close as possible to the original.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked Ms. Callejas if she was talking about something that possibly mimics spandrel glass.

**Ms. Callejas** answered yes. This is also one of the substitutes.

**Dr. Henry** complimented Ms. Callejas on doing a great job.

**Mr. Engle** asked if any of the replacements will be curved.

**Ms. Callejas** answered yes.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** congratulated the petitioner. He said he believes it is a great building and a great project.

#### **Board Action:**

Approval for rehabilitation of the historic/former  
Greyhound Bus Depot located at 109 Martin



Luther King, Jr. Blvd. with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval prior to construction:

1. All materials, finishes and color selections not provided in the submittal packet are to be submitted to staff for final review and approval.
2. The petitioner is to work with staff while researching for a substitute material for the Vitrolite and Vitrolux panels on the front façade. - PASS
3. Locate the dumpster within green screening at the rear of the property to screen it from the public right-of-way.
4. Recess the fence/gate along MLK further into the drive opening to expose the original round window on the side of the curved window.
5. Where intersected by a new driveway, the sidewalk shall serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Keith Howington

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

19. [Petition of Hoffman Engineering Group, Inc. | 13-004366-COA | 452 Price Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

**Mr. Tom Hoffman** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting a second story rear addition for the property located at 452 Price Street. The rear of the building has a partial width one-story appendage. The new addition will be above this. Therefore, the footprint of the building will be the same.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends to continue the petition for a second-story, rear addition for the property located at 452 Price Street to address 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.

**Ms. Michalak** said that the petitioner, after seeing the staff's report, submitted some proposed changes in an effort to try to meet some of the preservation standards. Obviously, the Board cannot vote on the changes today, but the petitioner only wanted to show them to the Board and get feedback on the design.

**Mr. Hoffman of Hoffman Engineering Group** came forward and introduced himself. He said they are in agreement with the staff's comments. They have made some revisions which will mitigate some of the concerns. The plan is similar to the house on the north side of Gordon Lane. He said basically the existing roofline of that one-story structure remained as the new addition came out of the top. Consequently, their proposal is to keep the roofline intact.

**Mr. Engle** asked if there was a reason why there is no fenestration on the elevation facing Gaston Street. As someone stands on East Gaston Street they will be looking at the side of the second story and it is one solid mass with no windows at all.

**Mr. Hoffman** [pointing to an area] said this will be the south elevation that is facing Gaston Street. This will not be visible from Gaston Street because of the trees and vegetation. He said that their desire is not to have a window on this side of the building. Their other change is with the rear wall of the house. They will shrink the large opening to the width of the window. The rear of the house will remain and they will encapsulate the siding. Therefore, this will be the entrance into the addition. He said that basically they will abandon the perimeter of the existing roof structure. If the addition comes down [pointing to an area], this part of the wall will remain and the perimeter of the roof lines will be there, the slopes will be salvaged and people will be able to see what was there if they decide to remove it. They addressed the reversibility aspect with this.

**Mr. Engle** asked if there is an aerial with this submission.

**Mr. Hoffman** answered no.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that they only usually do aerials with new construction.

**Mr. Engle** said, therefore, they have no view from Gaston Street.

**Ms. Michalak** said there is a photographic view from Gaston Street.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes one view was from Gordon Lane.

**Mr. Engle** asked about sheet C-7.

**Mr. Hoffman** said one of the photographs was taken looking into the yard and the other was of the front of the house.

**Mr. Engle** said he would like to see a photograph from Gaston Street looking up as he does not know how you would not see the second floor of the new addition.

**Mr. Hoffman** said there is vegetation here. A large tree is here and other vegetation. He said, granted, the tree could be chopped down, but they would not be able to see much of the addition.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** said she appreciated Mr. Hoffman showing the Board the new drawings, but she does not really understand why they are talking about this. Did you ask for a continuance?

**Ms. Ramsay** said the petitioner has not asked for a continuance.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** said the elevations do not match the plan. She told him that if he chooses to come back, she suggested that this be rectified.

**Mr. Hoffman** asked Ms. Weibe-Reed to clarify her statement.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** clarified that from the edge of the wall to the edge of the window, the elevation shows that they are symmetrical.

**Mr. Williams** said he sensed that the petitioner will be coming back before the Board. He asked the petitioner to think about the massing in relationship to the addition of the first floor. It might be worthwhile to make it slightly smaller to answer some of the concerns that have been raised by the staff. Dr. Williams said it might be helpful for Mr. Hoffman to look at other options for the roof such as gable or hip.

**Mr. Hoffman** stated that they were trying to prevent getting into the roof structure of the main house.

**Mr. Hoffman** requested a continuance.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **Board Action:**

Approval to continue the petition 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. - PASS
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.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

20. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 13-004367-COA | 611 East River Street | New Construction Amendment](#)

Attachment: [Aerial Views.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

Attachment: [Previously Approved Part II Submittal packet.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Staff report.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. This is an amendment to previously approved New Construction at 600 East Bay Street, also known as 611 East River Street. The Part I Height and Mass were approved on February 13, 2013 and Part II came to the Board on June 7, 2013. She explained that the petitioner is proposing revisions which include changes to Part I Height and Mass as well as Part II Design Detail, in addition, the light fixtures and signage.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the proposed amendments, lighting plan and signage plan with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for verification and approval with construction drawings:

1. Add the louvered vents with appropriate colors to the panel for approval.
2. Select a more decorative metal panel for the vents below the windows which meets the intake requirements but is also more contemporary and decorative in design.
3. In the revised windows, use paired windows in order to meet the standard.
4. Provide southwest stair detail.
5. Revise the lighting type on the west façade to be a bracketed pendant style fixture, as indicated in previous renderings. Eliminate the shepherd's crook light.

6. Provide the sign clearance height for verification of conformance with the standard.

**Dr. Henry** asked if some of the windows will be thicker.

**Ms. Harris** said the windows will be widened from three feet to four feet. She explained that the recess on detail number 7 and the Bay Street façade are being decreased by nine inches from three feet to two feet – three inches. Ms. Harris said all of the recesses are being decreased by nine inches.

**Dr. Henry** stated that it would be helpful if Ms. Harris used the model and point to what she is saying as these are small changes.

**Ms. Harris** pointed out the changes on the model.

**Mr. Merriman** asked if the proposed windows meet the standards. He said other than changing the paired windows to meet the standards, what does this mean?

**Ms. Harris** said the windows could go back to what was previously approved would be an alternative.

**Mr. Howington** asked if railings were added on the north elevation or were they here before.

**Ms. Harris** said the railing were there.

**Mr. Howington** asked if the larger windows are metal as well.

**Ms. Harris** stated that this is her understanding.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Shay** said he would recap quickly. The variety of rivets and indents for the PTAC grills are necessary to accommodate the selected HVAC equipment. He does not have a choice with this. The single width windows increasing from three feet wide to four feet wide is also to accommodate the HVAC equipment and they are very much in agreement with staff on dividing that into two lights so that each of the individual lights meet the standards. Mr. Shay said that the decorative perforated metal panels that were previously approved had approximately a 58 percent free area and the manufacturer of the HVAC equipment requires 90 percent free area. They have had many discussions with them about this and what they came up with was a way to present something that was still decorative. They fit together with the balcony railings and have a way of screening the mechanical equipment.

**Mr. Shay** said they think that the staff's recommendations for something a little more decorative is good and he was prepared to show the Board something that he believes meets this if they so desire. He explained that the increased building area of the eighth floor is very unobtrusive, but it is an increase and they felt they had to come to the Board to let them know that the mass was increasing by approximately 550 square feet. It is mostly increasing because they had to double the size of one of the rooms in order to meet the ADA requirement and move one wall about five feet in order for one bay to be devoted to the rooftop pool mechanical equipment.

**Mr. Shay** explained that there are some exhaust vents that have to do some exhausting from facilities that are on the roof and you cannot have an exhaust outlet closer than ten feet. Therefore, the balconies that were here were removed. They would have loved to have the

balconies for people to stand on, but they had to do a shifting as a consequence of that.

**Mr. Shay** stated that in addition to the brick face mechanical screen, turns out that there is a giant mechanical unit that is hidden in the base of the crown. It also turns out that there has to be a very large mechanical unit up above that stair. Therefore, they chose to put a brick screen around it, but there is a four foot high parapet and three feet back from that, there is a six foot high wall. It is going to be very unobtrusive.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he thought that was a great staff report. The picture that is in the report to the Board that was shown by staff showed a through wall louver that was dark brown and a red brick wall. This is to show the Board the type of louver that they are talking about, not the color. The color will be carefully matched. He stated that he was thankful for the staff recommendation to have it made into the sample panel because he, too, would like to ensure that the color is not approximate, but is as close as they can possibly make it.

**Mr. Shay** said in the lighting submittal, he missed the wall packets that were included in the lighting package that are along the descending stairs. He stated that all along, they intended to have a bracket wall fixture here. They have found a Bishop's crook that mounts to the wall.

**Mr. Shay** reported that in order for the Board to understand the issue with the railings on the River Street side, the existing River Street elevation at the curb line is around 11.5 feet below mean sea level. The required FEMA flood plain elevation for the interior of the building is 13 feet. The ADA requires that any exit from the building actually functions as a fire exit also has to meet ADA. Therefore, they cannot come out of a building that is 13 feet high and get down to 11.5 feet high without doing this. But, they do not want people to just bust out of the front door and step off an 18 inch curb and break their ankles either. So, ADA requires that where they have the sidewalk it is actually the ramp. It is actually the sidewalk that does the ramping. They have to have a handrail on the side for anyone needing assistance can place their hand on the rail.

**Mr. Shay** said that he has talked with staff at length about working as long as he can with the civil engineer for the project to see if there is not some way that they might be able to at least bring up River Street a little bit on this side.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he informed the Board that if they wanted him to, he would show them a different grill design. However, he would not show it unless they wanted him to do so.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes the Board wants to see the grill design.

**Mr. Shay** showed the grill design and explained it.

**Mr. Howington** asked if it was actually louvers or bars on the sides of the grill.

**Mr. Shay** answered that they are bars.

**Mr. Howington** asked if there was a way to move the three wall vents to the east side.

**Mr. Shay** said he is totally stuck. The rooms ended up having to have a specific mechanical system and, therefore, they have to be where they are. He said that Ms. Harris asked him if he could make them symmetrical and they are where they are.

**Mr. Howington** explained that he was talking about the ones on the brick wall that are

painted; the ones next to PTAC units that are actually on the wall.

**Mr. Engle** asked how far behind the deck of grill will the unit be.

**Mr. Shay** answered at least three inches.

**Mr. Engle** asked if it would be painted dark or white.

**Mr. Shay** said it would be painted dark.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**Board Action:**

Approve the alternative grill design presented at the meeting as well as the proposed amendments, lighting plan and signage plan with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for verification and approval with construction drawings:

1. Add the louvered vents with appropriate colors to the sample panel for approval;
2. In the revised windows, use paired windows in order to meet the standard;
3. Provide southwest stair detail; - PASS
4. Revise the lighting type on the west façade to be a bracketed pendant style fixture, as indicated in previous renderings. Eliminate the shepherd's crook light; and
5. Provide the sign clearance height for verification of conformance with the standard.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

Robin Williams

- Aye

21. [Petition of Nathan Godley | 13-004373-COA | 322 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**NOTE: Ms. Weibe-Reed recused from participating in this petition. She is the architect for the project.**

**Mr. Patrick Godley** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to construct two additions at 322 East Oglethorpe Avenue. The first addition is to the rear, north façade of the main structure. It consists of a four foot six inch by six foot six inch powder room addition, porch, and stairs on the first floor and a four foot six inch by six foot inch laundry room addition on the second floor. The second addition consists of adding a second floor to the west part of the existing one story accessory building to the north of the main building.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the proposed addition to the main house and addition to the accessory building with the following conditions:

1. Provide additional information on the "salvaged wood door." If the wood door is from another historic property, it may create a false sense of historic development to reinstall at this location.
2. The historic window that is not proposed to be reinstalled should be stored onsite.
3. In the event that during construction, the existing aluminum siding must be removed, the original wood siding beneath should be restored (if possible) rather than replaced or recovered.
4. On the proposed balcony on the accessory building, either increase the depth and support with brackets, or recess the railings to be architecturally integrated into the door opening.
5. Ensure that the column capitals extend outward on the porch architrave.
6. Ensure that the baluster spacing on the porch staircase on the main house addition and on the balcony on the accessory addition do not exceed four inches.

**Dr. Henry** said he was unclear what the petitioner is planning to do with the aluminum siding. Are they planning to remove all of it?

**Ms. Harris** answered that her understanding is that the aluminum on the main house is proposed to be left in place. However, because they are going to put an addition on, staff recommends that if it necessitates removal in that particular area, that it remain off and that the wood siding, presuming that it is in reasonable condition, be restored beneath. However, at this point, the petitioner isn't proposing to do anything with the aluminum siding.

**Mr. Lominack** asked, "why it the balcony to be removable?"



**Ms. Harris** answered that she does not know. This is a question that the petitioner would be able to answer.

**Mr. Lominack** asked, "how far is it being projected outward?"

**Ms. Harris** said this was not indicated. It appears to be attached to the building without any projection.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Patrick Godley** came forward and introduced himself. He is present on behalf of his father, Nathan Godley, who is ill today.

**Mr. Godley** said in answer to the question about the salvaged door; it was actually a part of the original property. It was removed from what is now the enclosed front staircase. Therefore, it is a part of the original structure. He said that they will be happy to store the window on site. Mr. Godley said regarding the aluminum siding, they are hopeful in the near future to remove all the aluminum siding from the house, but currently they are doing the rear porch addition. The aluminum siding will be a later project. He said as far as the railing on the new structure on the lane side of the building, they would be happy to do as staff has recommended to do it recessed in the doorway.

**Mr. Godley** said with regards to the capitals and balusters on the porch staircase, they will make these compliant with the code.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Godley if he had an idea of the condition of the wood under the aluminum siding.

**Mr. Godley** answered that they have only removed one little piece As they had to do some repairs to a gas line on one of the fire places. They cut about a six inch piece and the wood appeared to be in fairly good condition. They were happy to find that it was in a fairly good condition and they are hoping to find that more wood is in good condition as they do this addition.

**Mr. Lominack** asked that once the rail is recessed "will it be removal?" If so, "what is the purpose of removing it?"

**Mr. Godley** answered that the addition on the lane side of the nonconforming structure will be a storage room. They are doing double doors so that they would have the ability to put large things in there that maybe a staircase couldn't handle. It would only be removed if they were moving something large in and out of the storage unit.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Howington** stated that the only thing he would request is that another column capital design would go back to staff. He said they have had, in the past, where the columns and

entablature did not work out. He would like to see this again, if possible.

**Board Action:**

Approval of the proposed addition to the main house and addition to the accessory building with the following conditions:

- Provide additional information on the “salvaged wood door.” If the wood door is from another historic property, it may create a false sense of historic development to reinstall at this location;
- The historic window that is not proposed to be reinstalled should be stored onsite;
- In the event that during construction, the existing aluminum siding must be removed, the original wood siding beneath should be restored (if possible) rather than replaced or recovered. - PASS
- On the proposed balcony on the accessory building, either increase the depth and support with brackets, or recess the railing to be architecturally integrated into the door opening;
- Ensure that the column capitals extend outward of the porch architrave; and
- Ensure that the baluster spacing on the porch staircase on the main house addition and on the balcony on the accessory addition do not exceed four inches.
- Column porch details come back to Board.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present

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

22. [Petition of Becky Lynch, AIA for Lynch Associates Architects, PC | 13-004374-COA | 303 East Gaston Street | Rehabilitation/Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Project Narrative.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Window Cut Sheet.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Staff Report - REVISED.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs small.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for rehabilitation and site improvements for the property located at 303 East Gaston Street. The property consists of three buildings: main house, guest house, and carriage house.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for rehabilitation and site improvements for the property located at 303 East Gaston Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval prior to construction:

1. All windows on the south elevations at the new infill location are to be operable on the second and third floors.
2. Ensure that the new window sashes are inset not less than three inches (3") from the exterior façade of the building or that the inset matches the inset for the existing windows.
3. Ensure that the sidewalk on Lincoln serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway.
4. All colors, finishes, and materials to be submitted to staff - including but not limited to: the finish for the wood pergola, the finish for the wood vehicular gates, a fabric sample for the pool pavilion, all paint colors.
6. All specifications and manufacturer's cut sheets (with the exception of the replacement windows) to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to construction.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that she believes the majority of the materials are handmade or custom. She believes this has a lot to do with the missing specifications.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Lynch** said they agree with the staff's recommendations and are happy to comply. They will make the windows on the south elevation operable. This should not be a problem with the exception of the transom windows. The window sashes are actually shown on a note in the same elevation that they will be setback a minimum of four inches from the face of the building and all replacements and new windows. She said the sidewalk on Lincoln Street is an existing curb cut and driveway. If they are to improve that sidewalk in any way, they will be sure to make it continuous as it is now.

**Ms. Lynch** said they will be happy to submit all colors, finishes and specifications to staff. She said regarding the pool pavilion, at the wall, it is in compliance with fences, trellises and walls. It has a limit of 11 feet. The structure is not a fence or trellis. They do not see it as being a part of the guideline as it is actually an independent structure. It is not a trellis and this is why a roof is on it. Another house is very close to their side garden and they are looking to get some privacy.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the staircase will be enclosed.

**Ms. Lynch** said they are reconfiguring the stairs. There is a large ugly stair that goes from the ground level to parlor level. They are taking this out and will put a new stair underneath the newly reconstructed side porch. Also a newly constructed stair up to the third floor.

**Dr. Henry** stated that many years ago he had a conversation with the owner and as he recalls, this was an original staircase moved to the outside.

**Ms. Lynch** said actually the stair that is existing on the side porch she believes was relocated from the parlor level. There is no existing interior stair from the parlor level to upstairs. Therefore, they are planning to remove and preserve this at this time. However, they are still working on how to get from the parlor level to the second level.

**Dr. Henry** said that staircase is in terrific condition.

**Ms. Lynch** explained that they have done some preliminary demolition inside and they removed railings and preserved them so that they could reuse them if the owner chooses to do so. She said nothing is being proposed to be done on the garage, but they may do so at a later date.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

### **Board Action:**

Approval for rehabilitation and site improvements for the property located at 303 East Gaston Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval prior to construction.

1. All windows on the south elevations at the new infill location are to be operable on the second and third floors.
2. Ensure that the new window sashes are inset not less than three inches (3") from the exterior façade of the building or that the inset matches the inset for the existing windows.
3. Ensure that the sidewalk on Lincoln Street serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway

- PASS

across the driveway.

4. All colors, finishes, and materials to be submitted to staff - including but not limited to: the finish for the wood pergola, the finish for the wood vehicular gates, a fabric sample for the pool pavilion, all paint colors.

5. All specifications and manufacturer's cut sheets (with the exception of the replacement windows) to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to construction.

**Vote Results**

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Nicholas Henry

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

**IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION**

**X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS**

23. [Petition of Janet Lewis for Kern & Co., LLC | 13-004025-COA | 1 West Jones Street | Staff Approved - Steel Structural Support](#)

Attachment: [COA - 1 West Jones Street 13-004025-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 1 West Jones Street 13-004025-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Scott Hall | 13-004051-COA | 548 East Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Windows](#)

Attachment: [COA - 548 East Taylor Street 13-004051-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 548 East Taylor Street 13-004051-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of S. Bart Redmond | 13-004069-COA | 14 West State Street | Staff Approved - Roof Replacement](#)

Attachment: [COA - 14 West State Street 13-004069-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 14 West State Street 13-004069-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Jennifer Deacon | 13-004090-COA | 126 West Bay Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 126 West Bay Street 13-004090-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 126 West Bay Street 13-004090-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Betty Roane | 13-004104-COA | 511 Tattnall Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 511 Tattnall Street 13-004104-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 511 Tattnall Street 13-004104-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of David McKinley for Coastal Canvas Products Co. | 13-004107-COA | 545 East York Street | Staff Approved - Canopy](#)

Attachment: [COA - 545 East York Street 13-004107-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 545 East York Street 13-004107-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Charlie Angell for the House Doctor | 13-004171-COA | 136 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 136 Habersham Street 13-004171-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 136 Habersham Street 13-004171-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Charlie Angell for the House Doctor | 13-004172-COA | 23 Montgomery Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 23 Montgomery Street 13-004172-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 23 Montgomery Street 13-004172-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Jimmie F. Gross | 13-004184-COA | 312 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 312 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-004184-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 312 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-004184-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Brenda Pearson for Dawson Architects, PC | 13-004204-COA | 125 West River Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 125 West River Street 13-004204-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 125 West River Street 13-004204.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Freda Smith | 13-004306-COA | 407 East Charlton Street | Staff Approved - Shutters](#)

Attachment: [COA - 407 East Charlton Street 13-004306-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 407 East Charlton Street 13-004306-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Doug Bean for Doug Bean Signs | 13-004323-COA | 513 East Oglethorpe Avenue Ste D | Staff Approved - Fascia Sign](#)

Attachment: [COA - 513 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-004323-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 513 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-004323-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Timothy Balding for Greenline Architecture | 13-004202-COA | 605 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Awnings](#)

Attachment: [COA - 605 West Oglethorpe Avenue 13-004202-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 605 West Oglethorpe Avenue 13-004202-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Sam Carroll for Concrete Interior Forms, LLC | 13-004355-COA | 114 East Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Garage Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 114 East Gaston Street 13-004355-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 114 East Gaston Street 13-004355-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Trey and Deanne Skinner | 13-004357-COA | 318 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Wall](#)

Attachment: [COA - 318 East Broughton Street 13-004357-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 318 East Broughton Street 13-004357-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Ramsay Khalidi for R K Construction & Development Co., Inc. | 13-004387-COA | 420](#)

West Bay Lane | Staff Approved - Alterations and Repairs

Attachment: [COA - 420 West Bay Lane 13-004387-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 420 West Bay Lane 13-004387-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. Petition of Matt Klimek for Signs Unlimited | 13-004477-COA | 414 MLK Jr. Blvd | Staff Approved - Color Change Sign Face Change

Attachment: [COA - 414 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd 13-004477-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 414 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd 13-004477-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. Petition of Charles F. Owens | 13-004516-COA | 549 East St. Julian Street | Staff Approved - Roof Replacement

Attachment: [COA - 549 East St. Julian Street 13-004516-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. Petition of Elisa Dickens | 13-004523-COA | 41 Drayton Street | Staff Approved - Awning

Attachment: [COA - 41 Drayton Street 13-004523-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 41 Drayton Street 13-004523-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. Petition of Minnie Poole | 13-004530-COA | 108 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning

Attachment: [COA - 108 West Broughton Street 13-004530-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 108 West Broughton Street 13-004530-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

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

43. Report on Work Performed Without a Certificate of Appropriateness

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 9-11-13.pdf](#)

**Ms. Ramsay** asked about the house on Lincoln and Jones Street removing the back wall.

**Mr. Howngton** asked if the entire back wall was removed.

**Ms. Ramsay** answered yes. The Board asked them to retain at least the 2nd floor exterior within their dressing room and they agreed to do so, but they did not.



**Ms. Harris** said she reported this to Development Services. She will give a report on this at the next meeting.

## XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Items Deferred to Staff 9-11-13.pdf](#)

**Ms. Ramsay** said she had a question from a Board member wanting to know why Mr. Hoffman was allowed to show his changes.

**Ms. Michalak** said she asked the Board and told them that Mr. Hoffman would show the changes if the Board agrees.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she thought they agreed that no one would be allowed to show new changes at a meeting.

**Mr. Engle** said they also let Mr. Shay show his new grill.

**Ms. Ramsay** said Mr. Shay was asked to show his new grill.

**Mr. Merriman** said they told Mr. Neil Dawson during a hearing that if the information was not included in the packets where they could review it ahead of time that it was not properly posted and noticed, that they could not hear it.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes it depends on the extent of the package.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she believes they need to get some input from staff on this.

**Mr. Engle** said the grill is a minor issue and could have gone to staff. The Board did not have to review the grill.

**Ms. Harris** said this is what she thought she heard at the retreat, but she could be mistaken, that the Board would not act on new things put before them at the meeting. But, they would review and provide comments and not vote, only comment, at that meeting.

**Ms. Harris** explained that both applicants today were not asking the Board to vote on what was presented to them, but just wanted to show the Board what they were proposing. She said it did not occur to her that this would be unacceptable just to show it. The unacceptability would be for the Board to act on it.

**Mr. Howington** said it was his understanding that when there is a large project such as the hotel were the gentleman came in and had an entire new scheme, it was too large for the Board to digest. However, as Mr. Thomson has stated to the Board, this is the petitioner's time to show the Board certain things as long as it does not waste the Board's time or get into a large project.

**Mr. Engle** asked, "what was shown to the Board on the roof top addition?"

**Mr. Howington** said he was only talking.

**Ms. Michalak** said she believes the Board is talking about 452 Price Street, Tom Hoffman. Ms. Michalak explained that Mr. Hoffman was not asking the Board to look at it. What she told him is that she will tell the Board that he sent her some things. She told him that the Board would not be making a decision on those. She said she was saying that if the Board could, provide him some feedback on that, but he was not asking the Board to vote on it.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the clarification was needed because it helped Mr. Hoffman to have what he was thinking would be acceptable.

### **XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

#### **Notices**

45. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, September 19, 2013 at 3:00 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

46. [Next Meeting - Wednesday October 9, 2013 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

### **XIV. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **XV. ADJOURNMENT**

47. [Adjourned](#)

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen I. Harris  
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem