



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
August 13, 2014 1:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

AUGUST 13, 2014 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Keith Howington, Chair
Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian
Debra Caldwell
Reed Engle
Justin Gunther
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Marjorie Weibe-Reed
Tess Scheer
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Member Not Present: Ebony Simpson, Vice Chair
Stephen Merriman, Jr.

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

City of Savannah Staff Present: Lorie Odom, Downtown Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Order](#)

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

2. [Petition of The Fitts Company, Inc. | 14-003314-COA | 120 Drayton Street | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

Approve the petition for a new sign package for the bank business located at 120 Drayton Street with the condition that the proposed banners be removed from the sign package because they are not permitted per the sign ordinance. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Reed Engle
Debra Caldwell - Aye
Reed Engle - Aye
Justin Gunther - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Marjorie W Reed - Not Present
Tess Scheer - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

3. [Petition of Dawson Architects | 14-003380-COA | 20 East Broad Street | Rehabilitation/Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

Approve the petition for rehabilitation and alterations to the “Pirate’s House” located at 20 East Broad Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Salvage and reuse the historic granite curb material. - PASS
2. Ensure that the inset of the new windows is not less than 3 inches or matches the inset of the historic windows.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Reed Engle
Debra Caldwell - Aye
Reed Engle - Aye
Justin Gunther - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

4. [Petition of Barnard Architects | 14-003466-COA | 204 West Broughton Street | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 204 West Broughton Street 14-003466-COA.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

Approve the petition to replace the ground floor storefront for the property located at 204 West Broughton Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible, and meets the preservation, design, and sign standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

5. [Petition of Lott + Barber | 14-003469-COA | 123 Abercorn Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 123 Abercorn Street 14-003469-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 123 Abercorn Street 14-003469-COA.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the petition to install a building identification sign at 123 Abercorn Street because the sign is visually compatible and meets the Historic District's sign standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

6. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 14-003504-COA | 556 East Gordon Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the petition to construct brick privacy walls for the vacant property on the eastern portion of the parcel located at 556 East Gordon Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the design standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

7. [Petition of Lynch Associates Architects, PC | 14-003506-COA | 102 Fahm Street | Alterations and Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Board Action:

Approve the petition for alterations and a sign for the property located at 102 Fahm Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Provide all color selections.
2. Clarify whether the existing chain link fence surrounding the site will be removed. If yes, clarify if it will be replaced with another wall of continuity. - PASS
3. Ensure that the storefront glazing is inset a minimum of 4 inches from the face of the building to meet the standard.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

8. [Petition of Sawyer Design | 14-003507-COA | 538 East Gordon Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

Approve the petition for a second-story, rear addition for the property located at 538 East Gordon Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Do not replace the vertical trim on the side facades between the rear appendages and the main building AND do not replace the original first-floor appendage cornerboards with Hardi. Either keep the existing in place or extend the existing with wood material. - PASS
2. Use a wood or Hardi soffit instead of the proposed plywood on the addition.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
----------------	-------

Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

9. [Adopt August 13, 2014 Agenda](#)

Board Action:

Approve the adoption of the August 13, 2014 agenda. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

10. [Approve Meeting Minutes of July 9, 2014](#)

Attachment: [07-09-2014 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the Meeting Minutes of July 9, 2014. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

11. [Petition of Jeff Cramer for Diversified Designs | 14-001183-COA | 615 Habersham Street | New Construction Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Board Action:	
Continue.	- PASS
Vote Results	
Motion: Robin Williams	
Second: Justin Gunther	
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

12. [Petition of Beth and Tim Gaudreau | 14-002343-COA | 527 East Jones Street | Alterations](#)

Board Action:	
Continue.	- PASS
Vote Results	
Motion: Robin Williams	
Second: Justin Gunther	
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

13. [Petition of Joseph's Clothiers | 14-003471-COA | 28 West Broughton Street | Signs](#)

Board Action:

Continue. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Justin Gunther

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

14. [Petition of Andrew Lynch AIA, Lynch Associates Architects | 14-002351-COA | 402 East Gwinnett Street | New Construction of Three Duplexes: Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Mercer Ward.pdf](#)

Mr. Josh Ward of Lynch Architects was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of Part 2: Design Details for three duplexes on the vacant lot located at the northeast corner of Price and Gwinnett Street. Two of the duplexes will face Price Street and one will face Gwinnett Street. All duplexes will be two stories tall and have modest front stoops. The two duplexes along Price Street will have a pyramidal roof while the Gwinnett Street duplexes will have a side gable roof. Part I: Height and Mass was approved by the HDBR on June

11, 2014 with the following conditions:

1. Reduce the height of the Gwinnett Street duplexes to be more compatible by reducing the roof pitch or changing to a hipped roof. The condition has been met.
2. Add additional voids to the south facade of the south duplex on Price Street which faces Gwinnett Street to better address Gwinnett Street. The condition has been met.
3. Restudy the west façade of the Gwinnett Street duplex as this faced will be highly visible from Gwinnett Street, given that it is approximately 12 feet from the duplex to the west. The west façade of the Gwinnett Street duplex is on the property line; therefore, additional voids cannot be added.
4. On the south façade of the Price Street duplex along Gwinnett Street increase the vertical to horizontal window ratio to 5:3 to meet the standard. The condition has been met.
5. On the east façade of the Gwinnett Street duplex, place the electrical meter on the north side of the fence to screen from view. The condition has been met.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of Part II Design Details for two duplexes along Price Street and one duplex along Gwinnett Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Provide color and material samples;
2. Reduce the exposure on the fiber cement siding and ensure that it has a smooth finish;
3. Select an alternative for the stucco buildings – either brick or siding;
4. Add additional detailing to the portico columns; and
5. Provide additional details to staff on how the railing connects to the porch post.

Because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards.

Mr. Howington asked Ms. Harris for clarification, if she said that all of Part I: Height and Mass was met.

Ms. Harris answered all were met with the possible exception that the Board asked for a restudy of the west façade the Gwinnett Street duplex to explore options of potentially how to add additional voids or other architectural details. However, the west façade of the Gwinnett Street duplex is on the property line. Consequently, this precludes voids from being there. All the other conditions of Part I were met.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Ward stated that in regards to staff's recommendations they will ensure that the fiber cement siding has a smooth texture and they can reduce the exposure to five inches. They will work with staff regarding the detailing of the portico columns and the railing connects to the porch post. He explained that concerning the stucco on the two duplexes facing Price, they would like to keep this stucco. They believe, of course, that the project as a whole needs some variation in materials. He said they believe that the lapsiding on the Gwinnett Street duplex is appropriate for that street corridor. The stucco along the Price Street corridor can be handled. They did a sort of a windshield survey from Gwinnett Street to East Liberty Street by going south on Price Street and there are approximately five different stucco buildings that occupy corners along Price; and about a total of 18

masonry buildings. Therefore, they believe it is a compatible material that will fit well within this corridor. Therefore, they want to retain the stucco on those two duplexes.

Mr. Ward said that they studied using brick for these, but when you do brick construction opposed to just a lapping exterior wall, you can add about four or five inches of extra depth to the wall. Therefore, over the course of the site they are adding 18 inches that took away from the interior spaces. They ruled this out; and they believe that the stucco in order to keep some variation on the site, it would be appropriate for those two duplexes.

Dr. Williams asked why the stairs on the Gwinnet Street duplexes comes out towards the sidewalk rather than as they do on Price Street where they follow the typical Savannah configuration.

Mr. Ward answered that he believes the neighboring building has that configuration of the front porch and the steps come out from this. They are trying to utilize that design.

Dr. Williams said that building is setback more from the sidewalk which is when you typically see stairs coming straight down. Although the model shows the steps coming onto the tree line, the drawings show the sidewalk. He assumes that drawing is correct and the model is wrong, but the façade is lined up with the site of this, but the front façade of the building is recessed to the depth of the porch.

Mr. Ward explained that the porch comes to the property line and the steps protrude.

Dr. Williams said he believes for it to be more compatible with the tradition of duplexes and rows in Savannah; it would be more typical to have the stairs coming down sideways instead of open to the sidewalk. He believes the building beside this is a singular building. Dr. Williams asked Mr. Ward if they would be amenable to this adjustment.

Mr. Ward answered that he would like to study a couple of more situations. He believes there might be another example of stairs along Gwinnett Street that has similar configurations. He is not sure, but believes that the stairs come forward instead of to the side. Therefore, he wants to look at more examples along Gwinnett Street.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Ward if their building is actually pushed back to the building line.

Mr. Ward answered that he does not believe that it is exactly on line. He believes that the building next door is actually further pushed back than the others. Most of the other buildings come to the property line and have stoops that encroach onto the sidewalk.

Dr. Williams asked if the brackets on the upper elevation have fascinating detailing. He said this project does not have to be a slave to everything surrounding it as Mr. Ward has said they will look down the block to see what else is here. Dr. Williams applauded Mr. Ward for those brackets. He did not notice a detailing on the brackets. Is there a detailing for the brackets?

Mr. Ward answered that presently, they do not have an enlarged detailing of the brackets.

Dr. Williams asked if the brackets will be simply 4 x 4.

Mr. Ward answered yes; this is what they are anticipating.

Dr. Williams asked if the brackets will have chamfering, etc.

Mr. Ward stated that he believes the elevation is showing the front and a piece of the horizontal member to have it chamfered.

Dr. Williams said it is an unusual feature and he believes it deserves a little attention. He does not know how the Board feels about it, but this is something that he can work out with staff. He believes, however, it needs to be resolved and maybe at the same time he is resolving the details on the porches with staff, he could do the same with the brackets.

Mr. Engle asked if lintels are over the windows. If so, they should extend beyond the opening of the window.

Mr. Ward answered that there are examples where this does not happen downtown. He has heard this argument here before; and, therefore, he is aware of this. However, they took a different approach and feel it is appropriate for these buildings.

Mr. Engle told Mr. Ward that he does not agree with him on this. If these are lintels, they are supposed to extend because they are structural features. They are pretending that this is a brick building and all the masonry will be stucco, but it still does not make sense. He believes the lintels should extend four inches beyond on either side or do not have them as they perpetuate an architectural feature that is not generally correct. Is there a reason since they are just added stucco detail you cannot extend them beyond or make them out of cast stone or something else so that they will look real?

Mr. Ward answered that they will look into this. They are not opposed to extending the lintels over the edge of the windows.

Ms. Scheer asked that on the plans the waste receptacle is very tall and obstructs some of the visual view of the window. Can this be lowered so that the window is fully visible?

Mr. Ward answered that they can look at this and ensure that it is not that tall. They were only matching it up with the masonry wall next to it, but they can lower it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Howington asked the Board how they feel about the stucco versus the lapsiding. There seems to be an argument from the petitioner for the stucco.

Mr. Engle said he finds it ironic that the more elegant element is the brackets; but he would have expected that it would have the stucco. He thinks this is almost flip-flop. The stucco tends to get into the Italianate and these brackets are indicating a higher style. But, yet, there is lapsiding. He believes this would totally be defensible as stucco. But, he believes the other should be lapsiding.

Dr. Williams said if they do remain stucco, he agrees with Mr. Engle regarding the lintels aligning with the other windows. He said he does not know how the Board feels about reorienting the stairs.

Mr. Howington said he recalls that when he looked at the photos the majority of the stairs come down the side. He realizes that there are other examples, but the most examples he remembers, the stairs come down the side.

Mr. Gunther said this is more characteristic of a double house that the stairs would be parallel to the front of the façade.

Mr. Engle said if someone sits on the front steps, they would be blocking the sidewalk as their legs would be in the public space.

Mr. Gunther said he believes the double house on Gwinnett Street should be clad.

Mr. Howington said he believes the house that is north of here was at one time clad. If the petitioner wanted to change it to stucco, he would need to bring it back before the Board. But, as presented to them today, it would have to be lapsiding. The question then would be the other two. Should they be stucco or lapsiding? The petitioner presented it as stucco, but the Board recommends has to not be stucco.

Mr. Engle said he goes along with the Board; he believes they are getting too many new buildings that are stucco because it is easier to put on. He personally believes it should be lapsiding.

Dr. Henry agreed. The staff's recommendation is lapsiding.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Ward how he felt about flipping the porticos to the side so there will be a side entrance. The Board feels this would be more appropriate and also the stucco on Price Street buildings be lapsiding to match the other buildings.

Mr. Ward answered they will flip the porticos to the side and use lapsiding on the buildings on Price Street instead of stucco. They will get with staff on the details.

Board Action:

Approve Part 2 Design Details for two duplexes along Price Street and one duplex along Gwinnett Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Provide color and material samples;
2. Reduce the exposure on the fiber cement siding and ensure that it has a smooth finish;
3. Select an alternative material for the stucco buildings- either brick or siding;
4. Add additional detailing to the portico columns, and brackets on Gwinnett; - PASS
5. Restudy the height of the trash enclosure; and
6. Provide additional details to staff on how the railing connects to the porch post and redesign the stairs on Gwinnett to be oriented to be parallel to the façade.

Because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Nicholas Henry

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

15. [Petition of Matthew Frankel for Hansen Architects | 14-003378-COA | 230 West Broughton Street | New Construction: Part 1 Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Decker Ward.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 230 West Broughton Street 14-003378-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Petitioners Presentation.pdf](#)

Mr. Patrick Phelps of Hansen Architects was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for Part I: Height and Mass of a four story tall building with basement at 230-240 West Broughton Street. The building features three, 30 foot wide bays, and central storefront.

Ms. Harris explained that 230 West Broughton Street is currently a vacant lot which once housed the four-story Chatham Furniture building. The original building suffered extensive damage from a fire in 1989. While the HDBR denied the petition for total demolition (HRB 89-0817), the ordinance at the time did not have the same protective measures as it currently does and the demolition legally proceeded after a stay of 12 months in 1991. 240 West Broughton Street is listed as a non-contributing building constructed in 1924 by R. J. Whalley for the Bono Brothers. The HDBR denied an application to demolish the building on February 12, 2014 (14-000193-COA), however, the Zoning Board of Appeals overturned the decision on June 26, 2014 (14-002598-ZBA).

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of Part I: Height and Mass for new construction at 230-240 West Broughton Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part 2: Design Details:

1. Reduce the overall height;
2. Move the stairwell/elevator shaft toward the lane to be less visible and more visually compatible with contributing structures;
3. Increase the voids of the first floor on the lane façade;

4. Redesign the second story to not include storefront but regular window openings;
and
5. Increase in the depth of the front entrance recess;

Because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards.

Dr. Henry asked if persons would be seen walking on each floor.

Ms. Harris said that there is a non-see-through element, but materials are not a part of the review today. Therefore, staff did not get into the specifics, but essentially this is a full storefront. She said the petitioner can explain more fully about what would be able to be seen from the street level.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Phelps said they did a survey of both historic and existing four story buildings, although there are not many four-story buildings on Broughton Street. They used digital software to measure heights of existing buildings. These include four-story buildings that are mid-block, on corners; adjacent to single-story and two-story buildings. He said that a lot of the buildings had extra ornament on top of the pronounced cornice line. The average heights they found started around 60 feet, but go up to 70 feet for the main cornice line and some extensions from this as high up into the 90 feet range. He showed a photo of the Adlers Department Store which encompassed two buildings located on the corner of Broughton and Bull Street. The main building is 65 feet tall and the building in the mid-block is 77 feet tall at the cornice line and an additional 90 feet tall at the detailing.

Mr. Phelps stated that 1- 5 West Broughton which is currently standing is 65 feet tall at the cornice line and with the extension of the parapet, it is 78 feet tall. At the corner of Broughton and Habersham Streets, currently the Acura Dealership was a four-story building adjacent to single stories on the block that are 70 feet tall. The previous building that was on the site of 230 West Broughton Street which was the Chatham Furniture building was 70 feet tall to the cornice and had a pitched roof that went back and, therefore, would take the building height up to approximately 80 plus feet. The Marshall House hotel is 70 feet tall at the cornice line which is fairly consistent. The block is landscaped adjacent to single stories and two stories buildings.

Mr. Phelps said the building that they are proposing is 63 feet up to the main cornice line with a small pop-up in the middle bay at will be 66 feet. The highest point of the building will be the stair tower which will be 70 feet. Even though it will be a four-story building, is compatible with historic and existing buildings on Broughton Street. They have surveyed a number of buildings on Broughton Street during the past year and the floor-to-floor heights average from 18 to 12 feet. Most of the floor-to-floor heights are within the 14 to 16 feet range. Therefore, they feel they are compatible with what is existing on Broughton Street.

Mr. Phelps said they are amenable to the elevator relocation. In their proposed submittal, they had an elevator and service area located on the roof. But, they will remove that and essentially this will take the mass of the stair tower and push it back an additional ten feet. Therefore, it will be plus or minus 20 feet from the face of the facade and this will also

narrow the front of the stair tower by about six feet. Ultimately, this will reduce the size of it and visually push it back. He said they are decreasing the site line so that it will be less visible.

Mr. Phelps said regarding the voids to the lane, they are proposing that if it is acceptable to the Board, they will provide recessed brick enclosed window openings following the patterns of the windows above. If they travel down the lanes of Broughton, they will see that most of the windows are blocked up over time due to the functions on the ground floor being retail, commercial for security reasons and/or mechanical utilities. Therefore, he believes this will help to break up the façade.

Mr. Phelps said pertaining to the second floor store front, they have gone through and looked at the prototypes on Broughton Street that are existing now and throughout history. There seems to be a movement from the 10s thru the 30s the buildings were being built to increase the amount of storefront, not just on the first floor, but to extend it up to the second floor. This gives the opportunity for two story retail. A lot of this was done through mezzanines, but some of them have buildings that were converted or newer buildings were built and actually occupied second floor retail spaces that were connected. Since they are proposing a modern building, they would like to follow with this idea. There will be retail on the second and third floors. They would like to take to take the streetscape activity which is the ground floor retail and carry it up through so that there is a true identity of what the functions are of that space. He said Leopold's Department store had a full mezzanine with occupied retail above. This is a building that was demolished and the Kress building was extended over to 110. They can see the different window patterning up on the upper floors were they are using larger bays; filling in the full voids of the 15 foot bay width with more of a storefront window versus a double hung window. Mr. Phelps said 109 Broughton Street is the J.C Penney's building and he does not know if it was converted back or if it was modified. Currently double hung windows are here, but at some point in time, there was storefront throughout the four bays.

Mr. Phelps stated that 118 West Broughton Street is more of a late 20 or early 30's building and there was full glass on the second floor. He said some of the renovations that happened in the 20s when art deco was more prevalent there was retail on first and second floors. He said he understands the staff's concern about have some delineation between the first and second floors, but they still would like to maintain the idea that there is retail spaces on the first and second floors and that it is separate from the stories above which would be residential. Therefore, they will reduce the size of the window opening providing a metal panel underneath and providing a double hung window. He believes that overall, this changes the vertical expression of the building and makes it a little more horizontal. They are amenable to making this modification. As far as the recess entries, they surveyed the two blocks adjacent to the property that they are hopeful of developing. Of course there are some larger openings; World of Beer has been increased for outdoor seating; there is restaurant space located in this building which previously was a club. The size of this was increased for cueing. They are looking at an average of three to four feet. Some have no setbacks, some have three feet setback, while some have four feet setback. Mr. Phelps said they are proposing that they keep within this street rhythm and are proposing that they will increase it up to a four foot recess. He believed staff has discussed the window align, but the center window will be treated as a triple window with matching framing trim in between the windows so it will seem as a central unit. They are working to keep the fourth

floor story distinct from the rest of the floors. He entertained questions from the Board.

Dr. Henry asked will you be able to see the people walking on the second floor.

Mr. Phelps answered that this will be retail space and there will be the visibility of seeing people on the second floor.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked Mr. Phelps that regarding the elevator shaft to the fourth floor that they are eliminating, is this only access to the fourth floor of the elevator.

Mr. Phelps said the elevator will still go to the fourth floor, but not the roof.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked if this was on the front of the building.

Mr. Phelps answered right.

Dr. Williams stated that he knows that the stair has been pushed back ten feet. Is there any reason you could not come back further?

Mr. Phelps answered this is the primary residential entrance. If they were to push it back, you would meander through a long corridor to get access. Therefore, this is more of a direct access for the residents above.

Dr. Williams asked if this was at the roof level. He realized this is the staircase.

Mr. Phelps said the fourth floor is programmed to be residential. He said there will be an elevator lobby and stair lobby. If they push it back, you would have to go back through the first floor through a long hallway to get to the elevator.

Dr. Williams asked if this was the top of the elevator shaft.

Mr. Phelps answered that it is the top of the stairs.

Dr. Williams asked why the stairs need to extend to the roof.

Mr. Phelps stated the stairs extend for access to the roof.

Dr. Williams asked if this is for the residents.

Mr. Phelps answered no. The stairs extend for maintenance purposes.

Dr. Williams asked if it needs to extend above the staircase that the residents will use.

Mr. Phelps answered that it is more efficient to use a single stair for this process.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Phelps that his survey of recessed entries did not take into account the size of the buildings. The only building that comes to the size of this building is the Kress building which has 3 feet – 2 inches and also has a canopy which creates a sense of shelter extending about eight feet out onto the sidewalk.

Mr. Phelps stated that he believes the ordinance states that the entrance must be recessed. It has no specific depth. It says it has to be compatible, but does not talk about compatibility with other factors as far as the depth of the building, width of the building, or a canopy.

Dr. Williams said that all of these things are a part of compatibility.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said their Architectural Review Committee met yesterday and reviewed the petitioner's plans and read the staff's report and recommendations. Mr. Carey said this was not a disclaimer, but that their comments on the proposed design should not be construed as any kind of implication or stipulation that the building immediately to the west would be removed as a part of this should be removed. They still contend that this building can be adapted for use and incorporated into this project and into this design. Mr. Carey said they actually believe it will improve things and help with the transition of height from the corner to the larger building that is proposed. They also believe that it will assist in a softer transition in facades, materials, and ultimately would enhance the new infill building that is proposed. He reiterated that this is not an implication or a stipulation that they should lose the building to the west.

Mr. Carey said the HSF agrees with the staff's recommendations and he appreciates the petitioner's ability and efforts to address some of those concerns. He said the HSF agrees that the overall height of the building should be reduced. He has listened carefully to the other examples and the other data collected. In spite of the research and some of the data, there is still something unsettling to their Architecture Review Committee about that building in terms of its relation and visual compatibility with the others in the block. They understand and respect the fact that this is a four story zone and a four story building is being proposed, but if this is a close representation of what they might get, then it does not fit and isn't visually compatible. Mr. Carey said they agree with moving the stairwell goes the lane and appreciate the effort to push this back 20 feet. He believes that there are a lot of questions and issues with respect to the fenestration pattern on the front. This is not just how windows do or do not align, but the number of windows particularly on the third and fourth floors and the differentiation really between floors one and two, two and three, and three and four, and in particular the banding between floors two and three, and three and four they think is a little heavy. In one case, they believe it should be reduced between three and four and perhaps increased between one and two. Mr. Carey said he believes this is reflected in the staff's recommendations regarding their concerns with the storefront windows on the second floor.

Mr. Carey said for a building of this magnitude, it might call for a heavier cornice on the top of a building this size. He believes that the primary concern for the HSF is that the building is too tall. However, they realize that when they get to Part II, there will be a chance for them to talk about the design details. Mr. Carey said he believes that Dr. Williams picked up on this, but there is a kind of lack of depth or relief on the building. It seems a little sheer; a little flat and it is the flatness and not just with respect to the entrance [they do agree that the entrance should be deep and increased] but the feel is that there is not much shadowing on the building. Just looking at the building, he does not

believe that it will allow itself to have that much depth and that much feel to it. Mr. Carey said they believe that this is important. Ultimately, he believes the building needs to pay more respect to its neighboring properties in the immediate vicinity in this block, which would be bringing it down a little and trying to be more visually compatible with its neighbors.

Mr. Carey said they had no problems with the openings in the lane, but he likes the idea of recessing the brick so that the false openings will be in the lane side.

Mr. Howington said he wanted to clarify Mr. Carey's comment. This was mentioned in a previous Board meeting, but at that time they were playing by a different set of rules. He knows the Review Board denied the demolition of that building. The reality is that building has been approved to be demolished and is moving forward. The duty of this Board is to look at what is before them today and move forward with the rules that are in place now. He just wanted to clarify this for the record. Unfortunately, it did not go the way this Board believed it should, but the rules have changed.

Mr. Michael Brown stated that he has ownership interest in four separate parcels in the 200 Block of West Broughton Street. Mr. Brown said he agrees with the opening statement of the Historic Savannah Foundation in reference to the existing building. However, he wants to be in general support of the developer. He said that he is involved with the developer in three other properties. The developer has been extremely supportive of the existing buildings and very sensitive to the preservation of the existing buildings and taking an enormous amount of care, interest, and expense in exposing existing openings of facades. Mr. Brown said, however, he is not too supportive of this project as it is a request for additional cubic feet.

Mr. Brown said he believes the request for additional cubic footage is strictly requested on economic reasons. If he is correct, the Review Board cannot consider projects for economic issues. The request is probably not driven by the developer, but by the tenant. He believes if the developer can convince the tenant to reduce the cubic feet, they probably would not have this issue. It is the developer's responsibility to educate the tenant on the value of complying with the unique qualities and existing rules and regulations. This is a new construction in the Historic District. Mr. Brown said if the value can be translated to the proposed tenant, this issue would be resolved.

Mr. Brown said the entrance to one of the buildings he owns was mentioned which is World of Beer. He explained that the existing entrance was there when the building was built. They retained the entrance not for additional seating, but because it was existing. He did the same with the building he has across the street which has a greatly recessed center which is used for outside seating. It was also existing and it has a terrazzo entranceway. There are many examples of deeper recesses along Broughton Street. They own the Kress building and did the entrance for historic tax credits. The Department of Interior told them that their entrances were correct because of the awning. He does not believe that a large awning on the proposed building would be appropriate, but he believes it would be appropriate to have a more recessed entrance.

Mr. Howington invited Mr. Phelps to comment on the public comments, if he so desired.

Mr. Phelps stated regarding recessed entrances, they will be happy to work with staff and

make it more compatible with the surrounding areas. This is adjustable.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Phelps how he felt about Mr. Carey's comment regarding the flatness of the façade.

Mr. Phelps stated that he agrees that the renderings do not accurately show shadow patterns, but they are working diligently with the detailing in the storefront, the windows, the setbacks and the materials that will create that difference. All of Broughton Street has 12 inches of wall thickness that you can demonstrate the expression of the building. They will work with those patterns do ensure that they have a nice building.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said the most important thing that they have to realize is that compatibility is quite explicitly stated in the ordinance. The important aspect is the adjacent building. He agrees that there are buildings two blocks way; three blocks away, and four blocks away that may be compatible. But, what really matters is what is adjacent to this proposed new building. This is what compatibility is judged on. It says extra weight is given to adjacent buildings. There is no question; a lot of buildings were redone in the 20's and 30's. In fact he has used two of those photographs to show how buildings were inappropriately changed in the 20's by adding very large windows on the second floor. To him, this building is very monolithic and the buildings in this block are not monolithic. There is no definition at the entrance. A photo of Adler's was used as an example, but look at the entrance and details. It has a second floor mezzanine level, but look at the detailing. Mr. Engle said what bothers him is they have the center bay and it is the main entrance and awnings are everywhere, except over the entrance. On a rainy day, someone will come right off the street with no canopy, nothing. The ordinance says that the entrance on Broughton Street should be prominent. He said that the first two floors do not work. It does not know whether it wants to be modern and if it was strikingly modern, that might work. But this is not modern and is not historic. Mr. Engle said, therefore, the first two floors do not know what they want to be. He has problems with it and does not see it compatible with anything in this block; the upper two floors are. He is not as concerned with the height because there was a high building. But, maybe it could be reduced to 14 feet on second floor and take off two feet on the third floor. The mass and the lack of coherence on the first two floors are problems for him.

Dr. Williams agreed with all of Mr. Engle's comments. He said regarding the entrance, he thinks that a building of this magnitude and they have to operate under the assumption that it is going to be 90 feet wide. This would be one of prominent landmark buildings on this end of the street. Dr. Williams believes this is a great opportunity to make in some manner a grander gesture with the entrance. Maybe an opportunity is here for the entrance to rise up into the second floor. In Adler's, there is the double height entrance bay [he does not think it is a mezzanine], but just a double height area. May be the entrance could be restudied.

Dr. Williams said he wanted to contextualize the issue of height because it was actually the building that was on this site that drove the ordinance language when he served on the committee writing the code. They used this specific building as the example of how four stories can be low or four stories can be high. In those discussions, especially with regards to Broughton Street, they did not want to see the monolithic effect that Mr. Engle has

mentioned. They worried that if everyone was regulated with the exact same height of the same four stories all the way down that they would end up with something truly monolithic. He said that the problem here is that 90 feet accentuates this challenge. If it was 60 feet wide like the preceding building, the height may be less an issue. The larger it gets the more it needs some kind of articulation such as Mr. Carey mentioned. Maybe it could use some gestured on the roofline. Dr. Williams said he is not concerned about the height, but he is concerned about the overall ambiance of the design. A part of the building seems like it wants to be modern and he applauds this. In fact he believes that the building at Barnard and Broughton Streets that were rehabilitated with aluminum cornices and details is an opportunity example how something could be actually more modern, and, yet, evoke past traditions. The fenestration appears as if it is trying to please everyone. Dr. Williams said, therefore, since they are talking about height and mass, he would ask the developer not only to deal with the issue of monolithic, but also get more coherence.

Dr. Williams said he believes that the fenestration is a great opportunity to not necessarily try and be a kind of simplified historic, but may be more boldly modern. If they are looking at historic, then it should be done with integrity.

Mr. Howington said some of this may come out in the materials in the future as they are using modern materials, zinc panels and zinc metal wraps. They will have a contemporary building especially in finishes.

Ms. McClain said even with the detailing she was having a problem with the massing. It is not visually compatible with any of the buildings. She believes this section of Broughton Street is very pretty and she thinks that this building will be out of place. Ms. McClain said there is something about the windows on the second floor; may be there are too many windows on this floor. Also, the massing appears to be off.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said as far as the compatibility is concerned, she thinks the horizontal members of this building do not necessarily relate to either building to either side of it. This bothers her visually. She said that the spandrel glass seems to fall within the floor line of the adjacent building. But the windows above it are much taller. She said given the fact that this is new construction, they are missing an opportunity to put a modern building in its place. She believes the building needs to make up its mind of what it wants to be.

Mr. Engle said the petitioner is allowed to build four stories; but this does not guarantee that they can build the four stories. He asked staff what is the minimum requirement for four stories.

Ms. Harris answered that the minimum for commercial building on the ground floor is 14 feet - 6 inches. The second floor is 12 feet and every story above the second floor is ten feet.

Mr. Engle said, therefore, 46 feet would meet the four story standard. However, it is 17 feet higher than the minimum. It could be reduced tremendously and be more compatibility with the neighboring buildings and still be within the minimum.

Ms. Caldwell said she believes that Mr. Brown made some excellent points during his comments. The tenant might want a bigger space, but it does not necessarily mean that they will be able to get it. She believes it would be a great idea for the developer to talk to the

tenant and if he would reduce the cubic feet, mass, it would help the way they all feel about this building.

Mr. Engle stated that the way this is presented today, he does not believe that it is compatible. The third and four floors probably will work, but the first and second floors do not work. He does not know whether it is too much. He is not concerned with the two story elevation of all glass. The buildings that were presented by Mr. Phelps are not buildings that are 90 feet long, they are buildings that are 30 feet or 60 feet. If the building was 60 feet it might work, but 90 feet is not compatible. Certainly, it is not compatible with any building on this block. Mr. Engle said he can support this as it is now.

Mr. Gunther said he appreciates the contemporary leaning on the first two stories. If this expression was carried throughout all floors it could be a more successful building. He likes the scale of the first two stories and believe they are much more effective on the renderings than it will be realized on the drawings when that band at the top of the second floor does correspond with the height of the other two buildings.

Mr. Howington asked Ms. Harris to pull up the revised submittal. He realized that they are not hearing this today. But it showed a more thicker band and this might address some of the issues. The petitioner has proposed that this will come back before the Board.

Dr. Williams said the band does impact height and mass as it relates to solids and voids.

Ms. Caldwell said they are not designing, but they all have a problem with the height and mass.

Dr. Henry said he believes a part of the problem is the height of the building.

Mr. Howington said he agrees with Mr. Gunther as there is something fresh about the first and second floors that he likes. But, he agrees with Mr. Carey's comments that the cornices on the top could be a little more pronounced. Mr. Howington said he is sensing that the general consensus among the Board may be a continuance.

Mr. Phelps said he wanted to get some clarification first because he has heard mixed opinions. Some of the members have said they like the first floor; they like the second; they don't like the first floor and they don't like the second floor. If they do come back he wants to be able to address those comments. They will work with staff, but he believes they need some solid input from the Board so that they will have a clear direction of where they are heading.

Mr. Phelps said he agrees and understands that looking at the historic photographs and getting the idea of the metal detailing, this really informs the mass and scale and the relationship of the form. All of this happens within the detailing phase. Therefore, he wants to keep the discussion in the direction of height and mass and not look at what they could add to the building or detail further because this will happen as they develop the façade. He will work with the entry as he understands that this is an issue. He likes the idea of may be creating a two-story recess entry to help make it a grander building. Mr. Phelps said he believes this was a good point. The direction as far as the first and floors they understand that there are two components to this building. They have retail on

the ground floors and they want to keep that modern interpretation. The upper floors are residential; so there are small window types in the residential double hung with divided lights is more appealing to that. It helps break up that four story in proportion which he feels helps the mass. Changing the materials, changing windows types, and focusing on the bottom three stories as a single building with a nice capital on top of it.

Mr. Phelps said he is concerned about the floor-to-floor heights. He said the Board needs to realize that as they make this building shorter, it becomes more horizontal and less vertical. This will have a stronger impact on the street than having a tall vertical building. In reference to the heights that are outlaid by the ordinance, he wanted them to understand that they are visual expressions of floor-to-floor heights and that they are minimums and he cannot say that there is a ten foot floor-to-floor height on Broughton Street. Mr. Phelps said, therefore, if the Board is going to do the math and add these up and say this is the minimum height, he believes this is wrong; he feels they would be reading the ordinance incorrectly. Realistically, they probably could drop some feet from the height, but he wanted the Board to understand that this will change the verticality of the building and functionally, they would be looking at five to six feet height difference. Now, he does not really know if this would be beneficial. He trusts that they can work with existing façade and may be change some of the bay structure so that it is not a continuous façade so that you do get a little more verticality and a little more identity out of each bay and work with the detailing part of the ground floor so that it does give you that sense of prominence on the street that they are looking for.

Dr. Williams stated that he has heard at least more than one of them express concern about the lack of the overall coherence with the design. Now, he hears Mr. Phelps' reason is because of the program that will be articulated differently. He is not convinced that just because it is residential it has to have the kind of windows that they would expect on a residential house on Gwinnett Street. In fact converting commercial buildings to residential that have lots of windows have a lot of different options. Dr. Williams said he would not feel constrained to have the kind of window that might be appropriate in the suburbs, but for him less appropriate on the fourth floor of a commercial building. Who is to say that the fourth floor will always be residential. It might become retail.

Mr. Phelps said they will need to look at the typology of Broughton Street. If they are going to take a function out of it, those window typically change in light pattern and they typically are going from either a one-over-one double hung window to a divided light window. Therefore, they are following that pattern.

Dr. Williams stated that he believes the challenge is to bring more coherence. However, it is interpreted, but he believes this is the point that several of the Board members made. He agreed that what is being achieved on the first two floors he also likes the effort to go towards something more modern. Dr. Williams said he believes that Mr. Phelps could carry it up further. He said that Mr. Phelps alluded to in his comments about one thing that he has been thinking about which is he now has the façade on a 30 foot base structure. He asked Mr. Phelps if he has given thought to subdividing at least the outer bays if not all of them may be into a 15 foot bay structure.

Mr. Phelps said 15 feet is not typical on Broughton Street. Everything is 30 feet, 60 feet, or 90 feet.

Dr. Williams said the neighboring two buildings are both 30 feet buildings cut in half

which make them 15 feet bays.

Mr. Phelps said the bays do not have the expression of being divided into two.

Dr. Williams said Mr. Phelps could have minor and major rhythms.

Mr. Engle said if Mr. Phelps would work with the center bay and try to do something as a significant entrance, it might carry it all the way. Therefore, instead of trying to be one unified 90 feet long building, he is visually breaking three buildings.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said as they look more at verticality of the building, the banding on the second and third floors look a little heavy to her. She believes it reinforces the horizontality. Ms. Weibe-Reed said she does not know if this is what the petitioner was intending, but the more she looks at this, she sees it as three vertical portions of a building; and the second to the third floor band really prevents her from seeing it this way. But she believes this is the way the petitioner intended it to be.

Mr. Gunther said may be the center bay has changed the detailing on it, but it does break the horizontal band.

Ms. McClain stated that she believes Mr. Phelps has a unique opportunity to have a more modern design. She would love for it to be more modern; she agreed with Mr. Engle in terms of breaking up the lintels. She is hopeful that when this comes back to the Board it will be a more modern plan.

Mr. Phelps asked for a continuance.

Mr. Engle said they are not combining Part I with Part II at the next meeting.

Mr. Howington explained that the continuance is only for Part I, height and mass to the September 10, 2014 meeting.

Board Action:

Grant a continuance for Part I Height and Mass of
new construction at 230-240 West Broughton - PASS
Street.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

16. [Petition of Shedrick Coleman for SHEDDarchitecture | 14-003482-COA | 407 and 409 East McDonough Street | New Construction: Part 1 Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Crawford Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Application - 407 and 409 E. McDonough Street 14-003482-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Public Comment- Rosenwald.pdf](#)

Mr. Shedrick Coleman was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of Part I Height and Mass for new construction on a vacant lot at 407 and 409 East McDonough Street. The new construction consists of a four story duplex with parking on the ground floor, accessed from East Perry Street. The petition also includes a variance request from the 30 foot structured parking variance.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of Part I: Height and Mass New Construction of a duplex at 407 – 409 East McDonough Street with the following conditions to be resubmitted with Part 2: Design Details:

1. Reduce the overall height to be more comfortable with adjacent contributing resources;
2. On the east and west facades provide more regular spacing and restudy of the triple door configuration which is not typically found on historic structures;
3. Restudy the entrance as it relates to a raised basement configuration;
4. Restudying the staircase protrusion on the east façade to incorporate it within the building;
5. Incorporate brackets or other architectural support on the balconies on the east and west facades;
6. Reduce the garage openings to a maximum of twelve feet wide;
7. Ensure that the apron to the garage is not located on the public right-of-way; and
8. Reduce the proposed gates width.

Because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards.

Ms. Harris reported also that staff recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the 30 foot structured parking setback requirements because the variance criteria have been met.

Dr. Williams asked if recommendation 2 regarding regular spacing on the side elevation is only for the triple doors or the entire fenestration.

Ms. Harris answered that the entire pattern of fenestration could be regularized with particular attention given to the triple doors.

Dr. Henry asked staff that pertaining to the garage doors are they suggesting four separate entrances.

Ms. Harris answered two separate entrances as there is no requirement for each unit. She explained that there are a number of options. It could be two 12 feet garages, four separate garages or two separate garages.

Mr. Engle asked how many units are being proposed.

Ms. Harris answered that she believes each side is a single-family residential unit.

Mr. Engle asked why does it call for a future rental.

Ms. Harris answered that this is a question that the petitioner will be able to answer.

Ms. Harris informed the Board that she received a letter today from an adjacent property owner opposing the height and recommended that it be reduced. The letter is attached to the adjacent.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Coleman stated that they have tried to maintain the minimum height allowed to accommodate the four stories and the surrounding buildings. The historic building at 35 feet on the corner facing Habersham Street is at that point. The building surrounding them, especially the large structures across the street, on McDonough Street are 40 feet tall, even though, they are three story buildings. The condo building to the east matches their 48 feet in height. He said, therefore, in the neighborhood their building fits the character of that street and is not overwhelming the street. Mr. Coleman said he believes he has given the Board computer generated drawings that show various views from different points with the surrounding building reflecting a massing standpoint in order for them to see what can be seen from different areas.

Mr. Coleman explained that on the Perry Street side, there was an attempt to drop this down to three stories by creating the balcony at the four story. It sits back six feet to allow for the fact the buildings along Perry Street are two stories on the opposite side. They would like to maintain the four story height bearing in mind that the buildings are only 20 feet wide. His client has a certain amount of living space that he is trying to accommodate in the building and the four stories are a big part of why the owner purchased that lot that would allow him to do so.

Mr. Coleman said they have no problems with the recommendation pertaining to the east and west facades. They will look at this and try to align the windows a little more. He said that the two single windows that are off line relates to furnishing the rooms. They are not aligned straight up, but there are other ways that they might be able to do some things. The triple doors can easily become double doors. They light the additional light, but they can work with this.

Mr. Coleman stated he believes that the simplest way for them to deal with the recommendation of restudying the entrance is to create a raised porch entry onto the raised first floor on the street that is more in keeping with the normal character of a raised basement type townhouse situation. He said he believes this would be a more favorable solution instead of constructing a balcony all the way across the front. He said they talked about whether the single entry at the bottom was the most desirable entrance to bring the guests through. They will address this by putting a porch at the upper level.

Mr. Coleman said with regards to restudying the stair protrusion, the stairs come out

because there is an interplay of space that the stair creates on the inside by creating places where the stair does not come out to the wall and allow light to come into the unit. He said that on the opposite side the stair does not do this. But, if the Board is adamant that the stair does not project out in the bay, the stair can work pushed back into the building. The only thing is that it changes the architectural internal layout of the building that his client really desires.

Mr. Coleman said they have no problems with the brackets on the balconies. They will go to single garages. They tried to do the double garages, but there is not enough room to get a double garage unless they do the 16 feet wide doors. If the 12 feet doors are their maximum, they will revise the plan to a single garage for each unit.

Mr. Coleman said they will deal with the apron and reducing the gate as this is not a problem. He explained that the question that was raised about the rental space is only there because if his client was looking at possibly selling it, the person might want to make the basement a rental unit. However, he believes this will go away now that they are talking about a single garage because there will no longer be parking that would allow this. Therefore, it will only become space within that unit.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Coleman to clarify his statement regarding the raised basement. Are you saying put a porch here?

Mr. Coleman explained that he would put a porch and stairs up from the ground level to the porch and make it the primary entry into the building from the raised first floor.

Dr. Williams asked if the building comes out to the zero lot line on McDonough.

Mr. Coleman answered yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Larry Lee resides at 407 East Perry Street. Mr. Lee said he brought some pictures with him of the neighborhood. He pointed out his home and the law office that is next to him. The law firm is trying to sell this property as residential. The other four structures are residential. Mr. Lee said that East Perry Street is a nice lovely street. Mr. Lee asked the Board to consider rotating the building. He does not know why on their residential street they have to face garage doors and refuse bins on their nice little residential street.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Lee that if the building was rotated would it be facing the curb cut.

Mr. Lee answered that there is a curb cut on both sides of the lot.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Harris if in the past the Board reviewed the Perry/McDonough Streets issue a block over and had the exact same issue regarding whether the townhouses would face McDonough or Perry Street. As he remembers, the Board said that McDonough Street was wider than Perry Street. Therefore, it would be better to back out on McDonough Street as Perry Street it is too narrow.

Ms. Harris explained that she believes the parking actually has underneath parking access from Price Street. Each of the buildings face both streets. However, this would not be an option here as there is no access from a north/south street. She said historically, there was a duplex that faced McDonough Street and would be historically appropriate.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Harris if McDonough Street is wider than Perry Street.

Ms. Harris answered that she believes McDonough Street is wider than Perry Street.

Mr. Engle said a part of the argument before was that it is not safe to back out onto Perry Street, particularly with cars parking on Perry Street as well.

Ms. Harris said she believes this would be a determination for the Traffic Engineering Department. She believes this has gone before SPR.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Lee that if the building is flipped would he be facing the four story elevation. One resident has already opposed the height. The petitioner is stepping down the Perry Street elevation in recognition of the shorter scale buildings on the north side of Perry Street.

Mr. Lee said he considered this, but he did not want to take two bites out of the same apple. His real concern was the direction. This is a large monolithic structure. They are excited about the new façade that they are going to get on their building after eight months of construction. He would like it lowered, but he was not present today for that reason. Mr. Lee said he will argue about all the brick in the neighborhood at another time. But, now it just seems that the rear end of the building facing them is not appropriate.

Mr. Tom Sharpe stated that he manages the Condos Association at 230 Habersham Street. Mr. Sharpe said the residents basic concern is that this project as structured will not allow egress and ingress to their parking spaces and a specific easement is recorded. It appears that there is a nine foot lane and a fence will be installed. There is not sufficient room for someone to make a left hand turn into a parking space. Mr. Sharpe said he is not sure where the gates will be located. A refuse area is here also.

Ms. Harris pointed out where the 20 feet access easement is located. She pulled up the elevation.

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said their primary concern is the same as the staff. They would like for the overall height of the building to be reduced. If this could be accomplished on the reduction of the floor-to-floor height, he believes it would be great. He said he believes the key is that there is at least two contexts for this building. There is the context of new construction and the context of existing historic contributing buildings. He cannot speak to the other buildings that are already onsite and he does not believe that they were built since he has been in Savannah, but they are concern about the relationship of the new construction to the existing historic and contributing buildings. If this could be reduced, he believes this would be successful.

Mr. Carey said there are many things about this building that the HSF is in favor of and supports. He said while it is unusual, they may differ with staff, but those east and west facades with the sort of unusual and inconsistent fenestration pattern, he believes is successful and appropriate because they are east and west façade. They like the dorsal fin of the stairway very much. To them, this breaks things up and provides some variation differentiation and signals that this is a contemporary building. Mr. Carey said he believes the building is creative and ought to be allowed because it is on a secondary façade.

Mr. Carey stated that he believes he heard the petitioner's willingness to restudy the entrance and work with the front doors to be more formulized. The front doors appear to be a little narrow. He believes the petitioner also made an effort to address the garage door. The HSF thinks the doors could be minimized. Mr. Carey said they will reserve their

comments about the materials until Part II. Overall, they believe the building is successful, but they do think it is a little too tall for the site in relation to some of the other buildings in the area irrespective of the new construction that has been allowed.

Mr. Howington invited Mr. Coleman to respond to the public comments.

Mr. Coleman said he would talk about the site issue as a lot of what has been said is related to the complexities of the site. He explained that when his client purchased the lot, it was found out that there is a 20 foot access easement that is a part of the lot. The lot is actually 60 feet wide and 20 feet of the lot is dedicated to making sure that the property at Habersham Street has access to the parking. Mr. Coleman explained that they have placed their building at the 20 foot access easement. The gate that is shown there is so that those persons will have access to their parking. It will be controlled by them, but because of the fact that his client has to have continuous walls and so forth, they have to put a gate there. This is done as a part of them meeting the intent of the historic ordinance by creating an entranceway into and out of the parking. The gate is not there for his client. He said further dialog will need to take place with his client and the townhouse group and this has been discussed with them. This is a complex situation, but it is beyond the architectural on his end.

Mr. Coleman said he does not know how he feels about switching the building around. He believes his client might like the fact that it is on McDonough Street and he does not know if this is a big issue; however, he will say that with reworking the rear elevation because they will not have the 16 feet garage doors will allow him to take a different look at how the elevation meets the street so that there will not be just simply garage doors there at the ground floor. Hopefully, this will provide some opportunity to make the adjacent property owner a little happier with the resolution of what they will do here.

Mr. Coleman said the height is not arbitrary. They did not do the four stories because they like four stories, but because they needed them. If there was any way to work the program that his client had into three stories or less, this is what they would have done. He said now that they are taking some of the space out for the garage, this may be an opportunity to reduce some of the fourth floor. However, he does not know this yet until they take another look into it. They have an additional bedroom on this floor and may be they can shift some programing around and reduce the fourth and make the recess greater than six feet in some form or fashion. Mr. Coleman said they are open to trying to do all they can to be a good neighbor, but at the same time there is a need to try to accommodate the family of his client. The client has invested greatly to get this property despite a lot of challenges in trying to make sure that this could fit in properly.

Dr. Williams said reducing the height can be done as Mr. Coleman is speculating by simply removing a story. However, he asked Mr. Coleman if he could reduce the floor heights. They are currently more than 12 feet.

Mr. Coleman stated that he probably would have reduced those floor heights, but presently at this stage, he has two feet thick floor joists and because the building is only 20 feet wide, as he gets into the engineering he can probably reduce that, but at this stage he was trying to ensure that the worse case scenario what he could come across is what was accommodated. Consequently, there are some opportunities, but right now that expression of being ten feet or whatever is the best that he can do. But, there are some places that he can probably take it down a bit.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said he agrees with Mr. Carey regarding the side elevation. Actually this is one of the things that struck him as being refreshing about this project as the east and west elevations were not yet another set of aligned windows and the interplay. He said it is a peculiar site that is hemmed in on the east and west by mandated open space. Dr. Williams said he believes that having something that is lively and has balconies. He said the overall irregularity of the east and west, the balconies, and use of the tower he finds pleasing.

Mr. Howington said this really comes through on the model very well.

Mr. Engle said the Board's goal is not just to judge this specific building, but also to judge the impact of this specific building on the neighborhood. Since McDonough has been uprooted by those two big building and if there is anyway to have the front face Perry Street he believes they would be doing right by Perry Street.

Dr. Williams stated that he believes it could also be said that although as staff mentioned, historically the site faces McDonough, there are some strange solutions on the east side of Downtown; therefore, he is in agreement with flipping it, although on this specific site it would ignore the historic precedent. However, he feels that the role of the automobile has had an impact on this block, too.

Dr. Henry stated that he believes there is a precedent for flipping the building which is Habersham and Hall Streets.

Mr. Howington stated that he believes the Board could request that the property owner look into flipping the building and come back with a solution. He asked the Board if they had an a comment on the height issue.

Ms. McClain said she believed the petitioner said he would study the height issue.

Dr. Henry said it would be nice if the building could be flipped and shortened.

Dr. Williams stated that if the building is going to have a raised porch this is a substantial change.

Mr. Engle said he believes this petition needs to be continued so all the issues can be dealt with and then brought back to the Board.

Mr. Howington asked the Board should it be fair to the petitioner if he asks for a continuance that he be able to bring Part I back along with Part II - Design Details.

Ms. McClain said she would like to see this separate.

Dr. Williams said if the Board allowed Parts I and II, but when they get the details, it might be that the Board could approve height and mass and continue the details. However, they could possibly approve both.

Mr. Engle said he believes the details will be less of a problem. The petitioner could talk with the owner about reversing the building.

Mr. Howington informed Mr. Coleman that the consensus of the Board is for him to ask for a continuance; with the continuance they are willing to see Part II - Details and Designs

as well. Therefore, may bring Part I and II. The issue with Part I is the height and reorientation as a possible solution.

Mr. Coleman asked for a continuance. The issues that the Board has raised are not big issues for him; and from a design standpoint, he understands that the Board needs to see this to feel comfortable.

Board Action:

Continue the petition for Part I Height and Mass for the new construction at 407- 409 East McDonough Street and allow it to be heard with Part 2 Design Details. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

17. [Petition of Signs for Minds | 14-003490-COA | 420 West Bryan Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Revised Drawing Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 420 West Bryan Street 14-003490-COA.pdf](#)

Mr. Antar Ellis was not present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting to install a principal use fascia sign at 420 West Bryan Street.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends that the petition be continued so that the sign location and mounting style at 420 West Bryan Street can be restudied so that it may be visually compatible within the Savannah Historic District and meet the standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Ellis was not present.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Howington explained that the petitioner is not present to ask for the continuance. Therefore, the Board may table the petition, postpone it to the next meeting or deny the petition.

Ms. Harris changed her recommendation to denial.

Board Action:

Deny the principal use fascia sign at 420 West Bryan Street because the sign is not visually compatible within the Savannah Historic District. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Nicholas Henry

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Nay

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

18. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc. | 14-003497-COA | 109 MLK, Jr. Blvd. | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Doug Bean was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for signs for the property located at 109 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. The reconstruction of the entire steel marquee (both the vertical and horizontal portions) was approved by the Board with COA [File No. 13-004365-COA]. This application proposing to signs to that marquee in the same locations as they were historically. The building maintains 66 linear feet of frontage along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval for signs for the property located at 109 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard as requested because they meet the preservation standards and are visually compatible. Staff also recommends approval for variances from the following sign standards:

- Fascia and Projecting Signs. Fascia and projecting signs shall be erected only on the signable area of the structure and shall not project over the roofline or parapet wall elevation of the structure.

- Maximum Sign Area for Projecting or Freestanding Sign (sf) = 30*
- Maximum Projection of Outer Sign Edge for Projecting or Freestanding Signs = 6 ft**

Because the proposal is visually compatible and reconstructs historic features of the building.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Bean stated that he was in agreement with the staff's recommendation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that they are in support of this petition. He explained that this is a historic rehabilitation tax credit project. The owner is committed to doing excellent work. The sign is a representation of that commitment. Mr. Carey said they agree with staff's recommendation and approval of the variance so that the petitioner may move forward.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry stated that as has been reported, the work is being done very well.

Board Action:

Approve the signs for the property located at 109 MLK, Jr. Blvd. as requested because they meet the preservation standards and are visually compatible.

Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for variances from the following sign standards:

- Fascia and Projecting Signs. *Fascia and projecting signs shall be erected only on the signable area of the structure and shall not project over the roofline or parapet wall elevation of the structure.* - PASS

- Maximum Sign Area for Projecting or Freestanding Sign (sf) = 30*

- Maximum Projection of Outer Sign Edge for Projecting or Freestanding Signs = 6 ft **

Because the proposal is visually compatible and reconstructs historic features of the building.

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

19. [Petition of Gavin Macrae-Gibson | 14-003508-COA | 31 East Jones Street | Addition and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Monterey Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Supplementary Information.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Petitioner's Presentation.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. McClain left the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

Mr. Gavin Macrae-Gibson was present on behalf of the petition

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for several alterations to 31 East Jones Street. A similar petition was heard by the Board on July 9, 2014[14-002860] and was denied by the Board. The petitioner has subsequently revised the proposal. Therefore, this is a new proposal. The petitioner is also requesting a variance from the 75% lot coverage permitted in the RIP-A District. The current lot coverage is 75.8%. The proposed lot coverage is 81.6%. The petitioner has requested a variance from this standard. The petitioner has provided the lot coverage of the adjacent rowhouses within Quantock Row which range from 93.2% to 86%.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the alterations to 31 East Jones Street as follows:

1. Add operable shutters in Van Deusen blue to all historic windows;
2. Add a light fixture above the main door and repaint front door Van Deusen blue;
3. Add gate to opening in raised stoop;
4. Replace existing railing with new railing with the condition that the medallion element be removed;
5. Replace existing brick stoop floor and brick stair treads with marble slab;
6. Remove the existing fire escape; and
7. Repair brownstone window lintels with Jahn 70 Masonry Repair Mortar.

Because the alterations are visually compatible, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and Design Standards.

Ms. Harris reported additionally that staff recommends approval of the alterations to the carriage house at 31 East Jones Street as follows:

1. Remove the existing fire escape stair and awning;
2. Remove the existing entrance on Drayton Street façade and restucco;
3. Extend the existing wall to meet the carriage house (currently a gate exist);

4. Remove all electrical boxes and conduit;
5. Replace the existing paired windows on the ground floor with an eight foot four inch wide cedar plank garage door;
6. Add a cedar plank with sidelights.

Because the alterations are visually compatible, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and Design Standards.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends denial of the alterations to 31 East Jones Street as follows:

1. Removal and reinstallation of the existing bay window; and
2. The four story stucco and cedar siding addition.

Because the proposed alterations are not consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation or the Design Standards.

Ms. Harris reported also that staff recommends denial of the lot coverage variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals because the variance criteria have not been met.

Dr. Henry asked what is the approximate size of the building.

Ms. Harris answered that she believes the carriage house is approximately 450 square feet per floors. Therefore, this would be 900 square feet (two floors). The main structure is a little over 1,000 square feet per floor. Therefore, with four floors may be it is approximately 4,500 square feet.

Dr. Henry asked if the petitioner is proposing to put a new window around the bay window.

Ms. Harris explained that the project essentially expands the footprint of the house where the bay window stays in its current place, but walls and interior space will be built around the bay window. Therefore, the bay window becomes an interior feature of the house rather than an exterior feature.

Dr. Henry asked the staff if at the last meeting the petitioner stated that he was going to let the property remain as rental units.

Ms. Harris answered that this is a question the petitioner can answer.

Dr. Williams asked the staff that regarding their recommendation for denial of the four story stucco and cedar siding addition on the main house is based on the Secretary of Interior's Standard and the Design Standards that deal with addition.

Ms. Harris answered yes.

Dr. Williams said in the staff's comments they say that it does conform to those standards in differentiation and height and mass.

Ms. Harris explained that it may conform to some of those standards, but it does not specifically conform to the standards that state that "additions shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material and without damaging or obscuring character defining features of the building, including but not limited to roofs, cornices, eaves, brackets, and should be designed to be reversible with the least damage to historic

buildings."

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Gibson stated that he was present to represent another petition for alterations to his property at 31 East Jones Street. He said that one of the main things that came up at the last meeting was the Secretary of Interior's Standard #3 regarding the question of physical development within a project. One of the issues that surfaced regarding that idea of the physical record was the bay window that is on the back of the building. The concern was that there would be a false sense of historical continuity if the bay was to be put onto the end of the proposed additions.

Mr. Gibson said one of the things that they are proposing in this presentation is that the bay window will remain where it is within the house and they will build a new bay which will refer to the existing bay, but be built on the addition so that there will be a continuity of special relationship between the existing and the new. He said he will explain this further as he moves forward into the presentation.

Mr. Gibson said he would not recap the context of the building. The building is on the corner of East Jones Street and Drayton Street and consists of the carriage house and the main building which has had various additions over time. It is a four-story building and is a part of the 1854 Quantock Row. There are five buildings in Quantock Row. It has a porch and as has been mentioned they will improve the front façade of the house by changing the materials of the stoop and railings. They will change the color of the door and light fixture. As you proceed down Drayton Street, you see the carriage house on the court. From the lane, they are proposing to put a garage and make the entrance here instead of on Drayton Street. They believe this will be safer, plus it will be away from the noise and congestion. He explained [pointing to an area] that in terms of the back of the house, the existing house is here; an addition was added; and the bay; and an addition to that. As the Board sees, many of the other properties including all the other properties in Quantock Row step forward from the line of the original house considerably more than their house. They are proposing to remove the fire escape. The extension will come to the same point as their neighbor. However, some of the neighbors' houses come further into the court. They will improve the carriage house, but will leave the historic material that you can see from the streets. He pointed out that the main goal is to keep the bay, but it would be inside the house because to make the project feasible, they need to expand it just as the other houses have done. There is less lot coverage for his house because it steps back, but all the other houses in the row are forward. The top of the extension is non-historic.

Mr. Gibson said the survey of the lot shows that it is 100' x 24'. The lot coverage as the staff reported is 75.8 which is 1.25% over and they will need to expand the house to align with the other houses. He said at the last meeting it was a little more than they have today. It was 82.8 now they have reduced it to 81.6. Therefore, it will be 8.75% over the lot coverage as compared to the 1.25% that exists now rather than 10% they showed the last time. The court is much larger at 31 East Jones Street than the other houses.

Mr. Gibson said based on the Sanborn Maps from 1888, 1916, and 1956 he will show the Board a historical analysis. The original house is the prismatic shape; it was added to some time before 1888 with a sleeping porch. Then the bay was added. He said pointing to a section that subsequent to that, these additions were made. Now, they are proposing to expand the base which is only nine feet wide [it is not very usable space] to this shape, but

the bay will remain inside. He believed a question was asked regarding what is the idea regarding the bay. Mr. Gibson explained that the idea is to keep the bay here, but it will be inside. Therefore, there will now be a new bay on the outside of the house. To show the Board what it would like, he pointed out that they will change the front as has been described. They want to abide by the Department of Interior Standard 3 which means that there will be no change in the spatial relationship, but there will be a new bay which preserves some of the characteristics of the existing bay, but in a modern style. Mr. Gibson explained that one of those characteristics is that this tends to turn the corner of the mid block court to Drayton Street just as the original bay; but with relocating the original bay on the outside of the house, they would follow the standard of the Department Interior's Standard 3 because they would be creating a different spatial relationship to the existing house. He said that if the bay is designed in a modern language, then they would have a spatial relation that would be brand new in keeping with the overall style of the addition and as he has said there would be no change to the spatial relationship of the bay, itself, preserved. It will be a modern bay in a contemporary style. He believes that one of the sticking points at the last meeting was to preserve the bay, but also abide by the Department of Interior's Standard 3 regarding not creating a false sense of historical development.

Mr. Gibson explained what they are proposing to remove. The shaded area denotes the original brick work, which accounts for 33.5% of the area. There is also approximately another 6% of non-historical fire escape doors; then they have 26% of the bay will be preserved. Therefore, there is 34% of the top floor non-historical; plus the non-historical doors which will be removed. The bay will be preserved at 61% would be either non-historical or preserved and the brick, which they are proposing to remove accounts for the remaining 33.5% in the small area at the base. They are proposing to reuse that brick in the party wall and this piece down here in some of the garden paving. Therefore, 100% of the elements of the project will still be on the site. They believe that since the main historically contributing component would be preserved inside the house, they have gone as far as possible towards the concept of reversibility as well as preserved the most character defining elements of the façade within the house. The side view along Drayton Street shows that it is principally the fire escape and they will come to the same line with the new bay.

Mr. Gibson stated that the bay, as the Board can see, has been added to with a narrow nine feet of space and has been used for the last 50 years as rental accommodations. This counts as six units of rental building. Their intent is to return it to its original function as a single family house. The use of these small pieces of space is difficult to use as they are only nine feet wide. This is why all the other houses in Quantock Row have been expanded. The house consists basically of two paired rooms, a stair and a corridor. Therefore, if they want to use this house for modern purposes; for example a kitchen, there is no plumbing. If you wanted to put mechanical equipment or storage, bathrooms, an elevator or any of these types of things you need to expand the house, is the principal that they come before the Board with a way of expanding the house, creating a bay which refers back to the characteristics of the original while still being modern, but yet preserving the original bay within the house.

Mr. Gibson said if a person is going to create single family houses that have the amenities that are required for houses of this scale and type, one has to consider the evolution of these buildings while at the same time trying to preserve as many of the Department of

Interior's Standards as possible. He hoped that he has shown the Board that they have gone as far as they think is possible to go preserving as many of those standards as possible.

Dr. Henry told Mr. Gibson that the impression he gave him was that he would keep the property as rental and just let it deteriorate. What happened?

Mr. Gibson clarified that the central point what he said at the last meeting was that for this project to be feasible, they would need to expand the house in order for it not to just consist of two rooms and a corridor on each floor. To do this they would have had to move the bay in the project that he showed before. As they thought about what is possible, he realized that it could be possible to keep the bay in place within the house if the plan was changed. Therefore, they altered the plan to preserve the bay within the house. If they could not expand the house, then they would have no choice but to keep it as rental. But, what they have today is an alternative that allows for the house to be expanded while at the same time preserving the bay.

Ms. Scheer asked Mr. Gibson what he was gaining with this addition. Is the addition going to give you the kitchen and the bathroom?

Mr. Gibson answered yes. He said that currently the house has a very narrow nine feet space. This makes it difficult to use the house. He explained what would be on each floor.

Ms. Scheer asked Mr. Gibson if four units are here.

Mr. Gibson answered that four units are in the house and two units in the carriage house.

Mr. Engle said Mr. Gibson said he is keeping 100% of the bay, but when he looks at this, he only sees two stories of bay which is at the door of one of the windows. Therefore, this is lost fabric. He explained that obviously the new bay will only be able to be placed between the new floor and new ceiling. This means that he will be removing some of the bay where the inner beaming floor comes in and the roof will be gone entirely. Therefore, Mr. Gibson will not be keeping 100% of the bay.

Mr. Gibson stated that this is correct with regards to the entire. Of course, they could only keep inside those parts which are in the interior of the space. Where the floor beams would meet the bay, those parts of the bay would be kept on site. But, where the floor intervenes, they could not keep that piece in the interior.

Mr. Engle said that when Mr. Gibson says if he takes off the addition, he will still have the bay he really will not; he will have a couple of chunks of what was a continuous bay.

Mr. Gibson stated that they would have as much as possible. It would be 11 feet of bay and 10 feet on the floor above. This would be the parts that would remain.

Mr. Engle said, however, a door will be put here.

Mr. Gibson said Mr. Engle was correct; a door would be placed here.

Mr. Engle said this means that the other window would be closed.

Mr. Gibson said on the east side, there would be one window would be adjacent to the wall. But, they will preserve the elements of the bay.

Mr. Gunther asked Mr. Gibson to clarify his statement regarding maintaining the bay in

place. He said if he is reading the drawings correctly, the bay has been relocated within certain spaces and is not in the same space as it was historically.

Mr. Gibson explained that originally a small window on the outside wall and bay is a little further down. He explained that they will be recreating it up slightly in order for it not to be in the middle of the room.

Mr. Gunther explained that the bay has been moved in from the rear of the house. It is not in its original location.

Mr. Gibson explained that the bay is not in its exact original location because it is being reconstructed within the house in a position that makes sense in relation to the new bay.

Mr. Gunther said this position is not the same as the old position.

Mr. Gibson said the elements would be the same.

Mr. Howington stated that he believes the Board needs to look at the bay element as being torn off. He said he appreciates Mr. Gibson's intent and effort to try to salvage some of the historic materials. It is on the inside of the building.

Ms. Caldwell said the majority of the Board members last month did not think the bay could be removed and rebuilt. However, Mr. Gibson today wants to do rebuild it in-kind.

Mr. Gibson said that they believe it can be taken apart and reassembled within the house. They do not believe that there is any technical difficulty with this.

Ms. Caldwell stated that last month the Board did not believe that this could be done.

Mr. Gibson replied that he believes the Board said it would be difficult to do, but they did not say that it would be impossible to do.

Ms. Caldwell asked Mr. Gibson what was his interpretation of why it was not allowed.

Mr. Gibson explained the main reason why he believes it was not allowed last month is because of the concept of false historical development. However, if you take an element and move it to a new location, then you have changed the spatial relationship of that piece. If they remember at the last meeting they had a new addition with the existing bay attached to it. They have now changed that and there is a new bay here. The objection was that it had a false sense of historical development because it had the existing bay on the outside of the house, now it has a new bay on the outside of the house so that it is one contemporary addition. But, they have attempted to keep as much as possible of the historical material inside the house.

Ms. Caldwell said, however, Mr. Gibson still wants to move it. Therefore, he will lose some of the historic fabric.

Mr. Gibson said it is necessary to take the bay now and rebuild it inside. It cannot be rebuilt in the exact same place, but it will be built in the same location, moved here and there a few feet.

Mr. Howington said he believes the Board needs to look at it as it becomes a decorative object inside and this may be okay. There is a part of the Secretary of Interior's Standards that allow you to put additions onto a building. He believes Mr. Gibson has done this very

well. The question now becomes the destruction of the historic fabric, but it has nothing to do with what happens to, where it goes, whether it is inside or not. As he has said, it becomes a decorative object inside which is outside of this Board's purview. Mr. Howington said, therefore, he believes the Board needs to look at it as an addition.

Mr. Engle explained that the Secretary of Interior's Standards say that you do not reuse historic fabric. Once the fabric is removed, it loses all of its integrity.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Janet Thegby resides at 323 West Jones Street. She is in favor of the request. The fire escape will be removed and the house will be returned to a single family dwelling. This is very important for the integrity of the neighborhood, block, and for Savannah.

Dr. Eunice Bell resides at 521 Tattnall Street. They are about to see a house that will have a family living in it. She is happy that it will be a house again instead of being a rental unit.

Mr. Ron Melander lives at 517 Tattnall Street. He said he has been watching this project and has been involved in it since the beginning. The property is in a dilapidated state. The garden level is basically inhabitable and the carriage house has so much termite damage in it that it will need to be rebuilt. Mr. Gibson wants to retire here and turn the unattractive property back to a great appearance. The back side of the property will be affected which over the years has been altered many times. Mr. Melander believes that it is time to make it into something nice and have a family living there.

Ms. Harriett Delong resides at 207 West Taylor Street. She believes what the petitioner is attempting to do with this house is good and will be a great addition to their neighborhood.

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) believes that the presentation by the petitioner clarified a lot of things for him. However, it is obviously a very complex undertaking. He stated that the primary concerns that the HSF has is the lost of the significant building materials that cannot be overlooked or fully set aside. Their organization would be inconsistent if they were willing to say this is okay and yet fight for half of the McDonald's building. Mr. Carey stated that he believes they need to be concerned and agree with staff on the potential loss of historic building material. He explained that their Architectural Review Committee had an issue with the lot coverage. He said in a way this is the forest; and all the details that they are talking about is the trees as they will add up to the forest. The forest is the issue of 81.6% lot coverage; although a reduction from the previous proposal is still nearly 7% more than what is allowed. It is the form that some of these buildings are taking whether they are new construction or rehabilitated historic buildings that give them pause. The fact is that when those changes start to alter the form, the Landmark District, and in a way he does not believe that it is too much of a stress where they start changing the rhythm of the streetscape, views and the sort of connectivity from the big house, to the back house or to the carriage house and what happens in between. When these things are altered to point of not being recognizable are concerns.

Mr. Carey said he does not envy the Board on this decision because a supportive community is present, a good petitioner, and a difficult decision; but nevertheless there is the seeking of a variance for additional lot coverage that does not seem warranted and there

is the loss of historic building material which is significant.

Ms. Katherine Atkinson resides at 114 East Taylor Street in the back of the petitioner's property. She said what the petitioner is proposing to do will make everything so much nicer for their area.

Mr. Howington invited Mr. Gibson to comment on the public comments.

Mr. Gibson thanked the community for their comments. They appreciate the community's support. He said in regard to the comments made by the HSF, the question of the lot coverage was debated by the Review Board at the last meeting. The minutes show that the Board was in favor of the lot coverage that was proposed at the meeting. They have reduced the lot coverage by 1.2%. He additionally wanted to point out that the entire Quantock Row has been expanded. The lot coverage in the other parts of the Row varies from 93.2% to 86% and they are proposing 81.6%. While he appreciates the comments that have been made, he thinks one has to look at the climate of these particular row of houses which is unique in itself and that they are trying to reserve as much opening as possible, but as was discussed at the last meeting, it is really important to understand that the usability of this house is very difficult when you have a nine foot slice of space on the back. This is why he said at the last meeting that they would be obliged to keep it as rental property if they could not expand it.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry stated that at he wanted to address all the public speakers. He voted for this the last meeting largely on the grounds that it would be cleaned up on the side and they would be getting permanent people on the inside. He said he was convinced at that time that the design was the only way that it could be done. However, a pattern is here. He believes in many ways this is a good design, but not a good preservation design.

Mr. Engle said the bay is a defining characteristic. He does not care if it is on the back, it is highly visible from the street and it is being proposed to get rid of it. This Board approves additions all the time, but they do not approve additions where they destroy the defining characteristics of buildings. It has been acknowledged that no integrity of the bay will be left. Mr. Engle said he would not vote favorable for it because the petitioner is putting it inside, this makes no sense. There will be no integrity; they are not preserving it by shoveling it between two floors inside. This is not preservation. By definition this is violating three standards and staff says this. This Board is governed by the standards. Mr. Engle said he does not see that they have a choice to say that they will not go by the standards this time. He said he felt bad, but why would someone buy a house with a defining characteristic knowing you are going to have to rip it off. If Mr. Melander was his realtor he is surprised that he did not tell him that this was going to be problematic. Mr. Engle said he cannot support this. The earlier alternative was better than this one.

Dr. Williams said he believes that they will agree that this is a vexing proposal. On one hand, they have said time and time again that they apply design that brings a fast approach; new designs as on Broughton Street and this proposal very much does so with its distinct modernist rear addition. As Mr. Engle has said, the Board has seen plenty of rear additions. He believes the reality is maybe they don't need all this space. He believes just as the Cotton Sail Hotel where there is a vacant building and a proposal came in to remove the historic fabric throughout a story on the roof and revitalize the building and give it new life. Dr. Williams said the standards are here for guidelines ultimately and they strive to

work with them, but there are times, such as with Cotton Sails where members of the public including Historic Savannah opposed that addition. But for him, this project has been very successful. He regrets the loss of the bay, but on the other hand, do they want another building that is going to continue to deteriorate as a rental. It may and it may not, this Board does not know.

Dr. Henry said look at the pattern. This Board tried to get the petitioner to ask for a continuance, but he said he would rather for the property to remain rental.

Mr. Howington said he believes the petitioner clarified and explained what he meant. The way he understood what the petitioner said that he would keep it as a rental if he could not do the addition, but now he has come back with another addition. It will still be a single family. The only way it would remain rental if he could not do the addition. Mr. Howington said this is probably may still be true if he cannot do the addition.

Ms. Scheer said she believes that they all would love to see this property become a single family home. She said last month she voted favorable for the plan. Dr. Williams is correct; the standards are guidelines, they are not rules. She believes if the Board does not have discernment, then they cannot honor these buildings past because they would not be able to give them a future. She wished the petitioner would have asked for a continuance at the last meeting because she believes they could have expounded on that petition. In that plan, the bay window was kept, but now it becomes a display case for pieces of it and it is an interior design. But, it clearly goes against the standard that says "without damaging or obscuring." Ms. Scheer said she cannot support this proposal.

Dr. Williams asked if the petitioner asks for a continuance, would he be able to return to the original request.

Mr. Engle said the petitioner would have to wait 12 months if he wants to return to the original request.

Mr. Gunther applauds the petitioner's design for the addition. He believes it is an extremely successful design. However, he feels this is essentially the same petition that was submitted to the Board last meeting, but with some rearranging of the bay window. In his opinion, it is still in direct violation of two of the standards that deal with additions to historic buildings. This will destroy historic fabric, altering historic material, a character defining feature, and changing the spatial relationship of that historic defining feature to the rest of the structured. Mr. Gunther said the reversibility also in his opinion would be highly questionable. While he appreciates and actually likes the rear addition to the structure, it still is failing two of the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Therefore, he will have to vote the same as he did at the last meeting.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said the details of the bay window and the lot coverage are not so much of a concern for her when you look at what the neighbors were permitted to do with their properties. She is sure they removed some historic fabric. Why should this petitioner not be permitted to have the same luxuries as the neighbors? She somewhat likes the addition and feels it is definitely visually different from the existing building and she is not opposed to it.

Ms. Caldwell said she believes that they would love to see this project done. She is in favor of this, but the petitioner has put the Board in a bad position. This Board's purview is to uphold the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Ms. Caldwell said they would not be

upholding the standards if they approve the petitioner's petition as submitted.

Mr. Howington stated that while he is not in favor of variances or removing historic fabric, he thinks that buildings should be able to evolve. In this case and in this particular row, there are lot coverage that is more. He remembers in the last meeting that the lot coverage was not as much an issue as removing a historic bay and putting it back in a different place which created a false sense of historic. Mr. Howington said in his mind this was the worst situation because it did setup a real false sense of historic. But, with what is presented today, he sees it as a decorative object that the petitioner is reclaiming and repurposing for his own use. It has nothing to do with the Board's purview. He said that he agrees with Dr. Williams and Ms. Weibe-Reed that he likes the addition too. It shows a real sense of evolution and it is clearly not an addition. He hates the lost of historic fabric, but he is a firm believer in buildings have to evolve because you have to look at the building at as a whole and the entire building is getting restored. He agrees that it is against the Secretary of Interior's Standards and is a conflict, but this is just his personal view.

Mr. Gunther said that Washington does dictate how preservation should be done in this country through the Secretary of Interior's Standards. This is why they have great historic downtowns and why many buildings are preserved in the landmark districts is because of those standards. He is in great defense of them, but a recommendation as well on the application of standards is not to always apply the standards in terms of precedence. Therefore, regardless of what has happened in the past and he is sure mistakes have been made, historic fabric may have been removed, but the standards should be applied independently to every project. The standards should be looked at and apply them to one project at a time. Precedence has no relationship because every building has a different history, a different past, and goes through a different evolution. Mr. Gunther said, consequently, they cannot look at the rest of the row and say they were allowed to remove fabric, why should this petitioner not be able to do the same. He said the Board is looking at this structure and applying the standards to this individual project.

Dr. Williams said this building has a history of evolution. The rear elevation has been modified at least twice if not three times in its history. This is the nature of this building. He said as an historian, he looks at things from a very broad historical panorama. As Mr. Howington has said, the key question is the evolution of a building and for him, this is a part of the character. Buildings are complex things. Therefore, for him what is characteristic of the building is change. For other members of the Board what is characteristic of the building is the bay.

Mr. Gunther stated that he agrees with what Dr. Williams said. Buildings certainly do need to evolve in change in use as time changes. To him, the bay is important to preserve because the house is bookended as well by two Italianate features, the change that occurred on the front and has a closure in a way at both the front and rear because of the Italianate era of its history. If the building did not have this context and history of change, he might feel differently.

Mr. Engle said he still takes homage with the statement that the Secretary of Interior's Standards are only guidelines. The ordinance say that they will follow the Secretary of Interior's Standards. It does not say that the Board will consult the standards, but says that the Board will follow them. Therefore, if the Board knowingly ignore three of the standards when staff has told them, they would be violating the standards. They will be saying that they can do what they want to and don't have to go by the ordinance. Mr. Engle

said the ordinance is explicit and does not say basic guidelines for you to think about, but says that the Board will follow them. If they do not follow the guidelines then things will begin to happen as was done ten or twelve years ago when this was a different Board. This Board must follow the standards so that they are equitable across the Board with everybody. If this was a nice flat back, it would be a great addition. But, it is not a flat back and a lot of the other properties on Jones Street were flat additions. The only fabric that came out was 30 inches below a window where a doorway was installed through to a porch. This petition today would be taking out 80% of the fabric on the back.

Ms. Caldwell asked if Mr. Gibson could ask for a continuance today.

Mr. Howington answered that Mr. Gibson could ask for a continuance or he could ask for a vote. They have the same situation they had at the last meeting as it appears the Board is split. However, if he asks for a continuance, he could come back with the same petition, modify the petition.

Mr. Gibson asked if he asks for a continuance, would it not be feasible for them to come back with the proposition they had at the last meeting.

Mr. Howington said the petition at the last meeting was denied. Therefore, this petition would have to wait for 12 months.

Mr. Gibson wanted to know if they came back at the next meeting requesting that the bay be removed completely from the project, would this be grounds for a continuance.

Mr. Howington explained that he believes this is the issue with the Board being split. Some of the Board members feel that by removing the bay totally is actually a better solution than putting it back on the building.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Gibson to clarify what he means by not reinstalling the bay inside.

Mr. Gibson said he has attempted to abide by some of the Secretary of Interior's Standards regarding the bay. He said before he asks for a continuance, he wants some feedback from the Board whether removing the bay from the project would be grounds for possible approval. Otherwise, it is hard for him to see why he should ask for a continuance.

Mr. Howington explained to Mr. Gibson that he could not answer that question. Some of the Board members feel that by removing or touching the bay may be violation of the Secretary of Interior's Standards, while other Board members feel that maybe the addition is a good addition and that sometimes buildings need to evolve. He said, consequently, he could not tell Mr. Gibson how the Board would vote, but he can tell him that the Board is definitely split.

Mr. Gibson asked if it would be possible to do a straw vote.

Mr. Howington informed him that the Board could not do a straw vote. However, if the Board votes and the petition is denied, then he has the right to come back with a different petition. Or, he may ask for a continuance and come back with some changes.

Mr. Howington stated that Dr. Williams asked him a procedure question that he will share with everyone. He said that on this Board, the chair does not vote unless there is a tie. This is what Dr. Williams was asking him.

Dr. Williams said he remembers that the chair could vote either to break a tie or create a

tie.

Mr. Gibson asked if they ask for a continuance and remove the bay from the inside, would this be considered sufficiently different to bring before the Board again.

Mr. Howington answered it would not because in this particular instance, it would be an interior situation and the Review Board does not have purview over the interior. Therefore, something on the exterior would have to change.

Mr. Gibson said if they cannot move the wall out, they will have to keep the project rental. What he is trying to understand is whether there are grounds for coming back to the Board with the same project, but without the bay inside. They cannot come back with a project that does not expand and, therefore, affects the bay.

Mr. Howington said he understood that this is complicated, but he wanted to explain what he believes is some of the Board members concern. They are concerned about removing historic fabric, especially the bay because such a defining feature. Other members of the Board feel that the addition is a good addition. To answer Mr. Gibson's question, this Board is comprised of 11 members and eight are present today. Three members are not present today and he does not know how these members would vote if this was to come back to the Board as a continuance, but this would be the difference.

Mr. Gibson asked for a continuance.

Board Action:

Continue the project for alterations at 31 East Jones Street. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

20. [Petition of Becky Lynch, Lynch Associates Architects, PC | 13-004374-COA | 303 East Gaston Street | One Year Extension Request](#)

Attachment: [13-004374-COA- Request for extension.pdf](#)

Attachment: [One Year Extension Request.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve a 12 month extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) issued on September 11, 2013 for rehabilitation and site improvements to 303 East Gaston Street [File No. 13-004374-COA]. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

21. [Petition of Doug Patten for City of Savannah | 14-003331-COA | 201 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 201 Habersham Street 14-003331-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 Habersham Street 14-003331-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of Gena Taylor | 14-003481-COA | 429 Tattnall Street | Staff Approved - Windows](#)

Attachment: [COA - 429 Tattnall Street 14-003481-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 429 Tattnall Street 14-003481-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Jason and Jenny House | 14-003495-COA | 512 East Gwinnett Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 512 East Gwinnett Street 14-003495-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 512 East Gwinnett Street 14-003495-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Eric O'Neil for Greenline Architecture | 14-003496-COA | 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Balustrade](#)

Attachment: [COA - 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue 14-003496-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [502 East Oglethorpe-HDBR Porch.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Amended Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects, PC | 14-003505-COA | 607 Abercorn Street | Staff Approved - Rehabilitation of Building C](#)

Attachment: [COA - 607 Abercorn Street 516 Drayton Street 14-003505-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 607 Abercorn Street 516 Drayton Street 14-003505-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Sam Carroll for Carroll Construction | 14-003539-COA | 301 East Charlton Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 301 East Charlton Street 14-003539-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 301 East Charlton Street 14-003539-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Joshua Beckler for Coastal Canvas | 14-003545-COA | 421 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 421 East Broughton Street 14-003545-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 421 East Broughton Street 14-003545-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Joshua Beckler for Coastal Canvas | 14-003547-COA | 300 Drayton Street | Staff Denial - Awnings](#)

Attachment: [COA - 300 Drayton Street 14-003547-COA Denied.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 300 Drayton Street 14-003547-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Natalie Aiken for Hansen Architects, P.C. | 14-003614-COA | 101 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved and Denied- Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 101 West Broughton Street 14-003614-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 101 West Broughton Street 14-003614-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Natalie Aiken for Hansen Architects, P.C. | 14-003615-COA | 223 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 223 West Brought Street 14-003615-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 223 West Broughton Street 14-003615-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Amended Petition of Becky Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | 14-003629-COA | 546 East Harris Street | Staff Approved - Color Change, Windows, Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 546 East Harris Street 14-003629-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [submittal Packet.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Murray Barnard | 14-003642-COA | 516 East Harris Street | Staff Approved - Wood Siding](#)

Attachment: [COA - 516 East Harris Street 14-003642-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 516 East Harris Street 14-003642-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Peter Nelsen | 14-003673-COA | 417 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 417 East Broughton Street 14-003673-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 417 East Broughton Street 14-003673-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Amended Petition of Christina Swenson | 14-003676-COA | 541 East Liberty Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 541 East Liberty Street 14-003676-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Brett Turner | 14-003682-COA | 509 Whitaker Street | Staff Approved - Color Changes](#)

Attachment: [COA - 509 Whitaker Street 14-003682-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Proposed paint colors.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 8-13-14.pdf](#)

Mr. Howington said the staff has given the Board a report of recent work performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA).

Ms. Weibe-Reed stated that 24E started 2012. How long are they permitted to go.

Ms. Harris explained that the owner was scheduled to go to court this past Monday and asked for a continuance which the judge granted. If the attorney can confirm that they will be in court on August 25, 2014, it will be scheduled for this date.

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Items Deferred to Staff 8-13-14.pdf](#)

Mr. Howington said the staff has given the Board a report on the items deferred to staff.

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

38. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, August 14, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

39. [Next Meeting - Wednesday, September 10, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

New Business

40. [Vinyl Awnings Discussion](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Harris Vinyl Awnings 081314.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Preservation Brief 44 - The Use of Awnings on Historic Buildings Repair, Replacement, and New Design.pdf](#)

Ms. Harris explained that staff has noticed a recent rise in COA applications for vinyl awnings and would like to get the Board's feedback on their visual compatibility within the Historic District. Staff feels vinyl awnings are visually incompatible and should not be considered an "equivalent cloth" material but is seeking the Historic District Board of Review's guidance in the matter. Staff has invited a representative from Coastal Canvas to provide additional information on vinyl awnings.

Ms. Harris there are a few different sections of the ordinance that address awning materials. The Secretary of Interior's Standards say that the new work will be differentiated with the old and be compatible with the old. In the past, vinyl awnings have been approved in the Historic District. Awnings are usually

approved at the staff level. Most applications that the staff receives for awnings are woven acrylic fabric material and staff feels that this material is visually compatible. Vinyl intends to mimic the cloth-like quality of canvas, but it is not a woven material and, therefore, does not have the same texture as the acrylic or cloth. Staff feels that it has a reflective quality to it which is not visually compatible.

Ms. Harris stated that there is a Preservation Brief, National Park Service #44 which addresses the use of awnings and talks about awning material. She passed a vinyl awning sample to the Board and informed them that the representative from Coastal Canvas would show them vinyl awning samples also.

Mr. Glenn Wood of Coastal Canvas Products Company said in their making of awnings have been tasked with guiding their customers to the fabric that best suites their needs. They listen to what the client is attempting to do and then make a recommendation on what they think is best fabric. Oftentimes it is acrylic and sometimes vinyl. The smaller the awning, the more the acrylic lends itself. There are a multitude of awning fabrics available and as professional they are, they have to abide by the wishes of their customers. Millions of products are made out of vinyl; however, he believes vinyl has a bad connotation when just the word "vinyl" is used. However, one needs to realize how much of their car interior is made out of vinyl; then you will realize that vinyl can be made to look very attractive and function well. He believes they have done this with awnings.

Mr. Wood said they believe that vinyl awning fabric is compatible in its appearance and it does well for what it is designed to do. He would estimate that presently in the Historic District of Savannah that there are between 50% and 60% vinyl awnings and the remainders are not necessarily acrylic. There is no such thing as cotton or canvas. Mr. Wood said the word "canvas" in their name, they look at it as a verb and not a noun. It covers two shades and this is the reason why they chose the name Coastal Canvas. This is the first time that they have had objection to vinyl awning. They have had objection to back lit fabrics which also are vinyl, but they understand why. It is because they are not historical.

Mr. Wood explained that the reason they think that vinyl fabric is suitable in certain circumstances are it is inherently flame retardant; waterproof, not water repellent; very stable and holds its shape particularly in larger awnings or canopies. It has a long life and serves the customer well. Vinyl awnings stay clean longer and is easier to clean.

Mr. Wood said when he was talking with the staff, he commented that he believes the reason that there is an objection to vinyl awning fabric is the fact that it does not feel as good as acrylic. If the Board feels the vinyl awning sample, it does not make the Board want to hold it in their hands. This is because this is not what it was designed for, but is designed to be put on a building and serve as an awning and endure the elements such as blocking the sun rays. They have been using vinyl awnings in Savannah, Charleston, Beaufort, and Brunswick since the late 1970s or early 1980s.

Mr. Wood said he does not feel that it is fair to hand the Board a sample and ask them to think of this as something that is up in the air. He did not have time to prepare a slide presentation of all the awnings that exist in Savannah so that they could visually see the difference between the acrylic versus the vinyl. He believes the vinyl has its place.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Wood if he had a sample which they could compare the vinyl to.

Mr. Wood answered no. He said there are actually six or eight different families of fabric that they use. They stay with the vinyl and acrylic more than the others.

Mr. Howington explained that the Board would need something to compare the vinyl awning to and possibly some addresses of some examples of acrylic versus vinyl.

Mr. Wood said he has such a list, but it is not typed; but he will be more than glad to provide it. He will be happy to take pictures of the acrylic and vinyl awnings, but he is just returning from vacation.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Wood if sunbrella is acrylic. He said everybody believes that sunbrella is canvas.

Mr. Wood said sunbrella is acrylic.

Mr. Engle said the difference he finds is that acrylic molds like fabric; vinyl does not. When you look at awnings, you will have sags with sunbrella and acrylic, but you don't get sags with vinyl.

Mr. Wood said to address the sag in acrylic awning, they refer to it as morning sickness. If it gets wet or old it grows and sags. Some of the acrylic awnings downtown at 8:00 a.m. some will be sagging and drooping, but if you look at them at 3:00 p.m., they will be tight and very tailored looking.

Mr. Wood said he has other sample cards that will show the different colors and different things. He believes that as the Board looks at the sample, the measure of glossiness on the sample does not represent what it looks like when it is up in the air.

Mr. Howington said he believes it would be helpful for the Board to see what it looks like up in the air with the addresses that Mr. Wood has said he will get for the Board.

Mr. Wood said the list will show awnings of various ages. Some of fairly new and some are old. Therefore, the Board will get an idea of how they age in the weather.

Mr. Howington said this would be ideal in helping the Board may its decision.

Ms. Caldwell asked that when the sun is on the vinyl awning does it lose its shape.

Mr. Wood said no it does not; it is a very stable fabric and the comment about it not being a woven fabric is not correct; in fact it is a woven fabric; it has a scrim and has a vinyl coating on it.

Mr. Howington thanked Mr. Wood for sharing the information and asked him to give the Board a list instead of pictures. Then the Board members could look at it on their own time. Some times photos do not give the true essence of things. He believes it would be the responsibility of the Board over the next month to look at the awnings.

41. [Discuss HDBR Annual Retreat](#)

Ms. Harris explained that every year in September the Review Board has its annual retreat. As they are already into August, she just wanted to remind the Board to think about topics and any pressing issues they want to cover at the retreat. She asked the Board members to let her or the chair know so that as they put together the agenda, they can ensure that what they want to discuss will be addressed.

Ms. Harris said she does not know if scheduling the retreat on a Friday would work for everyone. She can send an email with dates thereon and then they will select a day that will work for every one.

Mr. Howington asked if they could get choices of three different days and, hopeful by the next meeting they will have the topics.

Dr. Williams asked that the first Friday in September be considered. He said that the second and third Fridays will not be okay for him because this begins SCAD's fall quarter. The fourth Friday would be okay.

Ms. Harris said she will see if the retreat could be held at Tybee Island, GA. She will give this information to the Board later.

42. [Review Position Guest Editorial Letter](#)

Mr. Howington said that Ms. Harris sent the Board members a letter that was wonderfully crafted by Dr. Henry. Dr. Henry took it upon himself to draft a guest editorial letter. At the last meeting the Board discussed that Dr. Henry would come up with some talking points that the Board could discuss.

Dr. Henry said talking points do not work.

Mr. Howington said during the month, the Board received a copy of the letter. He said that Dr. Henry asked him for his opinion; and his opinion is that if the Board is going to write a letter he would prefer [he has to sign the letter] that a motion be made and seconded that they will get a committee from the Board to help write the letter. Perhaps, starting with Dr. Henry's letter. If he is going to sign the letter, then he wants to have input. The Board may still discuss talking points or Dr. Henry is absolutely welcomed to submit a letter on his own. But if the letter is to come from the Review Board, he feels that everyone should have an input.

Dr. Williams asked if Dr. Henry could sign the letter as a member of the Review Board or would it just be Dr. Henry as a citizen.

Mr. Howington said that Mr. Engle wrote a letter to the editor.

Mr. Engle said the guest editorial is 600 words. He asked if the newspaper is willing to run the letter.

Dr. Henry said he talked with the managing editor and Mr. Tom Barton. The letter now is 700 words shorter than the old letter. Mr. Barton was contemplating how he would arrange it on the editorial page. They have an earlier draft of the letter. Therefore, they have an idea of its contents. The letter when completed will not be coming from an individual.

Dr. Williams asked Dr. Henry that when he spoke with Mr. Barton, he spoke to him as the letter coming from the Board.

Dr. Henry answered yes. He said if the Board agrees to submit the letter to the editor, that they ask that the letter not be edited. However, if they do feel that it needs to be edited that they get in touch with the Review Board so that they will be able to see what was edited and give their approval. The letter has already been edited in good faith. He said to be constructive, they should suggest that the newspaper run the letter two or three Sundays consecutively and break it down into smaller sections.

Mr. Engle said the letter has been sent to the Board members numerous times. If they get a committee to write the letter, it will never be completed. May be the Board needs to say forget the letter.

Mr. Howington said he believes it is a well-written letter and his problem is he will have to sign it and it did not come from him.

Ms. Harris explained that any Board member may write a letter just as Mr. Engle did. Or, Mr. Howington as chair, could write the letter, sign it representing the Historic District Board of Review.

Mr. Howington said he believes that if anyone wanted to put their name on the

letter, they would want some input which would go to a committee.

Dr. Henry said the letter was sent to all members of the Review Board.

Mr. Howington believes it is a great letter, but personally there are some things in the letter that he would not say.

Ms. Scheer said the letter is a compilation of everybody's input, therefore, in a way the letter was written by a panel.

Mr. Howington stated that he did not put in any input. There was a lot of input that he would not have put in the letter.

Ms. Caldwell said if there is anything controversial in the letter, may be they can take that out.

Mr. Howington said if the Board feels that they need to write the letter, he will put some edits that he wants to put.

Dr. Williams said he missed the first email. But, he read it recently, but did not send any edits because he just got it. Dr. Williams said, however, he will be happy to submit some edits. Personally, he believes that timeliness is the key. May be at this point, the Board could provide feedback to Ms. Harris.

Dr. Henry said he has talked with all the Board members and nobody suggested a change. He has tried to be definitive and tough. He has been on the Review Board for five years and he has never seen more overruling in his entire life. In his opinion, it is time for this Board to take a stand.

Mr. Engle said the majority of the Board members have already said they will sign the letter.

Dr. Henry said for example may be they can show that the letter was unanimously voted in the meeting of August 13, 2014. Include a special notation that the chair does not vote unless it is to break a tie.

Mr. Engle said a guest editorial letter cannot be more than 600 words.

Mr. Howington said he is in favor of everyone looking at the letter again. He has no issues with the letter. But, as it is written now, he will not put his name thereon as there are some points in it that he will not say.

Dr. Henry said he believes that the only option they have is to wait until the next meeting or have a special called meeting.

Dr. Williams said three of the Board members want to take a more detailed look at the letter. May be they can send feedback to Ms. Harris within a week. Then the letter could be recirculated to the Board members. May be they can show strike-through in the letter. New insertions could be in a different color.

Dr. Henry said his only concern is whether the Board would be meeting illegally when they do this.

Mr. Engle said he believes this why the letter should not be done as a Board, but that they just put there names thereon. This would not require a Board vote.

Mr. Howington said the consensus of the Board is that they will look at the letter and give feedback to Ms. Harris individually by next Wednesday.

Ms. Harris explained that she will take the master document and include all strike-through until she has a completed document. Everyone will be able to see what was struck-through and what was added.

Dr. Henry asked when does the Board send the letter to the editor.

Ms. Harris said the Board will have to vote on when the letter will be sent to the editor.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

43. [Adjourned.](#)

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen Harris
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem