



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
February 12, 2014 1:00 p.m.  
Meeting Minutes

**FEBRUARY 12, 2014 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING**

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

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

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

1. [Order](#)

**Chairman Howington** called the meeting to order at 1:05 and welcomed everyone to the meeting. In attendance at the meeting today were Mr. Justin Gunther's Preservation Economic class (undergraduates), Mr. Chad Keller's Historic Preservation class and Ms. Pinkerton's class. These students are attending SCAD.

**Mr. Howington** outlined the purpose and role of the Historic District Board of Review.

2. [Resolution of Appreciation for Lorie Odom](#)

Attachment: [Resolution of Appreciation for Lorie Odom.pdf](#)

**Mr. Howington** asked Ms. Lorie Odom to come to the podium. He said the Historic District Board of Review wishes to acknowledge and thank her for all of her dedication and hard work which has brought greater awareness of the Certificate of Appropriateness process to downtown citizens, reducing the size and quantity of violations significantly in just over 18 months. He read and presented the Resolution of Appreciation to Ms. Odom.

**Ms. Odom** thanked the Board for the resolution.

3. [Resolution of Appreciation for Linda Ramsay, FAIA](#)

Attachment: [Resolution of Appreciation for Linda Ramsay, FAIA.pdf](#)

**Mr. Howington** presented a Resolution of Appreciation to Ms. Linda Ramsay, FAIA for her service as Chairperson of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review in 2012 and 2013. Ms. Ramsay worked diligently and tirelessly on behalf of the citizens of the Savannah Historic District, displaying a deep commitment to historic preservation, the community, and an abiding concern for its continued well-being. Ms. Ramsay's untiring efforts reflect credit to herself, the Savannah Historic District Board of Review, historic preservation and the community. She now leaves the role of Chairperson and continues to be an active member of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review.

**Ms. Ramsay** thanked the Board and staff for the resolution.

## II. SIGN POSTING

## III. CONSENT AGENDA

4. [Petition of Ward Architecture | 14-000175-COA | 148 Price Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 148 Price Street 14-000175-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Photographs - 148 Price Street 14-000175-COA.pdf](#)

### Board Action:

Approval with the conditions that the proposed new door be inset three inches and that the stain color be submitted to staff for review and approval, - PASS  
because the proposal is visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards.

### Vote Results

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

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

5. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 14-000178-COA | 601 East Bay Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval of the two announcement signs, a supplemental identification sign, and the fascia and projecting principal use signs at 601 East Bay Street because the proposed work meets the standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Nicholas Henry

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

6. [Petition of Aurash Kheradmandi | 14-000182-COA | 300 Drayton Street | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 300 Drayton Street 14-000182-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Description, Photos, and Drawings.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval of the principal use sign fascia sign and principal use projecting sign for the business "Granite" at 300 Drayton Street as requested because the proposed work meets the standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

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

7. [Petition of Dawson Architects | 14-000241-COA | 135 MLK, Jr. Blvd. | Amendment New Construction](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Application - 135 MLK Jr. Blvd 14-000241-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval to add window openings, mechanical louver openings, and for stair tower amendments to the previously approved Certificates of Appropriateness for a six-story hotel, located on the vacant parcel at 135 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (508-512 West Oglethorpe Avenue) because the work is visually compatible and meets the design standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

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

**IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

8. [Adoption of the February 12, 2014 Agenda](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve February 12, 2014 Meeting Agenda. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Linda Ramsay

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

**V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

9. [Approve January 8, 2014 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [01-08-2014 Minutes.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval Minutes of January 12, 2014. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Linda Ramsay

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

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

10. [Petition of Sign Mart Inc. | 14-000149-COA | 111 MLK Jr. BLVD | Sign](#)

**Board Action:**

Remove from the final agenda. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Not Present

11. [Petition of Billy Nelson | 14-000177-COA | 427 Habersham Street | Arbor and Porch](#)

Attachment: [Staff recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 427 Habersham Street 14-000177-COA.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps -00177.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Previous application - Drawings.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Previous application - Photos.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Previous application- Staff Report.pdf](#)

**Mr. Engle** requested that this petition be pulled from today's agenda. The elevation on the plans are not adequate. The drawings are used to judge the impact on other historic structures. The elevations do not show the historical structures. The porch will require the removal of a historical hood that matches the hoods on the rest of the porches. It crosses an historic door opening and none of this is shown on the drawings. The trellis is not shown and this is critical. Mr. Engle said he believes the trellis will be 13.5 feet tall which will require a variance. However, the Board was not given the drawings to make this assessment. The property line is not shown on the site plan. Although the model is nice, the drawings are not adequate.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Howington** said as stated by Mr. Engle, there is justifiable reason to pull this petition. The Board has seen this petition before. There are some additional things included in the Board's packet and an extensively detailed model is before the Board that shows the porch enclosure. He believes the porch's enclosure is in question. The porch is

not expanded in footprint, but is above what is existing.

**Mr. Howington** asked the Board if they feel they have adequate information or do not have adequate information to make a decision.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she believes that Mr. Engle makes a good point. If the Board does not have the dimension item shown on the model and it is not on the drawings, then the Board would be voting on something that they do not know what is the height of it.

**Mr. Engle** said the previous drawings that the Board approved did not include the porch or a 13.5 foot trellis.

**Ms. Harris** clarified [pointing to a section] that the Board previously approved this element. Today what is being requested is this element and a porch enclosure of an existing deck.

**Mr. Lominack** asked Ms. Harris if there is an elevation that shows the rear of the house in relation to the porch.

**Ms. Harris** answered no. It shows the existing relation.

**Mr. Lominack** stated that what he is about to say is not specifically addressed to this project, but he noticed that there are several things on today's agenda that he does not believe satisfies the submittal criteria and application regarding completeness. He said one is a demolition request, there are some free hand drawings that is not to any scale. Mr. Lominack said many times the Board gets things where they are spending their time trying to review when there is not enough to review. It is difficult to review one thing that is inadequate, but when they have several things, it takes too much time trying to decipher what they are. May be they need to be a little more diligent as to what comes before the Board.

**Ms. McClain** stated that she believes the Board came to an agreement at the last meeting that when it is an incomplete submittal, that they would remove it off the agenda. She agrees with Mr. Engle and if there are additional items that are incomplete, they need to take them off the agenda as it is a waste of the petitioner's time as well as the Board's time. The petitioners are here for two or three hours before they are heard and the Board knows already that the petition is an incomplete submittal. Therefore, she believes that the Board needs to handle the incomplete submission before hand rather than later.

**Mr. Howington** said he had a request from the petitioner to speak. He said although the Board is having its discussion, he would like to give the petitioner the opportunity to speak.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Billy Nelson**, designer of the project, came forward and apologized for not giving the Board all the information they need. He said rather than drawing an elevation of the part of the arbor that rises up, he put a note as to the height it. Mr. Nelson said he had a photo of the full back façade. He said he was not aware that this was something that the Board needed. He understood from going online that the project was okay. Mr. Nelson said he

brought with him today some photos of the side panel because he thought there was a concern about what they would be made of.

**Mr. Nelson** explained that the panel would be mirroring or copying the one-by-six planks that are swaged in the fence that was approved previously by the Board. They were trying to stay with this design element on the side walls element of the porch.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the new addition goes over the other property.

**Mr. Nelson** answered no.

**Mr. Lominack** said the main thing that is missing is how the high part of the roof relates to the windows and doors on the rear façade. It appears to be lower than the arch over the window.

**Mr. Nelson** explained that the windows have sort of round arches and brick work. The ledger that he plans to put against the wall to hold the roof was going to be placed above the brick arch so that they would not cross-through. He said in speaking with his client, they did not want to obstruct the window. The windows in question basically will be on the inside of the screened porch.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes the trellis will be nice. However, the biggest problem is when the Board does not get the information they need to ensure that what gets approved and what is built is the same. He does not really have a problem with the design, but the lack of information.

**Mr. Howington** commended Mr. Nelson on a detailed model. The Board has the overall say on what is accepted and not accepted. He explained to Mr. Nelson that on the MPC website, a checklist is there that the petitioner may review to ensure that all the things are included. This petition will be continued to the meeting of March 12, 2014.

**Board Action:**

Continued the petition for the trellis and rear porch - PASS  
due to an incomplete submission.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

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



Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

## VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

### 12. [Petition of Jerry Williams | 13-006206-COA | 510 West Bryan Street | Signs, Fence, and Trellis](#)

#### **Board Action:**

Continued the petition to the March 12, 2014 meeting. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Linda Ramsay  
Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

### 13. [Petition of Hoffman Engineering Group, Inc. | 14-000181-COA | 522 East Gaston Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

#### **Board Action:**

Approve a continuance to the March 12, 2014 HDBR Meeting. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Linda Ramsay  
Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye

Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

## VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

### 14. [Petition of James F. Wubbena | 13-005467-COA | 307-311 East Huntingdon Street | New Construction Townhouses: Part I, Height and Mass and Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- material and specs.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Photographs context.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Photographs.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Site Plan.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Application.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Historic Building Map - Stephens Ward.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

**Mr. James F. Wubbena** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Mr. Howington** explained that at the January 8, 2014 meeting, Mr. Wubbena did not get a chance to speak to the Board because of having missing information. Mr. Wubbena has asked the staff if it would be possible for the Board to review Parts I and II at today's meeting. This is the third time that this project has been before the Board. Mr. Howington said he believes that everyone on the Board is familiar with this project. He believes Mr. Wubbena's request is reasonable that the Board review Parts I and II and unless the Board has opposition to this, they will review Parts I and II today.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the Board approves Part I, is it being said that they will have to approve Part II as well.

**Mr. Howington** answered no. It is left to the discretion of the Board. Part I or II may not be approved. The Board will be reviewing Part I and II today.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass and Part II, Design Details of three attached two-family townhomes for the vacant properties located at 307, 309, and 311 East Huntingdon Street. The townhomes are three-stories high. A variance from the 75 percent lot coverage development standard is requested for each of the three attached two-family townhomes. The lot coverage is proposed to be 78 percent.

**Ms. Harris** stated that the Board continued the petition at the November 13, 2013 meeting in order for the petitioner to:

1. Restudy the design of the entire project to take inspiration from the high-style Victorian design around them without copying an historic building;
2. When restudying the design, preference would be to stay within the 75 percent

maximum lot coverage; and

3. Provide exterior elevations for the east and west facades.

**Ms. Harris** stated that the petitioner revised the design to address the concerns of the Board. However, the Board continued the petition at the January 8, 2014 meeting in order for the petitioner to provide context drawings. She said that the petitioner has provided the context drawings.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass with the condition to simplify the fenestration pattern on the rear façade and eliminate the window indents on the west façade. The staff also recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for a "finding of fact" that the lot coverage variance to allow 78 percent lot coverage for each of the three attached two-family townhomes is visually compatible.

**Dr. Henry** asked staff if the rear porch count towards lot coverage.

**Ms. Harris** answered yes. She said as the Board recalls in the last submittal, the rear porches were 15 feet deep. They have now been revised to be 8 feet deep. She has not done the calculation to see whether they were 7 feet they would meet the 75 percent lot coverage. The petitioner can comment on this. Ms. Harris stated that they may have to be eliminated, but staff feels having rear porches is visually compatible.

**Mr. Engle** said it appears that the rear sidewalk has been eliminated. He believes it is not a part of the backyard. How do they get the trash cans out when parking is here. There was a sidewalk here that went the full length of the block, but now it is no longer here.

**Ms. Harris** explained that this is getting a little into Part II, but her understanding is that a fence will be along this property line with gates. Therefore, the trash could be taken out through the gates into the lane.

**Mr. Engle** said the cars will be parked there.

**Ms. Harris** said one of the conditions of Part II is for the petitioner to provide information on the trash enclosures. This is a question that the petitioner could answer.

**Mr. Lominack** said the Board has reviewed this petition twice. The first time a continuance was requested by the petitioner. He asked if the Board reviewed this a second time.

**Ms. Harris** answered that today is the first presentation that the Board has had regarding this petition. She explained that the staff report and all documentations were provided on the previous agenda.

**Mr. Lominack** said the reason he raised the question is because the staff's report shows "restudy the design of the entire project to take inspiration from the high-style Victorian designs around them without copying an historic building." He asked if this has been ignored.

**Ms. Harris** stated that the petitioner will be able to answer this question.

**Ms. Harris** additionally reported that staff recommends approval of Part II Design Details with the following to be submitted to staff for review and approval because the project is visually compatible and meets the design standards:

1. Simplify the fenestration pattern on the rear façade (per the Part I conditions);
2. Eliminate the window indents on the west façade (per the Part I conditions);
3. Replace the hardiplank siding on the east façade with brick;
4. Select a brick with a more uniform color palette;
5. Ensure the doors are inset no less than three inches from the façade;
6. Select another window make and model which meets the standards;
7. Replace the wood lattice infill beneath the stoops with a brick lattice infill;
8. Ensure that the balusters do not exceed four inches in distance from each other and the railing height does not exceed 36"; and
9. Provide locations of mechanical systems and refuse areas to staff for review and approval.

### PETITIONER COMMENTS

**Mr. Wubbena** said the wood lattice is shown as they are so that the windows beyond the stairs could be seen. It is a brick lattice and they have examples of both wood and brick lattices in this ward from contributing buildings. They have the wood stairs with the wood lattices underneath and the wood stairs with the brick lattices. Mr. Wubbena said his client decided to go with the brick because it is a little more hardy, longer lasting, and better looking in his opinion.

**Mr. Wubbena** said they will provide the dimension, but currently the pickets and railings are definitely less than four inches a part and no higher than 36 inches. He stated that the mechanical system is located on the roof and they will be happy to indicate this for the staff and Board on the roof plan. The trash cans will be in their own yards behind the wood fence that is detailed in the drawings.

**Mr. Engle** said the existing sidewalk from the parking lot is being eliminated by the backyards.

**Mr. Wubbena** said the fence line is snapped to the wrong side of the sidewalk. It should have been snapped to the face of the back stairs. Therefore, the sidewalk will exist. As it is presently, they do not intend to encroach onto the sidewalk or make it unusable. This is just a simple drawing error on their part. He said to be very clear, the fence line will run to the left side of the stairs that they see on the back of their building. The gates will be directly at the bottom of the stairs.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Wubbena if this changes the 78 percent ratio. The City bases their calculations on the area that includes the sidewalk and this could make a big change in the percentage.

**Mr. Wubbena** said the fence does not help them in this aspect, but the back porches will help which is the reason they reduced the back porches. His client owns the sidewalk.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Wubbena if he will correct the drawings.

**Mr. Wubbena** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Wubbena if he was amenable to a different brick.

**Mr. Wubbena** answered yes; they are willing to work with staff and select a better brick if this is what the Board wants.

**Mr. Wubbena** said there are two different types of windows that the company offers. One is wood true divided and the other is vinyl. They used this exact same window on East Broad Street on another approved project because of the wood and the true divided glass. He said obviously their windows do not have any divisions, but they are intended to be wood windows and inset the three inches that are required.

**Mr. Howington** asked if the windows are simulated or true divided.

**Mr. Wubbena** said the windows are true divided, but they are one-over-one. There are no divisions. The only divisions they have are actually on the front porch.

**Ms. Simpson** asked Mr. Wubbena if he was willing to eliminate the window indent on the rest of the façade.

**Mr. Wubbena** answered that they are open to this. He said they put them on here because they felt it was an awful large brick wall and the piece of property that is right there is actually owned by the house that is further down the street. Therefore, there is no likelihood that somebody will build something there. Consequently, they just tried to dress it out; however, if the staff or Board wants them to remove the indents, they will do so.

**Mr. Engle** said he was not sure if the brick screen goes with the wooden fence. Every place that he can think of downtown where there has been a brick screen under the stairs, they are masonry steps, not wood steps.

**Mr. Wubbena** said they have photos that show this condition. He said on the lattice on the right has this under the stairs as well. They did a site visit to verify what was behind the ivy.

**Dr. Williams** said most examples of the raised stoops with the wood stairs have brick infill nor lattice. He said on Taylor Street and Oglethorpe Avenue where you see all sorts of different kinds of porch materials, that there are so much variety with raised stoops that you can always find examples.

**Mr. Wubbena** said they looked at the ones that were close to theirs and, therefore, they took this language and ran with it.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Wubbena if it is his client's desire or his desire to have some form of enclosure or are they agreeable to have it open such as no lattice at all. There is a window behind here.

**Mr. Wubbena** said they would be in agreement to have it open if this was the general consensus to a better solution; this would be fine with them.

**Dr. Williams** said there may be brick underneath all the ivy, but this is not normal. Most of the historic raised porches are made of wood or open underneath. The masonry porches have the more substantial brick lattices.

**Mr. Wubbena** explained that the other façade that is split with brick and the hardiplank is because there is 18 inches of space between their building and the next door neighbor's building. The next door neighbor's building is not built directly on the lot line. Therefore, there was no way for them to ask for the neighbor's permission to adjoin the building to the neighboring building. He said they have actually been investigating this and are not opposed to researching this method. But, they figured if they put the brick far enough back, it would project about four feet beyond the neighbor's building corner, it would eliminate the visual of the hardiplank siding. This makes it hard for stuccoing and anything. There are a lot of examples of stucco on these types of walls and there is up to two feet of space between them.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they agree with the staff's recommendations for Part I. However, they do not agree with eliminating the window indentations. They believe that the window indentations help to relief the harshness of the blank wall facing the neighboring house and the side garden. She said particularly in this case as a building will not be built as a garden is here which will be open space and will be viewed to this façade. Therefore, they believe it is appropriate in this situation. This technique has been used in multiple new construction projects throughout the district. They feel that it is a successful treatment. Ms. Meunier said it was confused in the staff's report, but it is actually the east façade and not the west façade. She stated again that the HSF feels the windows indentations should be kept on the east façade.

**Ms. Meunier** said regarding Part II, Design Details, they suggest consideration of two-over-two windows as opposed to the one-over-one windows as they feel it is more in keeping with the Italianate style and character of the proposed properties. She said also the doors that lead to the balconies on the front façade at the top level, they recommend they be four pane glass doors as opposed to eight pane glass doors. This would be more in keeping with two-over-two windows.

**Ms. Meunier** said the HSF suggests that staff review the detailing of the brackets under the eave of the building for dimensions and proportionality on the final level.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said he is concerned that the Board does not have an idea where the HVAC units will be located on the roof. They are being asked to approve height and mass and this will include where the HVAC units are located. They could be surprised with having a full view of the HVAC units. He said if the Board approves the height and mass it has to be with the stipulation that the HVAC units are not visible from the front elevation. It would be nice for the neighbors on the east that HVAC units are not visible, if possible, from their garden.

**Mr. Engle** said he concurs with the HSF regarding the indents as they really add something

to the brick wall. Therefore, in this case, he believes the indentations should remain.

**Mr. Lominack** said he is concerned about the neighborhood and the neighboring buildings and he was not suggesting doing a Victorian building here. But somehow not recognizing the quality of that street and the neighborhood does not feel right to him.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she agrees with Mr. Lominack. She is deeply concerned at the proliferation of these brick boxes downtown. This appears to be the "go to" design wherever the project is. They are on different streets. This is less correct on Huntingdon Street than it was in the other places that they have done it. Ms. Ramsay said she is concerned.

**Dr. Henry** said he concurs. This is an Italianate block, but the proposal does not look Italianate to him.

**Dr. Williams** said that there is a similar row units on the 200 block of West Bolton Street on the west side of Forsyth Park. There are approximately eight houses, same height, and Italianate. The Italianate features are the brackets and cornice and segmental arches are over the windows; although this example he is looking at now has segmental top sashes and flat sashes. The porches are similar with the exception that this one has the covered stoop rather than an open stoop. Therefore, they have reasonable Italianate character, but variations are on the Italianate rather it is a standing or freestanding mansion or row houses. Dr. Williams stated that row houses tend to be simpler. Therefore, there is a precedent on the west side of Forsyth Park in the mid 200 block that has this kind of variety.

**Mr. Lominack** said he wanted to be clear; he was not suggesting a period style building be here. But, he was suggesting that a look be taken at what is around here before designing a view. A 21st century building should still take into account the architecture feel of the things that are around it.

**Mr. Engle** said he agrees with the comments that have been made today. If they look at the rest of the buildings within the block, the masonry is phenomenal. There are many kinds of enrichments in this area, but is not shown on what they see today. However, there is still an opportunity under Part II design details to do so. The fake colonial handmade brick is not the brick to do something with texture and color to enlighten these buildings. Something more compatible with the neighborhood is needed.

**Mr. Lominack** said the wonderful porches and all the other brick elements that make something feel like a neighborhood is needed.

**Mr. Engle** said they are beginning to see this over and over in every design that they see.

**Mr. Howington** said the Board would now discuss Part II - Design Details. He said he would like to see the outside railing line up with the outside of the porch at the column. This will make the stoop not heavy. He said on the building section, the water table that runs at the floor level, actually the base of the building projects out and the brick width creates a heavy bottom. Mr. Howington said he believes this is a very unusual type of construction. He does not know rather the petitioner would be willing to make this a clean solid wall so that the upper level would be flush with the lower level.

**Mr. Lominack** said the rail actually runs into the shutter.

**Mr. Howington** said this could be cleaned up by just pulling it back so that the outside of the railing runs with the outside of the column. Presently, it is a little too top heavy; it is not visually compatible.

**Dr. Henry** said he is in agreement with the HSF concerning the indents and windows on the east façade.

**Mr. Engle** said the Italianate character is wanted, there should be more variety on the windows. The main thing is to get rid of that brick. The opportunity with masonry is to enrich this building. Staff is saying one color brick, but he is not sure this is the answer. Maybe the petitioner needs to be going to two or three terms and go with diapering and try to get some enrichment in the masonry to carry the Italianate feeling. By eliminating the brick under the stairs, money will be saved that could be used on other masonry. He believes that the opportunity is still here accepting the height and mass to make these a lot richer than they are instead of looking like a Colonial row with an Italianate cornice.

**Dr. Williams** said what he is hearing is continuance on Part II. A suggestion is being made for some significant enrichments. He agrees that this is a special block. He agrees that this needs to be restudied.

**Mr. Howington** informed Mr. Wubbena that the Board wants to ask him two questions. He asked him to please come to the podium.

**Mr. Howington** told Mr. Wubbena that he did not see any real details of the metal eyebrow over the windows. Are there any examples of the eyebrow over a door without a transom?

**Mr. Wubbena** said they have lots of photos. His client has researched quite a few different buildings that are on his block that do just this. Actually, the eyebrows are helping to change this. They would rather have them made out of cast stone because there are similar eyebrows on this block that are made out of cast stone. Therefore, they feel as though there has been a lot of time studying the adjacent buildings on this specific block and then even going a block north and south and a couple of blocks east and west to see what exactly is here that is adjacent to this particular block.

**Mr. Wubbena** explained that taking the arched windows and going with the cast stone is one of the examples that they found. There is plenty examples of brick work that are exactly like their elevation and very close to their lot. The same goes for the cornice at the top. Therefore, they did not ignore the buildings around them as they literally studied different examples. Now, did the brick buildings they saw have that cornice. He said the answer is yes; they also had the arched windows and the cast stone eyebrow. Mr. Wubbena said there is a lot of language that they took from neighboring buildings very close to theirs to gain the front elevation. If there are comments that the Board would like to see them do, they have no issues with making the adjustments as needed. They will work with staff; they have no problems with the brick colors; if several different tones of brick is wanted, they are not against that.



**Mr. Wubbena** said his client definitely likes the brick buildings on his block and wants his building to blend with those buildings as well. He said they have additional photos of a lot of examples with addresses if the Board wants to see them.

**Mr. Howington** said Mr. Wubbena has done a lot of research, but he did not see the example of a door without a transom that had the arch over it.

**Mr. Lominack** said a building is a single statement; it should all fit together as one thing. They get too much of the stuff. They get there is one down there; there is one over there, etc. This is not what it is about. It is all about how the entire thing feels with in a neighborhood and this Board is not seeing this on many things that come before them. This is frustrating.

**Dr. Henry** said he should have made this statement when they were looking at Part I. The Downtown Neighborhood Association [he is on this board] is looking into the possibility of getting the southeast quadrant of the Landmark District to be designated as the "Castle District."

**Mr. Howington** informed Mr. Wubbena that he is getting a consensus from the Board that there are too many items that need clarification. He told him that the Board cannot request that Part II be continued, but he could do so.

**Mr. Wubbena** asked for a continuance on Part II.

**Ms. Harris** suggested that if the Board want to make a finding fact and vote on the lot coverage variance, this would allow the petitioner to move forward with the Zoning Board of Appeals processing. This is a matter of procedure.

**Board Action:**

Approved the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of three attached two-family townhomes for the vacant properties located at 307, 309 and 311 East Huntingdon Street with the following conditions:

1. Revise the site plan to show the correct location of the rear fence;
2. Simplify the fenestration pattern on the rear façade;
3. Ensure the HVAC units are not visible from the public right-of-way or from the adjacent building to the east;

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

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the 75% lot coverage - PASS

standard to allow for 78% lot coverage for each of the three lots located at 307, 309 and 311 East Huntingdon Street because the project is visually compatible and meets the variance criteria.

At the request of the petitioner, the Savannah Historic Board of Review continued the petition for New Construction: Part II, Design Details of three (3) attached two-family townhomes for the vacant properties located at 307, 309, and 311 East Huntingdon Street in order for the petitioner to restudy various aspects of the detailing.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Ebony Simpson

Second: Robin Williams

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

15. [Petition of Tracy Harvey | 13-005761-COA | 612 Price Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Mercer Ward Map.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [2007 Photograph.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [610 Price Street Subpoena.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Tracy Harvey** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to remove a portion of roof and wall above a three foot wide access lane between this property (612 Price Street) and 610 Price Street (to the north). The petition was continued from the December 11, 2013 Board meeting in order for the petitioner of work with the Historic Savannah Foundation and the City's Property Maintenance Department to explore alternatives to removal.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff 's recommendation was to continue the petition to remove the roof and siding/wall over the access lane between the historic residences located at 610 and 612 Price Street until the owner of 610 corrects the roof as requested by the City Inspector or until after the court date for the owner of 610 Price Street. The court date actually took place on Monday, February 10, 2014. However, the owner did not show up for court. Now, the court date has been continued to March 3, 2014.

**Ms. Michalak** said the inspector explained at Recorder's Court that she intends to ask the judge to give 610 Price Street only 30 days to repair the roof once he appears in court. Ms. Michalak said, therefore, staff recommends that this petition be continued until either the roof is actually repaired or until the court date is held.

**Dr. Henry** said he wanted to be sure he understood what is happening. He asked if the property owner of 610 Price Street is a "no show" for court, what happens?

**Ms. Michalak** answered that the decision is left to the discretion of the judge. Therefore, she does not know.

**Dr. Henry** said this could go on forever.

**Mr. Merriman** said he shares the same concerns as Dr. Henry. Even with issuing a warrant, this could go on for years. In the meantime, what happens for Ms. Harvey?

**Ms. Michalak** said this is why she is recommending to the Board to continue this petition one more time before they make a decision on this petition. She said with the property owner being summoned for court, this is somewhat a break because up to this time, no subpoena was issued. A court date was set approximately one week after the subpoena was issued. Therefore, she believes this was expeditious.

**Mr. Merriman** asked when does the time come for the Board not to continue this any longer and inform the petitioner that it is okay for her to remove a portion of the roof and wall that is causing the trouble. What happens to the derelict property next to her? Will she have to board it up where she has detached herself from it?

**Ms. Michalak** stated that the petitioner has a design to finish the end of her building.

**Mr. Merriman** asked what happens with the open hole of the petitioner's building where it was once attached to the other property.

**Ms. Michalak** said she was saying that Ms. Harvey has a design to actually finish her side. The petitioner has said that she will answer this question when she makes her comments.

**Mr. Engle** said the City has the right to move in and repair the roof. This is what was done two blocks from him. The people were ignoring the needed work. The City hired a contractor and the repairs were done. Then the City billed the owner.

#### PETITIONER COMMENTS

**Ms. Harvey** asked the Board if they received the letter she sent them in January 2014.

**Mr. Howington** answered that the Board received the letter in their packet.

**Ms. Harvey** explained that this situation has been ongoing since June or July, 2011. Therefore, this did not just start when she made an application with the Historic Review Board. She was not sure whether the Board has seen a picture of the building that was condemned where the two rooflines meet and the foundation is falling. All of this impacts her building. When the tenants moved out, they hit her porch with their truck. The water was turned off last month and now they are having pest control issues. Ms. Harvey said rats have moved into the roof and cockroaches are getting into her house. She does not know when this will end. Ms. Harvey asked the Board to please give her a date.

**Ms. Harvey** said regarding the contractor, her plan is to complete the house that is falling in. They wanted to make sure they reseal it, cover it and ensure that what they do will not cause anymore leaks to the property. She believes that Mr. Carey made an offer to assist the property owner with their repairs, but if the owner is not willing to do it and take an easement on his property, there is nothing Mr. Carey can do.

**Ms. Harvey** said she does not believe that the property owner will report for court on March 3. He is trying to sell the house and she believes it is under a contract. Her fear is that nothing will be done. She said her fear is that it does not appear that there is any control for the City to do something about this.

**Mr. Lominack** asked Ms. Harvey if the entire piece is on her property.

**Ms. Harvey** answered that entire alleyway is her property. If the Board looks at the lot lines, it goes to the siding of the house.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Harvey if she has explored retaining the appearance it has now, but achieving the detachment that she wants. Is this a flat ceiling?

**Ms. Harvey** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** asked if there is basically a triangular space between the two houses.

**Ms. Harvey** said [pointing to an area] that the roofs come together all the way down. She said this alone will cost her \$4,000.00. She said she does not have anymore resources, this is all she has. Ms. Harvey stated that she does not even have that.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said that Mr. Carey is the person who has taken the lead on this issue. The HSF agrees with the staff's recommendation to continue this petition in order to see what happens at the next court date. They believe that this is a very character defining feature of this property and, therefore, they are hopeful of coming to the best resolution that would keep this intact. But, obviously working with the property owner of 610 Price Street has proven to be very difficult. Ms. Meunier said the HSF has been talking with the owner as well as property maintenance. They will like to see what will happen at the next court meeting. Hopefully, there will be a resolution.

**Ms. Katie Purcell**, resident of the neighborhood, said by not doing anything to correct the problem, there will be potential damage and lost to an existing historic structure. Ms. Purcell was hopeful that the Board would do something to help Ms. Harvey.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes that Ms. Harvey has been through enough. There is no assurance whatsoever and no timeline when anything will be done to correct the problem. To allow Ms. Harvey's building to be destroyed with the hope of saving another building does not make sense. She should be able to save and protect her building from an irresponsible neighbor regardless of how historic that next door building may be.

**Dr. Williams** said he was wondering if there is a way to achieve the petitioner's request without a complete severing.

**Mr. Lominack** said he does not know if there is a great deal of lost to lose that.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes it would be very expensive to the weight of that roof. He believes that once it is severed, it will look that way. He agrees with Mr. Lominack that the petitioner has been through a lot and he does not have any faith in the March 3, 2014 court date. This Board is designed to preserve and save the fabric of the building. This is a character defining feature. However, it is a character defining feature that could be documented and replaced one day just as other features sometimes are.

**Mr. Merriman** said he, too, believes that Ms. Harvey has been through enough. If this was his property he would want to cut a way and be done with it. But, like Mr. Howington has stated knowing that it is a character defining feature and it is a historic fabric, he believes the least they could do to try to honor what they should be doing is to grant the continuance as recommended by the staff.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes that Ms. Harvey has requested a definitive date. He agrees that the Board should not continue this petition over and over. Ms. Harvey has to request the continuance in order for the Board to continue this petition.

**Mr. Engle** said what concerns him as he is reading the staff's report, it says that there has been no new interior damage since the building was repaired.

**Ms. Michalak** said there has been no interior damage, but as the Board can see from the pictures, the water is pouring down on the inside of the wall.

**Mr. Engle** said this is the wall next door.

**Ms. Michalak** said no, this is Ms. Harvey's property. Ms. Harvey replaced all that wood, but now it is rotten again.

**Mr. Engle** said the question is that since the boards are running front to back, the joist that is supporting the ceiling boards are going left to right. The Historic Savannah Foundation was going to try to investigate the cantilevers on the roof frame of Ms. Harvey's house. This was the reason the Board approved to continue this so they could find out what the

structure is. If there are cantilevers from the roof structure of Ms. Harvey's house, then two or three inches could be cut off and it would not need any support.

**Mr. Howington** said he is not a structural engineer, but he assumes that it is not as easy as it appears. He will be careful about trying to cut off something that will look like a cut off. The Board needs to be careful about this.

**Mr. Merriman** said the property owner of 610 Price Street did not show for court the last time. He may not show on March 3, 2014. This could be the same story month after month. But, this Board cannot let this be the same story here. There has to come a time when the Board will have to cut this off and let Ms. Harvey have some relief.

**Ms. McClain** explained that the property owner of 610 Price Street has property rights as well. The judge would not have continued it if that was not the case. Therefore, this Board has to be mindful of that.

**Mr. Merriman** asked if the property owner did not receive a subpoena to show up for court.

**Ms. McClain** said this Board does not know the specifics of that. There are a lot of deficiencies with court processes. This Board cannot just "assume."

**Dr. Henry** stated that he believes Ms. Harvey wanted to speak to the Board. He asked her what she wanted to speak about.

**Ms. Harvey** said she just wanted to let the Board know that the property owner of 610 Price Street works for the City of Savannah. He was contacted by Inspector Summers to come pick up his subpoena. Since he did not pick up the subpoena, Ms. Summers contacted his supervisor who forced him to come. Therefore, the property owner did receive his subpoena.

**Mr. Lominack** stated that it has been said that the property owner has rights, but does he have rights to damage other people's property. If the house next door has rats, termites, etc., they do not know the property lines and will cross over from one property line to the other quickly. Mr. Lominack said he is concerned that not only will that house that has all the damages done to it will be lost, but this house will be lost in the process. Is this a win situation?

**Mr. Merriman** said demolition by neglect is something also to be frowned upon. If the property owner got the subpoena and works for the City, he will have to go to show up soon or later especially if his supervisor made if go pick up the subpoena. He will not be able to sit this out forever. A court date is set for March 3, 2014.

**Dr. Henry** said an entire block of row houses are connected. If you want to waste an entire block, by not taking any action is the way to do it.

**Ms. Simpson** asked in the event that HSF is unable to do the study, how does this Board respond. It has already been three months.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Meunier why the HSF did not give a report on the study.

**Ms. Meunier** answered that she does not believe that they promised to do a "study." But, they offered their services to explore the situation. She was not a party to this and Mr. Carey is out of the state. Ms. Meunier said she tried to get in touch with him to get the details, but was unable to do so. However, she knows that Mr. Carey has been working primarily with Property Maintenance and the reports and feedback that they have given him up to this point. She knows that they cannot get into 610 Price Street obviously without the owner to look at what is happening on this end.

**Mr. Howington** stated that as he recalls, there was never an agreement to do a study. There was an agreement that the Historic Savannah Foundation would offer any assistance that was asked for.

**Ms. Simpson** said, therefore, the property owner may not have allowed Historic Savannah to enter into the building to review the project. At this point, how does this Board move forward. They have to decide soon or later.

**Mr. Howington** asked Ms. Harvey if she had a comment related to the help of outside parties.

**Ms. Harvey** stated that she does not believe that Historic Savannah agreed to do a study. She said that Mr. Carey met with Mr. Linwood, who is the person that runs Property Maintenance, to offer to the owners that when they met with him that they would be willing to do some of the work for easements on the property. However, if they cannot get the owner to respond, they cannot make the offer.

**Mr. Engle** said he believes the Board should continue this petition one more month.

**Mr. Howington** said he would accept a motion for a continuance or vote. He would like to put a limit on the continuance if this is considered.

**Dr. Williams** asked if a one month limit would allow enough time for the next court date. He said if the court date is continued, he would only give one more month at the maximum.

**Mr. Howington** agreed and said at that time, the Board would make its decision. He explained that if Ms. Harvey is agreeable to allowing one more month to allow for the court date, would be the time limit that the Ms. Harvey requested. Mr. Howington explained to Ms. Harvey that it is her option to ask for a continuance or to ask for a vote.

**Ms. Harvey** said she would ask for a continuance to the court date, which is March 3, 2014 plus the 30 days that the petitioner has to fix the roof, but if it is not done at that point, she would like for the Board to vote on her petition on April 9, 2014. She does not want to take another day off her job to come to the meeting again.

**Board Action:**

Continued the petition to remove the roof and siding/wall over the access lane between the

historic residences located at 610 and 612 Price Street until the owner of 610 Price Street corrects the roof as requested by the City Inspector or until after the court date, set for March 3, 2014, for the owner of 610 Price Street. The petition is continued to the April 9, 2014 HDBR meeting. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Linda Ramsay

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

16. [Petition of Josh Bull, Greenline Architecture | 13-006344-COA | 601 East Bay Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Memo.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Trustees' Garden Ward- ADJACENT.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Washington Ward.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps -6344.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Context Photographs.pdf](#)

**NOTE: Mr. Howington relinquished the chair and abstained from discussion in this petition as he is an employee of Greenline Architecture. The Vice-Chair, Ms. Simpson, was not available to chair the petition. Ms. Linda Ramsay served as chair during the hearing of this petition.**

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

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of various alterations to the structures associated with 601 East Bay Street, also known as the Mulberry Inn. The alterations include:

1. Demolition of the existing pool house and associated walls and gates (on the interior of the property);
2. Construction of a new pool house and fire pump room;
3. Construction of a new trellis;
4. New brick wall and gate along East Bryan Street;
5. Move the previously approve gate on East Broad Street to the south, still along East Broad Street.



**Ms. Harris** stated that on January 8, 2014, a petition was heard by the Board and was continued in order for the petitioner to:

1. Restudy the roof shape and design to be more compatible with the contributing buildings with which it is associated;
2. Restudy the gate on East Broad Street to address the City's safety concerns;
3. Restudy the configuration of and establish a wall of continuity along East Bryan Street; and
4. Restudy the trellis to meet the standards.

**Ms. Harris** reported that the petitioner has subsequently revised the drawings to address the Board's concerns as well as the City's SPR prior comments. The SPR for the project was held on February 10, 2014. Staff attended the SPR meeting and there were no concerns expressed by the City with the revised design. The Fire Marshal wanted to have a little closer look and if there are proposed alterations by the Fire Marshal, the petitioner with either return to the staff or Board as appropriate depending on the degree of alterations. But, nothing was expressed at the meeting.

**Ms. Harris** additionally reported that staff recommends approval of the demolition of the existing pool house and associated walls and gates, construction of the two new accessory buildings, new walls and gates, and new trellis because the project is visually compatible and meets the design standards.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Deering** came forward and entertained questions from the Board.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said this submittal is much better than the last submission.

#### **Board Action:**

Approval of the demolition of the existing pool house and associated walls and gates, construction of the two new accessory buildings, new walls and gates, and new trellis because the project is visually compatible and meets the design standards. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle  
Second: T. Jerry Lominack  
Reed Engle - Aye

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

17. [Petition of Harry Kyriakides | 14-000166-COA | 41 Whitaker Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 41 Whitaker Street 14-000166-COA.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Staff Photographs - Existing Conditions.pdf](#)

Attachment: [2006 and 2012 Photographs.pdf](#)

**Mr. Harry Kyriakides** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to alter the front façade of the building located at 41 Whitaker Street. The Board reviewed this petition at the January 8, 2014 meeting and denied the after-the-fact alterations to the front façade.

**Ms. Michalak** said the petitioner has submitted another application requesting to alter the current design and provided the following three options:

1. Remove the window, T-111 siding and trim and replace it with stucco to match the existing stucco above on the north end of the storefront.
2. Replace the T-111 with new tile that will match the existing as closely as possible. Also, increase the height of the window to 6 feet.
3. Replace the T-111 siding with new tile that will match the existing as closely as possible and remove the window.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that in the January 8, 2014 Staff report, staff recommended that the window, T-111 siding and trim be removed and the T-111 area be stuccoed with a texture and color to match the adjacent existing stucco. She said because staff's recommendation was consistent with "option 1," this is the design that they have used in their report.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval to alter the front façade of the building located at 41 Whitaker Street because the proposed stucco meets the preservation standards and is visually compatible.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked if the staff was basing their report and approval on is the area with the T-111 in the window.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes. This is the only area that was hit by the car.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked, therefore, the tile will remain. But, this is not what the sketch

shows.

**Ms. Michalak** said she understood, but staff felt that the drawings were not necessary for this option to simply state they were taken off the T-111, take out the window and replace it with stucco. A drawing would not be required for a material change such as this.

**Mr. Lominack** asked that the area to the right between the awning and the pilaster is this tile.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes.

**Mr. Lominack** said if they look at the building's elevation, there will be tile, door, window, door, and stucco. Is this right?

**Ms. Michalak** answered no.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes there is nothing else in question except where the car hit the building.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that the rest of it was preexisting; she said [pointing to an area] that it was the only section that was altered on this project.

**Mr. Engle** asked when was the tile put on.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that she believes the tile was put on after Sushi Zen left. Therefore, they believe it was in 2007 or 2008. She said apparently it was done without a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). There is no documentation pertaining to this.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the door will remain.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes; it was there before. They are only talking about the area that was hit by the car.

**Mr. Howington** asked to clarify and be sure, there is some T-111 that wraps the corner and into the door. Therefore, he believes this area will be stucco as well. He said this is shown on picture number 5.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that Mr. Howington is correct. However, clarification is needed from the petitioner that this has to be stucco as well. The Board can also put this into their motion that this area has to be stucco also.

**Mr. Engle** asked Ms. Michalak if staff was going to ask the petitioner to supply a small test patch so they do not end up with a third or fourth color in material here.

**Ms. Michalak** said the Board could put the request for a small test patch by the petitioner into their motion as well.

**Mr. Merriman** asked doesn't a test patch has to be reviewed by staff to ensure that it complies.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that this is not a requirement to have a stucco test patch, but repointing requires a test patch. But, they can require a test patch for stucco if they believe it is necessary. There is enough textures on this building; therefore, the color and texture should match the other stucco as well.

**Mr. Merriman** asked where did the door come from.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that this door as been there for some time. There is no record of its approval and the photos that she found, you could not see into that opening. Therefore, staff does not know when this was installed.

**Mr. Lominack** asked staff why they opted the option they did for the stucco as opposed to continuing the tile.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that staff does not believe that the petitioner will be able to match the tile. She feels it could confuse the façade even more. But, the stucco can be matched.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if another pattern and texture will be introduced here.

**Ms. Michalak** answered no. Staff is recommending that it match what is already here.

**Mr. Howington** explained that he believes the discussion centered around that may be in the future the tile could be removed and this would be stuccoed as well. Therefore, it would be back close to what it was.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Kyriakides** asked that if he puts stucco here, it has to match the other end so that it will look the same.

**Mr. Howington** answered yes.

**Mr. Kyriakides** said he will be willing to put the stucco or he will put tile there making it the way it was before it was damaged. However, what the Board wants him to do is fine. He would also like to put a window here.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Kyriakides if he would be willing to wrap around and go inside the doorway as well with stucco.

**Mr. Kyriakides** answered yes. It will not be the same size, but it will match; it will be the same color as what is there now.

**Mr. Howington** informed Mr. Kyriakides that he believes the idea is for it to be flush with the upper portion.

**Mr. Engle** said if they look at the historic photographs, it is not flush.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes that they are just filling in and are not going back to what was here.

**Mr. Engle** stated again that it is not flush. He asked Mr. Kyriakides if the Board could talk him into removing all the tile.

**Mr. Kyriakides** stated that if he starts taking the tile off, he will have to go back to what it was in 1920 and this would cost him more than \$50,000 to do the front. He said that the windows and doors were 20 feet high with arches on top.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** stated that whoever makes the motion needs to include that a stucco test patch be done for staff's review and approval.

**Board Action:**

Approval to alter the front façade of the building located at 41 Whitaker Street because the proposed stucco meets the preservation standards and is visually compatible with the conditions that:

1. The stucco extends into the recessed door opening located at the south end of the façade.
  2. The stucco texture and color match that of the existing stucco on the façade.
  3. The petitioner provides a 4 foot by 4 foot stucco test patch for review and approval by staff prior to the full execution of the work.
- PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Robin Williams

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

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [MPC File Picture.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [1973 Sanborn.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Decker Ward.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application and Supplementary information - 240 West Broughton Street 14-000193-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Rear Photo.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to demolish the structure at 240 West Broughton Street. On November 26, 2013, staff approved the exploratory demolition of the stucco façade in order to ascertain the existence of original historic fabric beneath. It is staff's understanding that the exploratory demolition was not undertaken as the property owner transfer has not yet occurred.

**Ms. Harris** stated that 240 West Broughton was constructed in 1924 and likely altered sometime in the early 1970s. Alterations included window reconfiguration and replacement, applied stucco on the south and east facades, and alterations to the parapet. It is not clear if these alterations destroyed the historic integrity of the building, particularly as the north (rear) façade of the building is intact. She said staff also has concerns about the ability to demolish 240 West Broughton Street without causing structural damage to 246 West Broughton Street.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends continuing the petition for demolition of 240 West Broughton Street until additional information and exploratory demolition can be provided to substantiate that the historic integrity of the building has been lost, and additional information to ensure that the structural integrity of 246 West Broughton Street will not be damaged.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked staff if they have maps that go back further than the 1970s.

**Ms. Harris** answered that staff has maps that go back further than the 1970s, but these maps contain the same information.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked for clarification on staff's statement concerning the building possibly losing its historic integrity. Does this pertain only to the front façade?

**Ms. Harris** answered that she was not saying that the building has lost its historic integrity, but she is saying that it is a noncontributing building and the reason it is noncontributing is because it was perceived that it had lost its historic integrity. However, she is recommending that this petition be continued until this fact can be verified either through exploratory demolition or other means.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** stated that her experience working on Broughton Street has been that there are layers upon layers of history that are covered up. This building does not appear to her that it is a noncontributing building just because it cannot be determined that it is.

**Ms. Harris** said just for clarification for the Board, in order to be considered as a contributing structure, than as a designation that is part of a historic building's map has to be approved by City Council. Therefore, it is a noncontributing building because it is not listed on the map. This is the only way. She said now if it is eligible, she is in agreement that they cannot determine from the information that is available if it should be considered contributing. But as she has said, currently it is not.

**Mr. Engle** stated that he believes when the determinations were done, they were done incorrectly. This property may be listed by the post office as two buildings. But, it is one building. Therefore, they can play the post office game and say it has two different addresses, but it is one structure. He said part of this one structure has been altered. However, the entire building is either contributory or not contributory. Today, if this building went through the Secretary's of Internal Review, they would not be able to say that half of the building is noncontributory.

**Ms. Harris** said the building is on two separate parcels. At different parts of time, there were as many as four addresses here. This is why they see the variance between 246 to 240. Some point in time the addresses were 246, 244, 242, and 240. Ms. Harris said she believes that the Sanborn Map gets to Mr. Engle's point that this dash line in between is not a structural wall.

**Mr. Merriman** questioned what are some of the criteria that the building would have to meet in order for it to be recommended that it be considered contributing.

**Ms. Harris** explained that they would follow the National Park Service Standards which is the first criteria for eligibility that it is 50 years old or older. But, this is not the only criteria has the building would have to possess architectural or significance or there are other criteria that can be associated. Ms. Harris said there are several different criteria, but the first cut off is 50 years old. However, just because it is 50 years old does not mean that it is historic. In this case she believes the criteria that this building would fall under is architectural significance.

**Mr. Merriman** asked that if this building was demolished, would it affect the contributing characteristics that it is attached to?

**Ms. Harris** answered that if the attached building was damaged, it could potentially affect the contributing characteristics. But, the designation of 246 as contributing was not predicated on the others as being noncontributing.

**Dr. Henry** said it appears that the probable situation is that they put a new façade in front of an old plan. This would certainly render it a significant building of some sort.

**Mr. Engle** asked how many buildings have they restored the front elevation on Broughton Street. Even if everything was dropped, it can be restored.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ben Carter** said that Mr. Phelps is consulting with and helping them understand the process of the building and the historic properties on Broughton Street. He is trying to

learn the process, learn how it works, and how they can collaborate and help get things done. He said his perspective of this is a little different from the dialogue that he has heard today. Mr. Hansen is his expert.

**Mr. Carter** stated that a beautiful four-story building was next door to this building. He is trying to recreate that building. The reason he wants to demolish 240 is that he wants to recreate the building that was torn down. He wants to build a four-story structure there that replaces that old architecture. He explained, therefore, the context of this request is that he needs the Board to understand is not as it relates to just demolishing this building, but he is trying to bring back the larger historic building that was there before.

**Mr. Carter** said a part of his challenge as a developer in the Historic District is that there are a number of people that they would like to bring to the Historic District is retailers who do not fit the 30 x 90 footprint. This is a very difficult urban footprint and it is there because these are very old buildings and they are special. He is getting ready to make a huge investment because they are special. He said he respects this and appreciates it. Mr. Carter said his business probably does not matter to the Board. But, there are certain international retailers that are known to be in the best historic properties around the world that like to come to these historic districts that are in the process of revitalization and enhancement and be what is called an anchored tenant. This particular tenant wants 25,000 square feet. They cannot fit a floor plate less than 800 square feet. The company's name is H&M. They are internationally known brand is adapted into historic buildings all over the world in some of the most famous historic districts in the world.

**Mr. Carter** said he was simply asking that the context of this consideration for him is different. One dialogue is what happens to this building that used to be four occupants; the other dialogue is what happened to the building that used to be Chatham Furniture. Therefore, he is coming at it from the right side going left. He wants to recreate the Chatham Furniture building. They have historic photographs of it and it is not what was torn down in the parking lot, it is not big enough to accommodate a world class leader in urban redevelopment of retail. These people are more famous than Urban Outfitters; they are more famous than Anthropology; they are all over the world in historic districts.

**Mr. Carter** encouraged the Board to take a look at the H&M stores around the world. He said this company loves and embraces architecture. They collaborated with SCAD for a two weeks design charrette where they worked with them on recreating that building. Mr. Carter entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Engle** said the furniture store was only in the vacant lot. He told Mr. Carter that what he wants to build with not be replica of the furniture store. Therefore, it will be a fake.

**Mr. Carter** said it could be called that. He stated that all he was saying is that the furniture store replicated will not accommodate a retailer that is known in this country for revitalizing downtowns and all over the world. He said he could replicate the other building.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Carter if he could not restore 240 and recreate the furniture store.

**Mr. Carter** answered that he has to have floors on top of 240.



**Dr. Williams** said the height map shows four floors for this area.

**Mr. Carter** said he would have a four-story façade on top of that next to a four-story building it versus a beautiful new four story building.

**Ms. Simpson** stated that personally she is excited that this type of store is coming to town and she has a background that economic development along Broughton Street is very important. However, this Board cannot concern itself with the type of retail that goes in there. She said that they cannot base what they decide today on the type of retail.

**Mr. Carter** said he was not asking the Board to do so. He was only sharing with the Board his business perspective. He said Mr. Phelps will now share with the Board what the store photograph of what it looked like. It was a beautiful property.

**Mr. Phelps** said they met with staff when this request was made and created a dialogue about it as this is not an easy process going through with a demolition of a building, any building whether it is contributing or noncontributing, whatever its rating, and whatever date it was built. He said they have done extensive research on this building and poked around in the interior as much as they could. Mr. Phelps said they do understand that there is the ability to pull the façade and pull the layers back, but he believes that he has enough information to share with the Board the history of the building, its context, what the building actually is and hope to convince a vote. If not, then they will be happy to continue and keep doing their investigation. He told the Board that if they do not mind, he would take the time now and show them what they have done thus far.

**Mr. Phelps** pointed out the location where 240 is located and said that McDonald's is the existing condition. He said early renovation was done in 1981-82 and McDonald's was currently restored in the past couple of years. He had a copy of the MPC's report that was done in the late 1980s. Mr. Phelps told Mr. Engle that he is aware of the post office's designation, but this property has two separate pin numbers, two separate pin numbers, two separate addresses, and they are two separate properties. One has been classified, which is McDonald's, as contributing and the other has been classified as a non-historic building.

**Mr. Engle** said they cannot say that the building is non-historic as it is historic, but is noncontributing.

**Mr. Phelps** said let's follow-through with the research. The building was built in 1924 as a single building. In the 1950s, an extensive renovation was completed. He said maybe the Board could see the head height of the window that is aligning; the sill definitely does not align and if the Board notices compared to the original photograph, that the structure column has been removed to allow for that window. He said that the entire ground floor retail storefront retail has been removed and replaced. In the 1980s another renovation was done. They can see that these windows sills were actually lower than these window sills. Therefore, more materials were removed; material has been in-filled. Mr. Phelps said [pointing to an area] and material has been in-filled here and not just in the openings, but structurally. There need to be some modifications carried into the building to carry that canopy. So, they know that this has been modified. There should be lentils or bricks; the bricks and lentils here have been modified; removed and probably replaced to create that opening and these openings.

**Mr. Phelps** showed a photograph of the rear façade and stated that it is intact. He said that the Board will notice that some repairs have been done along the top of the cornice for the entire building probably due to moisture. But, he wanted the Board to notice the area that looks like it has been repaired or replaced. He said if they look at the floor plans of the existing conditions, this is from the renovations that were done in the 1980s, all new interior partitions and the integration of a stair which takes structural modifications; integration of an elevator and another set of stairs that requires structural modification; new plumbing, and new bathrooms. Mr. Phelps said a mezzanine was squeezed in between the first and second floor which explains the change in brick. There were structural modifications that happened in that façade and repaired. The third floor same; commercial office space; elevator and two stairs. He said showed the Board a photograph of how the interior is today. There is a new elevator; drywall partitions, probably wood framed; drywall drop ceilings; acoustic ceiling tile and they are all from the 1980s.

**Mr. Phelps** said in-between the floor systems, up above the first floor ceiling and the second floor framing the Board can see that this is new framing and not historic. He showed the Board a picture of the back lane wall where the modification was made to support this and at the roof, there was also new framing.

**Mr. Howington** asked if the new framing is where the mezzanine is located.

**Mr. Phelps** [pointing to an area] said this happened at the mezzanine and this happens about mid-way through the building on the roof level and then drops down for the ceiling. He said just to walkthrough the crypt diagram - existing building, modifications in the 1950s which removed that much material, if not more to get what they see; modifications in the 1980s which removed that much materials, if not more to get this. In the 1980s, they can see that the framing extended beyond; it approximately 30 feet from the access visible before it got too dark to determine what the framing was for the roof. He said the interior partitions are gone, but they can see that the first and second floors have been substantially renovated. The 1980s should really be the time period of the building. It is not a 1924 building any more. It is a new building that has replaced the 1924 building.

**Mr. Phelps** said they do anticipate that the wall is back to the 1924 building, but it is a shared partition wall and it is probably damaged, both in the fire and in the demolition of the adjacent building unless there was a gap that was shown on the Sanborn Map, but that has been stuccoed over. He said as far as the defining historic character, he does not know if a demising partition between two buildings on Broughton Street would qualify as historic character. Typically, he would see this as the Broughton Street Façade that contains that historic character. Mr. Phelps said certainly they can make the argument for the lane, which 80 percent of the original wall is still intact. He said the Board can see all the demolition that would have been affected in that façade.

**Mr. Phelps** explained that with the layers of stucco as with most buildings on Broughton Street, unfortunate when they applied these façade they would cut back the brick or any protrusions. Therefore, he is certain that these have been modified.

**Mr. Merriman** asked Mr. Phelps if he had evidence of this or if he is speculating.

**Mr. Phelps** answered that he was speculating on that.

**Mr. Phelps** said the Board can see that this building has been substantially modified through its history to the point that it has been deemed non-historic and they feel that the evidence shows that it has earned that unfortunately. He said about 75 percent of the Broughton Street elevation has been removed based on the photographs and the documentations that they have. Mr. Phelps said, therefore, they are asking for the ability to demolish this building.

**Mr. Phelps** invited the Board to now look at the historic scenarios and what is best for the district. If the lane wall is important and they keep to it, then he believes the removal of it does not harm the historic designation of the building adjacent to it, which is McDonald's. If this is removed, the historic integrity of that separate property with a separate pin number is still going to be maintained. If the building is deemed historic and remain to stay, it with force either them or somebody else down the road to come back and muddle the building once again whether it is removing all the layer back to ten percent of the existing building that maybe there and either recreating that façade which is an appropriate preservation or developing a new façade, which still means demolition of that façade which is the historic character.

**Mr. Lominack** informed Mr. Phelps that the date on his application shows that the building was built in 1870 is an incorrect date.

**Mr. Phelps** said the date is incorrect. The staff has corrected them on the date.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Phelps how he arrived at the 75 percent of the front façade was removed.

**Mr. Phelps** said based on the amount of demolition that had to occur.

**Dr. Henry** said he realizes that the section that was replaced by a window was probably gone, but this is not 75 percent.

**Mr. Phelps** stated that from the original building of 1924, they know that this has been removed; and they know that the windows were removed; and they know the center window was removed. This is how he derived at the approximate 75 percent of the façade is gone.

**Dr. Williams** said if he understands where Dr. Henry is going, may be only 30 percent of the brick work is gone. He said that more than half of Mr. Phelps's 75 percent is actually void and glass.

**Mr. Phelps** said he believes that this was modified since that structural element is gone and the new structural element is gone that there needs to be some type of reinforcement here to carry the load above. But this is not shaded. However, if they are looking at individual material or looking at brick versus the opening, yes; but what would be left is predominantly brick.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Phelps if he thinks the double pediment is still there.

**Mr. Phelps** answered that he does not know.

**Ms. Harris** explained that term historic is interchangeable and in a legal sense of that it is on a contributing building.

**Mr. Merriman** asked that in order for it to be contributing, it has to be at least 50 years old and be approved by City Council.

**Ms. Harris** answered yes, it has to be approved by City Council and this building has not been approved by Council.

**Mr. Engle** said if they are talking about the Secretary of Interior's Standards, then it is historic. Now, it has not been determined if it is contributing because a study has not been done. Someone looked at it and said "it has been changed, it is not contributing."

**Ms. Harris** said this is why staff is recommending that additional information be provided before a decision is made.

**Mr. Merriman** asked "during the exploratory demolition what specific things would determine whether the building has or has not lost its integrity?"

**Ms. Harris** explained that what staff approved previously was a test patch which involved removing the stucco on the front and side elevations. The petitioner wanted to see what was behind.

**Mr. Merriman** asked that if this is not done, there would be no way for the Board to vote on this without the information.

**Ms. Harris** said that the Board could vote on it or the petitioner could request a continuance.

**Mr. Merriman** asked what if the petitioner decides not to tear it out.

**Dr. Williams** asked what are the conditions under which an extra story can be granted. He said he knows the one regarding the activation of the street level. There are a variety of scenarios that would grant an extra story. Dr. Williams stated that the reason he says this is because the original four-story building was extraordinary tall. It was a 60 foot, four-story building and with a 60 foot building they could have something shorter than the original building and be five stories. He said he remembers that when Mr. Lominack and he were on the committee that was selected to make recommendations about stories, this was the building that they used as their case study. He was wondering for example that if the Board was leaning towards preservation of this building as a recommendation. For example, the finding fact is that most of the building is there; could a condition of saving the adjacent building be used as a basis for an extra story?

**Mr. Phelps** answered that he would say not technically.

**Ms. Harris** said that this is not one of the criteria. There are other criteria that it could meet such as multiple ground floor active uses. Or the exterior building walls incorporating masonry materials as well as a green roof.

**Mr. Engle** said that under the Secretary of Interior's Standards, they could restore the front façade; they could build a two-story addition on top as long as it was setback one bay.

Therefore, they could go to four-stories with a setback from the front elevation. There are ways to restore that building and keep the front elevation. Mr. Engle said it is done all the time.

**Mr. Phelps** said his point is that with the amount of demolition that they know that has happened through photographic evidence, this will not be a restoration, but a replication. Is this the appropriate method that the Board would want to proceed with? The building has been muddled; are they going to continue muddling it even if it is muddling it to make it look like it was original? Or is it best at this point to look at what is remaining on this building? This built was substantially rebuilt in the 1980s. It is probably best if they start over and create a new legacy on this site.

**Mr. Merriman** asked Mr. Phelps "without the exploratory demolition, does he know for certain whether it has been demolished or just covered over?"

**Mr. Phelps** answered that he knows that much material has been removed based on the photographs. There are window openings where there is masonry and the storefront has been removed. He is hopeful that he has shown the Board this through the progression.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

A citizen came forward and stated that she has heard that another architect has plans for this site. If they do change their minds and do not want to rebuild there, the building would be allowed for McDonald's part to bid on just because McDonald's is already there and serves the community in a crime-free manner. This is highly important to Savannah at this time.

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation** said that they agree with the staff's recommendation. They believe that the additional information and some sort of physical proof needs to be provided to substantiate that the historic integrity of the building has been lost in order to move forward with any kind of demolition.

**Mr. Ryan Arvey** stated that he is in attendance with Mr. Chad Keller's Historic Preservation class. Mr. Arvey said he believes that the Board is on the right track. He, too, believes that more exploratory work is needed on the building. He said with the fact that a lot of the surface area that is in the highlighted areas were voids to begin with, there is potential for those matching parapets to still be there as well as a lot of the brick. Mr. Arvey believes this raises the question to what point has the building been modified. Is there a point where the building cannot be brought back? He believes at this point, there is far too little information to make that kind of conclusive decision. He said as a main street program manager for several years in Florida, Mr. Carter is every manager's dream; everyone wants an angel to come in and say "I am going to give you a lot of money." However, he is hopeful that the procedures and any decisions that come out of this do not leave a sour taste in Mr. Carter's mouth or scare him away by any means.

**Mr. Arvey** said he believes that Mr. Carter's suggestion about rebuilding the Chatham Furniture building is enticing as long as he does not mean rebuilding it in scale and number of stories. If he is really interested in doing something significant here, he could actually reconstruct the façade. As far as the utilization of the building next door, he has the option of using the two stories that are already exist. Therefore, what he believes is really the issue here from a retail perspective, and he assumes that this is really Mr. Carter's main concern is the utilization of the airspace above the building. He said he loves the idea of the setback so he could still do his four-story plan. However, he has seen

this happen a lot where economic redevelopment people come into an area and say "if you don't want to do it this way, we will just take our business some place else." They use this scare tactic which he believes is a little unscrupulous. If H&M is really interested in downtown Savannah in this market, he does not believe that this airspace will be a deal killer. He also believes that the structural integrity of McDonald's should be a real concern. If this comes down, he believes it will create a lot of other problems. He believes they need to worry about setting a precedent here. This is one of the first major projects that the developer will be undertaking and they could expect more of this on Broughton Street, selective preservation and demolition at will if it does not fit in with a particular retailer.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said he respects a lot the work that Hansen Architects have done and he could see it if they had been asked to restore this building. This would probably be a different story. He said this Board looks at Part I and Part II. The mass and height of those buildings that are at that corner is a two-story block and to take off of the block, they would be changing the entire character of McDonald's Building as well. They would be, in a way, destroying the integrity of the McDonald's because 50 percent of this was the other building which is no longer there. He said he does not accept the fact that since 75 percent of the masonry that maybe 40 percent is gone. The elevation could be easily reconstructed and it has been done up and down Broughton Street. This would be a reconstruction, they know what was there and it could be put back. There are a lot of ways to give him more airspace.

**Mr. Engle** said he believes it is critical that if this first single project they say they are going to look for alternative ways to keep as much integrity to Broughton Street as possible and still bring in high end retail. What if the next high end retailers say they want to demolish five buildings because he needs a twelve-story building. This is not what it is all about. He said he believes that it is critical that they stick with integrity of the district. To say that they are going to demolish an historic building, he is sorry; it may not be contributing, but it is over 50 years old and is still historic. They are going to demolish this and then build a replica that is 50 percent larger than the original just because it fits that gap, no.

**Mr. Lominack** said what he is about to say has nothing to do with whether he thinks the demolition permit should be issued or not. He said whether there is a property line or a different pin number does not mean that this is not a single building. He thinks of something like Gordon Row where all these houses have different addresses, but it is one building. He said taking this as a single building, about 90 percent of the original building is left. In reality, he believes that when the map was done, an error was made. His personal house had an apartment on the ground floor a long time ago and he kept trying to figure out why the addresses skipped as they did. He found out that the basement had a different address than the upper two floors. Mr. Lominack said he does not believe that this has anything to do with whether the demolition should be granted or not granted. He believes if the Board is going to be consistent with what they do as a Board, then they have to look at single buildings as single buildings and not as pieces of single buildings.

**Dr. Williams** said the key finder of a building would traditionally would have been a fire wall. As Ms. Harris has mentioned, the Sanborn Map shows a dash line which represents partitions. They could be substantial wooden partitions, but they are nonstructural. He said

that Gordon Row has fire walls, therefore, they could tear down one of the units there. There are 15 buildings here, but Mr. Lominack's point is correct that this building does not have a fire wall. Therefore, from the point of view of the Sanborn Map evidence and what they have already heard, there is a suggestion that it is one building.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes that they all are excited about the potential development coming in and definitely the Board does not want to scare anyone away. But, the main focus of the Historic District Board of Review is to preserve and save the historic integrity of buildings that are here. Consequently, this is what the Board has to look at first.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Phelps if he wanted the Board to vote on his petition today or if he wanted to request a continuance.

**Mr. Phelps** answered that staff has made a recommendation that the petition be continued in order for him to follow-through with more investigation. He certainly would rather have a continuance than a vote for denial.

**Board Action:**

At the petitioner's request, the petition for demolition of 240 West Broughton Street is continued until additional information and exploratory demolition can be provided to substantiate that the historic integrity of the building has been lost, and additional information to ensure that the structural integrity of 246 West Broughton Street will not be damaged. - PASS

**Vote Results**

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

19. [Petition of Jeff Cramer | 14-000204-COA | 509 East Congress Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Application - 509 East Congress Street 14-000204-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Context Photographs.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Site and Surrounding Photographs.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Mass Model.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Sketches.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

**Mr. Jeff Cramer** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 2 1/2-story detached residence on the vacant property located at 509 East Congress Street. This is a multiphase project. This is the first of three buildings. All three buildings are shown on the model.

**Mr. Howington** asked, therefore, the Board should look at the portion of the model dealing with today's request for 509 East Congress Street as the other two may or may not happen.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes. The applications for the other two projects have not been submitted. She confirmed that today, the Board is only looking at 509 East Congress Street, which is the furthest project from Price Street.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the model does not have dormers on it. Have they been removed?

**Ms. Michalak** said the dormers are not shown on the model, but they are still a part of the project. This is something that the Board may want to consider adding as a condition to update the model for Part II.

**Ms. Michalak** said that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 2 1/2-story detached residence on the vacant property located at 509 East Congress Street.

**Dr. Williams** asked that where it calls for porches to encroach on the public right-of-way, do they know of other examples of four foot deep, double height galleries doing the same?

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes, in this ward. She said that Mr. Cramer and she did extensive research on the buildings in this ward. This is a diverse ward.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the façade is on the property line and the gallery is forward.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes. The petitioner went to SPR and appropriated the clearances to allow for the four feet. This is where the four foot depth comes. There are contributing buildings to the east and they actually have deeper porches, but they do not meet code. Therefore, four is the maximum depth per code.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if there are any other examples of full height doors. There are no muntins.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that she was trying not to look at muntins until Part II.



**Ms. Ramsay** said the Board has had discussions on whether window designs are included in Part I or Part II.

**Ms. Michalak** said the opening size is included in Part I. She said she spent a good deal of time considering those doors, but she felt they were visually compatible. It is a more modern feature to have all those doors on both floors. There are examples of doors on both first and second stories in the ward.

**Mr. Engle** said that with a three foot sideline, he does not believe that the dumpsters will be able to come out of the alley. He believes the dumpsters will be put there, but will never leave.

**Ms. Michalak** said the standards say that they must be screened from view. They are shown screened from view.

**Mr. Engle** said the dumpsters will not be usable.

**Ms. Michalak** said they cannot control whether they are left in the alley or not.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Cramer** apologized about the model, but it was due today and he did not know of any other way to do it as the two other models had to be submitted also.

**Mr. Cramer** explained that the dumpsters are 30 inches wide and he has approximately three feet or a little more. He is hopeful that he will be able to get a 32 inch gate there so he can get a 30 inch dumpster here. He believes they can make it work. He has about four inches that he will be able to play with. The house is 23 feet - 8 inches and the lot is 27.8 foot lot. He does not try to put everything directly on the line.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if there are casement windows in the dormers and what is the inset above them? This maybe going into the design details, but they are not really drawn.

**Mr. Cramer** said it looks to him like they are casement windows. Casement windows will fit here as he has the tight dormers.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked what is the little circle above the windows.

**Mr. Cramer** answered that he found some other dormers in the area. They are square top windows.

**Dr. Williams** asked if a cross gable roof is here with a front gable and two side gables and maybe a rear gable.

**Mr. Cramer** said yes. It will be similar front and back. This was his original idea, but they wanted to look more like a row house because of the area. Therefore, they changed the design.

**Dr. Williams** said this area has much variety. He believes that each building has its own

identity while still working with the others. Some of the sample photos that the petitioner included with his petition shows a really wide variety. Dr. Williams said he was just curious about the sketch.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said their committee saw this project and were intrigued by it. The HSF agrees with all of staff's recommendations. They have two extra comments for consideration. The first is to consider a shed roof over the top of the porch or gallery as opposed to the hip roof. Their second comment concerns the height of the dormers; they appear to be a little high. They suggest that the dormers' height be a little lower.

**Mr. Howington** invited Mr. Cramer to make comments concerning the HSF comments.

**Mr. Cramer** said he was struggling to get the extra bedroom up there. He is trying to make the house look not quite so tall. He is pushing roof down; therefore, the dormers are getting a little high because of the head heights and so forth, but he is sure he can do something with it. He said he will look at it. He said he will also look at the porch.

**Dr. Williams** said that Mr. Cramer is talking about usable space on the third floor. He asked him did his other format with the front gable and projecting side gables created more or less usable space.

**Mr. Cramer** said when they do the roof in the other direction, they end up with the stair hall on one side and you have to put a big gable on one side of it where the stair is located, otherwise you hit your head going up to the roof unless you have a three story straight up house. This is the house he thought would look okay, but it ended up not looking good. Mr. Cramer said that the roof helped on the 2 1/2 story versus the three story. However, he said, as far as the usability, the other one had a gable on the side.

**Dr. Williams** asked him which one was the most usable.

**Mr. Cramer** said because of the house going front to back sloping, this one does. One big gable will be on the left and a smaller gable on the right. But, you will not see all of those way up there from the street, but you have to show them in elevation.

**Dr. Henry** said he realizes that Mr. Cramer plans to build a building next door, however, he asked him if it would be a good idea to put a few windows there.

**Mr. Cramer** said he is one foot off the property line, therefore, he cannot put windows there.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Cramer if he would consider not having the colonial dormers and go with shed roofs; particularly, in light that the HSF has recommended that he go with a shed roof on the porch.

**Mr. Cramer** answered that he will definitely entertain that. He knows for a fact that it will be hard for him to get someone to build those like that for him.

**Mr. Engle** said the colonial dormers are large and if Mr. Cramer went with the shed roofs it would not be a fake colonial and he could also go with a shed roof on the porch and give it a kind of Arts-and-Crafts character.

**Mr. Cramer** said he believes this is a good idea. He will check it out.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the roof could be discussed in Part II Design Details.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes it could, but that is not to say that it will be agreeable. However, he believes that the Board needs to see it in both instances.

**Dr. Williams** said even though it is a part of height and mass, he would suggest that this detail be pulled into Part II, but have an option on both.

**Mr. Howington** said the Board could do so. However, he feels it would be dangerous for them to say that this is what they want without seeing it.

**Mr. Cramer** asked the Board if he should put the dormers on the model, they are so small.

**Mr. Howington** said he agrees that the dormers on the model would have helped, but he does not feel that it is necessary.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Henry** said he believes the petitioner has done a good job.

**Mr. Howington** said he agrees with the Historic Savannah Foundation's comments. Actually, he was going to make the same comment. He believes the front double porch would probably be more appropriate as a shed; and may be extend it out to the edge of the wall. Presently, it sets in. He knows this is Part II also, but the middle band board that is a base seems out of place. It looks like the house was raised at one time. Mr. Howington said his other comment was going to be the dormers also.

**Mr. Howington** said he knows the Board talked about the hip roof on the double front porch.

**Dr. Williams** asked staff to pull up page 8 of the documented 13 images of the buildings in the area. He said in looking at the documents that he did not know whether it had that kind of configuration.

**Mr. Howington** said this steps in a foot or two. He believes that either one would work.

**Mr. Lominack** asked Mr. Cramer that he said he was one foot off of the property line. He realizes that the Board is not reviewing the other projects today, but he was wondering if they will be one foot off of the property line also.

**Mr. Cramer** said it alternates; one has windows on the side. It will be three feet over so that he can put windows there. The next house goes over one foot, plus off. He said he has

a couple more inches on both of these dimensions.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if the space between the two buildings will be two feet or more.

**Mr. Cramer** said they will be four feet.

**Mr. Lominack** asked Mr. Cramer what is the exterior siding on the side that is one foot off. What is the material?

**Mr. Cramer** said presently it is clapboard siding.

**Board Action:**

Approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 2 1/2-story detached residence on the vacant property located at 509 East Congress Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II: Design Details for review and approval by the Board: - PASS

1. Restudy the roof shape and height of the dormers proposed on the front façade.
2. Restudy the roof shape of the two-story front porch.

**Vote Results**

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Nicholas Henry

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

**IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION**

**X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS**

20. [Petition of Paul Bush | 13-006166-COA | 405 East Jones Street | Staff Approved - Garage Door Opening](#)

Attachment: [COA - 405 East Jones Street 13-006166-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 405 East Jones Street 13-006166-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

21. [Petition of Douglas Roberts for Greenline Architecture | 13-006345-COA | 17 West McDonough Street | Staff Approved - Stucco Repair, Shutters, Windows and Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 17 West McDonough Street 13-006345-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 17 West McDonough Street 13-006345-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of J. B. Berge Enterprises | 13-006425-COA | 114 East Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Color Change, Shutters, Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 114 East Taylor Street 13-006425-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 114 East Taylor Street 13-006425-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Timothy Mellin | 13-006438-COA | 307 East Gordon Street | Staff Approved- Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 307 East Gordon Street 13-006438-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 307 East Gordon Street 13-006438-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Ryan Cassidy | 14-000017-COA | 422 East Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 422 East Gaston Street 14-000017-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 422 East Gaston Street 14-000017-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of Robert Jones | 14-000076-COA | 106 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Window Sash](#)

Attachment: [COA - 106 Habersham Street 14-000076-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 106 Habersham Street 14-000076-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Ameir Mustafa for Signs for Minds | 14-000150-COA | 19 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 19 West Broughton Street 14-000150-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 19 West Broughton Street 14-000150-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Jeff Whitlow | 14-000164-COA | 217-219 Abercorn Street | Staff Approved - Brick](#)

Repointing

Attachment: [COA - 217-219 Abercorn Street 14-000164-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 217-219 Abercorn Street 14-000164-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Charles Morgensen | 14-000174-COA | 9 East Gordon Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 9 East Gordon Street 14-000174-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 9 East Gordon Street 14-000174-COA.pdf](#)

29. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 14-000189-COA | 20 East Broad Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 20 East Broad Street 14-000189-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 20 East Broad Street 14-000189-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Brad Reardon | 14-000194-COA | 301 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Metal Louver](#)

Attachment: [COA - 301 West Broughton Street 14-000194-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 301 West Broughton Street 14-000194-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Amended Petition of Carlos Asensio | 14-00207-COA | 301 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Light Fixture](#)

Attachment: [COA - 301 East Bay Street 14-000207-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 301 East Bay Street 14-000207-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Carlos Asensio | 14-000209-COA | 301 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Cap Flashing](#)

Attachment: [COA - 301 East Bay Street 14-000209-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 301 East Bay Street 14-000209-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Richard H. Ellis | 14-000210-COA | 415 East Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Handrails](#)

Attachment: [COA - 415 East Taylor Street 14-000210-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 415 East Taylor Street 14-000210-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Amended Petition of Doug Bean for Doug Bean Signs | 14-000211-COA | 301 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Sign Amendment](#)

Attachment: [COA - 301 East Bay Street 14-000211-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 301 East Bay Street 14-000211-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Kareem Simmons | 14-000217-COA | 610 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Fence](#)

Attachment: [COA - 610 Habersham Street 14-000217-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 610 Habersham Street 14-000217-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Kenneth V. Livingston | 14-000242-COA | 539 Hartridge Street | Staff Approved - Remove and Replace Weathered Siding](#)

Attachment: [COA - 539 Hartridge Street 14-000242-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 539 Hartridge Street 14-000242-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Stewart Dohrman for CHS Construction & Preservation | 14-000251-COA | 650 West Jones Street | Staff Approved - Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 650 West Jones Street 14-000251-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 650 West Jones Street 14-000251-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Stewart Dohrman for CHS Construction & Preservation | 14-000252-COA | 650 West Jones Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 650 West Jones Street 14-000252-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 650 West Jones Street 14-000252-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of Minnie Poole for Coastal Products, LLC | 14-000276-COA | 416 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 416 West Broughton Street 14-000276-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 416 West Broughton Street 14-000276-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Petition of Ted and Karen Kleisner | 14-000340-COA | 20 West Harris Street | Staff Approved -](#)

Color Change

Attachment: [COA - 20 West Harris Street 14-000340-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 20 West Harris Street 14-000340-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. [Petition of Bart Redmond for Redmond Construction, Inc. | 14-000419-COA | 118 East Jones Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 118 East Jones Street 14-000419-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 118 East Jones Street 14-000419-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. [Petition of John T. Hughes for Dawson Architects | 14-000420-COA | 350 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Generator](#)

Attachment: [COA - 350 Bull Street 14-000420-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 350 Bull Street 14-000420-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. [Petition of Ryan Cassidy | 14-000429-COA | 422 East Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Front Porch Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 422 East Gaston Street 14-000429-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 422 East Gaston Street 14-000429-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. [Petition of Patrick Phelps for Hansen Architects, P.C. | 14-000433-COA | 220 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 220 West Broughton Street 14-000433-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 220 West Broughton Street 14-000433-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

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

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 2-12-14.pdf](#)

**Mr. Howington** said the staff has given the Board via their packets a summary of recent work performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA).

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



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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Items Deferred to Staff 2-12-14.pdf](#)

Mr. Howington said the Board has been given, via their packets, a summary on the Items Deferred to Staff.

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

**Notices**

47. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, February 13, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

48. [Next Meeting - Wednesday, March 12, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

**XIV. OTHER BUSINESS**

**Unfinished Business**

49. [Report from Energy Efficiency in Historic Buildings Committee](#)

**Mr. Lominack** gave the report on the Energy Efficiency Committee Meeting that was held on January 23, 2014. The members present were: Jerry Lominack, Stephen Merriman, Dr. Robin Williams. Absent: Keith Howington. In attendance were: Leah Michalak and Mary E. Mitchell, HDBR staff and Hallie Currihan, LP Building Products Representative.

**Ms. Currihan** made a presentation on "Smartside Trim and Siding." LP focuses on single-family new construction. The product is an engineered wood siding and trim. Hardi-Board (fiber cement) is their competition. She said they are the only engineered wood siding presently on the market. The product is termite and moisture-resistant. It is a renewable resource and can withstand 135 mph winds. It is available in a smooth finish, but not in a thicker profile and has a five year, 100% warranty and a 50 year limited warranty. The Committee asked Ms. Currihan to bring back samples of the smooth finish product, which are painted, to get a better idea of the finished product. She agreed to bring samples to Ms. Michalak and Ms. Harris prior to the February 12th Board meeting.

**Mr. Lominack** reported that the Committee continued its discussion on the Windows in Historic Buildings. At the last meeting, the Committee decided to visit various sites to look at the windows as provided by the product representatives. Dr. Williams viewed three installations and Mr. Lominack visited the United Way building. A discussion was held about replacement windows where no historic windows remain. Mr. Lominack said he has spoken

with the National Park Service in Washington, D. C. about this as well. He wanted to know if they should talk to the City Attorney about the Chair language that they are proposing. Ms. Michalak said she would talk with Ms. Harris about the proper course of action.

**Mr. Lominack** said that Ms. Michalak is guiding the committee. The minutes of this committee are posted on the MPC website.

**Mr. Howington** apologized for not attending the meeting. He believes that the Board must be specific when making recommendations to the Zoning Board Appeals (ZBA) on the case-by-case basis. Someone might ask what is the case-by-case.

**Mr. Merriman** said what the Committee said it is already on a case-by-case basis as there is already a remedy. The Board can then recommend approval to the ZBA.

**Mr. Thomson** said the Board needs to make the finding of fact strong when a recommendation is made to the ZBA.

## XV. ADJOURNMENT

50. [Adjourned.](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chair Howington adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ms. Ellen Harris  
Director of Urban Planning and Preservation

EIH:mem