



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
January 8, 2014 1:00 p.m.  
Meeting Minutes

**JANUARY 8, 2014 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING**

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

**HDRB Member Not Present:** Reed Engle  
Stephen Merriman, Jr.

**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 1:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. He outlined the purpose and role of the Historic District Board of Review.

**II. SIGN POSTING**

**III. CONSENT AGENDA**

2. [Petition of Shyam Mirchandani | 13-006071-COA | 19 West Broughton Street | Storefront Alterations](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for storefront alterations at 19 West Broughton Street because the work is visually compatible and meets the design standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

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

3. [Petition of Bill Norton, Sign Mart Inc. | 13-006100-COA | 25 Bull Street | Sign](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for a supplemental identification sign and two principal use signs as requested at 25 Bull Street because the signs meet the standards and are visually compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

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

4. [Petition of John Post, Commonwealth Construction | 13-006289-COA | 403 East Hall Street | Addition](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for the rear addition at 403 East Hall Street because the work is visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

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

5. [Petition of Genevieve & Jose Gomez | 13-006299-COA | 516 East Charlton Lane | Fence](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approve an after-the-fact petition for a fence at 516 East Charlton Lane because the work is visually compatible and meets the design and preservation standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack  
Second: Linda Ramsay  
Reed Engle - Not Present  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Abstain  
T. Jerry Lominack - Aye  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Linda Ramsay - Aye

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

#### IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

#### V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

##### 6. [Approve December 11, 2013 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [12-11-2013 Minutes.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve December 11, 2013 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle - Not Present

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - 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

#### VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

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

**Board Action:**

Continue to the February 12, 2014 agenda. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Reed Engle - Not Present

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

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

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

**Board Action:**

Continue to the February 12, 2014 agenda. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Marjorie W Reed

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

**VIII. REGULAR AGENDA**

9. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 13-005456-COA | 0 Alice Street | New Construction Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

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

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

**Ms. Harris** said that the Board approved Part I, Height and Mass on November 13, 2013 with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II, Design Details:

1. Utilize the three bay pattern on the rear of the interior buildings, similar to or matching the eastern and western buildings, or a similar solution as presented at the meeting;

2. Provide more substantial columns on the front porches and eliminate the railing;
3. Center all rear stoops and reduce the mass of the rear portico roofs;
4. Incorporate gates along Gaston Street; and
5. Restudy the design of the pilasters, string course and coping.

**Ms. Harris** stated that the petitioner has complied with all the conditions. She reported that staff recommends approval of the New Construction Part II: Design Details for five attached row houses at 0 Alice Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval because the project is visually compatible and meets the design standards:

1. Change the roof from white to gray, or similar;
2. Eliminate the metal medallion or articulate through the brick pattern; and
3. Ensure that the curb cuts do not exceed 20' in width and that the sidewalk shall serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

**Mr. Lominack** said he is not sure if the Board made the window pattern a condition, but knew that they discussed a change in the window pattern on the first and second floors on the front façade.

**Ms. Harris** stated that there were some discussions about this at the Part I meeting. However, she believes the consensus of the Board was not to dictate the specific change, but simply allow the petitioner to restudy the different elements. She believes the petitioner has taken all those comments in consideration and has provided a revised design.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Shay** came forward and introduced the design associate of Gunn Meyerhoff and Shay Architects, Ms. Maggie Ward. Also accompanying Mr. Shay at today's meeting is his client, Mr. Polansky. He said they have thoroughly examined the staff's report. They have no objection to the roof; the issue of the 20' curb cuts, they agree totally; and on the issue of the medallions, although they like the metal medallions, they have prepared, if the Board desires, an alternative in brick.

**Mr. Shay** said in regards to Mr. Lominack's question about the windows, they presented, not for approval, as a part of Part I a window pattern that involved windows with separate transoms. At that time, there were some discussions about how transoms belong above doors and maybe or maybe not above windows. Therefore, they kept the transom above the door and came up with a lite pattern on the larger windows that revealed something different from the upper story windows.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Shay if they were in agreement with the staff's recommendation that the sidewalk serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway.

**Mr. Shay** answered yes. They fully intend to comply with the ordinance. He said they have submitted this as a part of their Specific Development Plan to the City of Savannah.

**Mr. Lominack** asked what is the reason for changing the size of the window above the door on the entrance of the north elevation.

**Mr. Shay** stated that they wanted to accent the fact that it is not symmetrical. This was discussed in Part I. He believes that not every one liked the idea, but the consensus generally was that this was an acceptable path forward.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes that a rail was on the second floor above the porch.

**Mr. Shay** explained [pointing to an area] that they had something up here in Part I and it was thought by some of the Board members to be objectionable. Therefore, they went back, restudied it and agreed that they did not need to have that above there because it would not ever function as a balcony.

**Mr. Lominack** asked why no handrails are on the stairs. He stated that he does not believe that it is high enough to be required by code, but to him handrails would enhance the stairs.

**Mr. Shay** answered that he guesses it did not appear that way to them.

**Mr. Lominack** said he does not believe it is a condition for approval or disapproval, but to him the handrails are missing.

**Mr. Howington** clarified with Mr. Shay that the windows above the porch were not changed. Is this what was presented initially?

**Mr. Shay** replied yes.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** said she would be interested in seeing the brick medallion that Mr. Shay spoke of.

**Mr. Shay** showed a picture of the medallion and stated that it would be the same size and shape but would be stated in brick as the alternative material.

**Ms. McClain** asked Mr. Shay if this is the new design medallion.

**Mr. Shay** answered yes; the staff's report was not fond of the metal. Therefore, they developed the brick medallion as an alternative.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they have a few minor comments regarding the Design Details. Ms. Meunier said they prefer the restudy of the brick medallion or the brick design as opposed to the metal medallion, although, they would also offer for consideration the possibility of using an alternative material such as terracotta in place of a brick redesign.

**Ms. Meunier** said there appears to be a rowlock of bricks shown around the windows and above some of the doors that seems odd. The HSF suggests increasing the height of the front door and possibly eliminate the transom so that it aligns better with the windows. She said, however, they felt that it looks a little odd where the height of the door ends and the windows begin much higher. On the rear of the building, they believe that the roof above

the stoops could be lowered a little. They suggest raising the height of the door so that it would be closer to the height of the windows.

**Ms. Meunier** said the HSF also believes that the light pattern on the front would be more appropriate as two-over-one to match the rest of the windows. She said they believe the transom needs to be removed from the door. This why they feel that the two-over-one would be more appropriate.

**Mr. Howington** invited Mr. Shay, if he desired, to respond to the public comments.

**Mr. Shay** said they like the detailing that they have presented. They think that there is an alignment between the top of the door and where the muntins are located. He said that his favorite solution would be to have windows in the transoms so that it would match almost all the way across. But, this met some objections when they were here the last time.

**Ms. Simpson** asked Mr. Shay about the rear door.

**Mr. Shay** said he believes that the canopy could be lowered. If this is what the Board wants, they will do so and get the drawings to staff.

**Mr. Howington** said the HSF commented about the rowlock around the windows. Is this intentional?

**Mr. Shay** answered that the rowlocks are intentional just as everything on their drawings.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Howington** said the narrow window was presented at the last meeting and was approved by the Board. Mr. Shay has made an adjustment to the transoms as the Board suggested. Therefore, he believes this is covered.

**Mr. Lominack** said personally he believes the three windows on the front of the building on the first floor that are four-over-four is a mistake. He believes that the vertical expression of the façade is a lot better with two-over-one.

**Ms. Simpson** said her concern is the rowlock.

**Mr. Lominack** said he prefers the metal medallions over the brick medallions. However, he prefers just a simple parapet.

**Mr. Howington** said the parapet was a part of Part I. He assumes, therefore, the drawings are as presented. Consequently, the Board will move forward with that.

**Ms. McClain** said she agrees with Mr. Lominack regarding the front windows. She believes that the two-over-one would look better than two-over-two.

**Ms. Simpson** said if the Board does not object, she prefers that the rowlock not be around the windows.

**Mr. Howington** said in regards to the metal element, he believes that the Board would

have to vote on what is presented or presented as an alternate. They can propose an alternate material, but he does not believe that they can propose something that the petitioner is not willing to do as far as more expensive materials, etc. He said the Board would need to ask the petitioner if he is willing to do so if they are proposing something other than what he has presented.

**Mr. Howington** informed Mr. Shay that he heard what the Board said about the metal medallion. He asked him if he preferred to keep the metal, the brick or would he consider another alternative of terracotta or go back to staff.

**Mr. Shay** said they like having something inside the shape on the parapet. They like the metal, but they are not unwilling to change it to brick. If the Board wants the brick to be terracotta, will be fine. But, he would like to have a chance to study what that would be and bring it back to staff. He said he is trying to be as agreeable as he can. As far as the two-over-one window pattern on the front of the façade, if this is the Board's desire, then certainly they will accept that.

(After Dr. Henry made a motion and seconded by Ms. Ramsay, Ms. Weibe-Reed made an amendment to the motion that the brick surround be kept, the medallion be kept as presented and that staff's recommendations: 1. Change the roof color from white to gray or similar and 3. Ensure that the curb cuts do not exceed 20' in width and that the sidewalk shall serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height) be approved.

**Ms. McClain** said the original motion was not amended. It was a new motion on top of the original motion. She said the second motion is out of order. The Board needs to vote on the first motion as motioned by Dr. Henry and seconded by Ms. Ramsay. If this motion fails, then a new motion can be made.

**Mr. Howington** said the first motion could be voted against. He clarified that the Board is now voting on the first motion made by Dr. Henry and seconded by Ms. Ramsay.

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for New Construction Part II: Design Details for five attached row houses at 0 Alice Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval because the project is visually compatible and meets the design standards:

1. Change the roof color from white to gray, or similar;
2. Restudy the metal medallion material;
3. Ensure that the curb cuts do not exceed 20' in width and that the sidewalk shall serve as a - PASS

continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

4. Lower the rear portico roofs;
5. Change the fenestration pattern on the north façade, first floor windows to a two-over-one pattern, and
6. Eliminate the stacked brickwork on the sides of the windows.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Linda Ramsay

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

10. [Petition of J. Corde Wilson | 13-005459-COA | 544 East Liberty Street | New Construction Townhouses: Part II, Design Details](#)

- Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal packet- material selection.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Aerials.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Context Photographs.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Revised Drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Context Elevation Drawing - Part I.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details of seven attached multi-family townhomes with carriage houses for the vacant property located at 544 East Liberty Street. The townhomes are three-stories and the carriage houses are two stories high.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that the Board approved Part I, Height and Mass at their December 11, 2013 meeting with the following conditions to be submitted for Part II, Design Details:

1. Eliminate the false, shuttered windows on the west façade of the main building along Houston Street.
2. Reduce the height of the entry door system recess to match the height of the

- adjacent window and add a lintel above.
3. Increase the height of all windows.
  4. Revise the design of the main buildings' rear porches between the first and second levels.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that the staff recommends approval of Part II, Design Details with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Provide window manufacturer information.
2. Inset the windows three inches from the face of the building.
3. Continue the stringcourse to the south façade of the main structures.
4. Continue the parapet wall and stringcourse along the north façade of the carriage houses.
5. Provide the front stair treads and portico floor material.
6. Redesign the column details.
7. Ensure the space between the balusters is not greater than four inches.
8. Clarify which railing design is proposed.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if the parapet on the north side of the main house is continuous.

**Ms. Michalak** answered no. But, staff is recommending that the parapet wall be continuous.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if the cornice is continuous.

**Mr. Michalak** answered no.

**Mr. Lominack** said the cornice was not mentioned in the staff's report.

**Ms. Michalak** clarified that the cornice is mentioned in the staff report as a "stringcourse." This applies to both buildings, the main house and the carriage house. Staff is recommending that the stringcourse be continuous for both structures.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Wilson** stated that they have received the staff's recommendations and have addressed most of the comments. They have gotten the manufacturer's information on the window. They have just located a supplier for eight foot windows as they were hard to find. Mr. Wilson said the windows will be inset three inches. They will be inset in the wood frame and the brick veneer will be in front of them. He said actually, the windows will be inset more than three inches. The stringcourse on the south façade of the main structures will continue around the structure as well as the carriage. The parapet wall and stringcourse along the north façade of the carriage houses will be continuous. The front stair treads and portico floor materials are matching cast stone and brick. Mr. Wilson said the column details have been redesigned and submitted to staff. The space between the balusters will be taken care of. The railing design is on the selection sheet.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Wilson if the treads will be cast stone and the portico will be brick.

**Mr. Wilson** answered yes. The portico will be brick and the treads will be cast stone.

**Ms. Simpson** asked if the railing will be four inches.

**Mr. Wilson** said in order to meet building code, the railings will not be greater than four inches.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Wilson if he is proposing to clad the entire building in brick that is shown in the renderings.

**Mr. Wilson** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** said the bricks look different than the renderings. He said he was concerned about the rustic handmade quality of the bricks. Dr. Williams asked Mr. Wilson if he was trying to achieve an "old affect."

**Mr. Wilson** answered correct.

**Dr. Williams** said given the design of the building, it seems to be aiming for a more refined, kind of federal style quality; the lintels over the windows traditionally were in the late 18th through the 19th century, a builder building these would have actually done the opposite with going from a refined brick to a hard pressed brick. In other words, something that looked a little more finished. Therefore, it appears that the petitioner is going in two different directions with the design concept. Dr. Williams said this kind of brick is good on a more rustic structure and an industrial building.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Wilson would he be opened to a more refined looking brick that would be more compatible.

**Mr. Wilson** answered yes.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** stated that it appears that the windows on the side of house on the ground floor are smaller than the ones on the front. She said she does not know if Mr. Wilson considered this, but in the dining room there will be two different sizes of windows which will be problematic. The plans show the windows to be much smaller.

**Mr. Wilson** said the windows are six feet by three inches wide, but he believes a good suggestion would be to make these windows eight feet as well so they match.

**Mr. Howington** asked Ms. Weibe-Reed if she was suggesting this for both windows on the side.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** answered yes.

**Ms. McClain** asked if she heard correctly that the column redesigned has been restudied.

**Mr. Wilson** said the column detail has been redrawn, but has not been resubmitted to staff.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Muenier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they agree with the brick change. Their main concern is the design of the front door. They believe that the design of the front door could be restudied to be either a solid panel door or possibly some division in the light. Presently, the door does not appear to be in line with the rest of the property to have a single pane glazing there and also how it relates to the transom. Consequently, they believe that the single pane transom would be more appropriate with divisions.

**Mr. Howington** invited Mr. Wilson to respond to the public comments.

**Mr. Wilson** said they would be agreeable to make the front door solid and add the mullion above it.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** stated that given the general simplicity of the design, the two-over-two is not consistent with the sidelights. Therefore, he would say that the house is trending towards a federal style skeleton, but with a more later 19th century two-over-three or even a 20th century two-over-two is very simple. He said he would suggest that the transom be kept the way it is.

**Board Action:**

Approval of Part II, Design Details with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Provide window manufacturer information.
2. Inset the windows three inches from the face of the building.
3. Continue the parapet wall and stringcourse along the north façade of the main structures.
4. Continue the parapet wall and stringcourse along the south façade of the carriage houses.
5. Provide the front stair treads and portico floor material; - PASS
6. Redesign the column details.
7. Ensure the space between the balusters is not greater than four inches.
8. Clarify which railing design is proposed.
9. Reselect the exterior brick to be a more "refined" style to complement the architecture.
10. Increase the height of the windows on the Houston Street façade of the main building.

11. Redesign the front entrance doors to be a solid wood panel style.
12. Simplify the sidelite design at the front entrances.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Linda Ramsay

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

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

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Historic Building Map - Stephens Ward.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

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

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

**Mr. Lominack** stated that he would like to make a motion to continue this petition as it is an incomplete application. He explained that there are no elevations related to the adjacent properties. The photographs of the buildings immediately to the east were not included.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Lominack if this was in the form of a motion.

**Mr. Lominack** answered yes.

**Ms. Ramsay** seconded the motion.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Howington** asked the Board if they felt the drawings and photographs were critical to their decision today on Height and Mass.

**Mr. Lominack** stated that the application is being submitted by a different applicant. He said looking back, it was somewhat sketchy as to whether the previous application included

the photographs, but the application today does not show the related elevations in the submittal criteria. The site plan and the elevation should show the relation to the adjacent properties and neither is shown.

**Ms. Simpson** said it would have been more appropriate if the petitioner was informed at the onset of the meeting that his application would be continued due to being incomplete rather than letting him remain at the meeting for a substantial period of time.

**Mr. Lominack** said he consulted with staff and was told that this was the appropriate time to motion that the petition be continued.

**Ms. McClain** asked what happens with the application.

**Mr. Howington** stated that the petitioner would have to resubmit his application for next month's meeting.

**Dr. Henry** said this is a new architect. The staff has taken a particular perspective of what surrounds this site. Therefore, he believes that anything dealing with other buildings in the area should be seen by the Board.

**Mr. Lominack** said they have a printed set of criteria that are required documents for new construction. The list of required documents is available to anybody making an application. It is not the responsibility of this Board or necessarily the responsibility of the staff to ensure that the people follow the printed criteria.

**Board Action:**

Continue the petition for 307-311 East Huntingdon Street; Part I: Height and Mass to the February 12, 2014 HDBR meeting for an incomplete application. The petitioner was asked to return to the next meeting with the missing "context drawing." - PASS

**Vote Results**

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

12. [Petition of Erik Puljung, Hansen Architects, P.C. | 13-005926-COA | 138 Habersham Street | Alteration](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 01-08-14.pdf](#)

**Mr. Erik E. Puljung** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to alter the enclosed two story rear porch by replacing the existing plate glass windows and door with new Marvin Exterior Clad Ultimate French Casement windows at the second floor, Marvin Direct-Set Casement windows at the first floor and Thermal Steel in-swing French doors by Architectural Traditions on the first floor. A knee wall system of louvered cedar panels will support the windows above.

**Ms. Harris** said that this petition was reviewed by the Board at their meeting of December 11, 2013 and was continued at the request of the petitioner in order to allow him to restudy the divided light pattern in the fenestration. She stated that the petitioner has restudied the divided light pattern as well as the railing pattern.

**Ms. Harris** informed the Board that the petitioner has stated that their preferred design is the original design submitted to the Board, and requests that the Board consider this design. The petitioner has submitted a description with further analysis and explanation of the design options.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the alterations to the rear porch at 138 Habersham Street as originally submitted because the alterations are visually compatible and meet the design standards. The petitioner's studies of the alternate divided light patterns and altered railing design support the recommendation to approve the original submission.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Puljung** came forward and stated that hopefully the Board would see and appreciate the efforts they went through to study the alternate façade options for the reconfiguration of porch enclosure that exist. At the last meeting, they were concerned about the divided light patterns. There was an idea that perhaps they were embracing the historic divided light patterns of the home and were producing that. Mr. Puljung explained that they were not attempting to do this. As Ms. Harris has explained, they have restudied their divided light pattern and the railing pattern.

**Dr. Williams** stated that he believes the reason the petitioner is not using the plate glass is so that the windows can be operable and allow fresh air to come in. Is this the basic idea?

**Mr. Puljung** said their goal is to have operable windows on the second floor. They do not have the necessity to have operable windows on the first floor; therefore, they have gone with the direct set glass. They felt that the divided light pattern that they have requested approval for did a better job of bringing together the entire elevation and unifying the façade with that pattern.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Puljung if he considered option 2 with the vertical boards of option 3.

**Mr. Puljung** stated that they did look at this, but in view overall of the window openings, regardless of what the below railing was doing, they did not feel that the upper and lower windows created an attractive appearance.

**Mr. Puljung** said they are respectfully requesting approval of their original submittal and the large divided light pattern that they have shown. They have done their best to use contemporary materials for the windows and doors and they feel that they have used a more modern interpretation of the divided lights in the infill version.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Gene Carpenter** resides at 140 Habersham Street. Ms. Carpenter said she was speaking on behalf of herself as the adjacent property owner. She was also presenting the Beehive Foundation where she works who restored this property in 1990. Ms. Carpenter said she was speaking again today because they still feel that this proposal is visually incompatible with the house, itself, and the adjacent property.

**Ms. Carpenter** said she believes there may be some misconception that the Beehive Foundation wants people to live in the dark ages. This is not true; they begrudge nobody the desire to live a modern lifestyle. She wanted it to be kept in mind that the Beehive Foundation helped to sponsor the construction of the new Ships of the Sea North Garden expansion which is probably the most modern new construction within the City. Also, they are not against additions for enclosures nor modern solutions for historic properties. They object to inappropriate additions and enclosures to any properties; specifically, of course, to the Beehive Foundation restoration of the 1990s. Ms. Carpenter said they consider, as do others, to be some of the finest and most authentic restorations in Savannah's recent history.

**Ms. Carpenter** explained that the purpose of these restorations were to as accurately as possible protect what these houses might have looked like during their time period. In the case of these two houses as a duplex to add modern additions such as the porches to make them move livable. They regret having to speak against this petition and she against her new neighbor. But, their first allegiance is to these restorations themselves, which Mills B. Lane considered one of his most significant contributions to the City of Savannah.

**Ms. Carpenter** said to summarize their objections from last month which still stand for this house [they stated that they did not have any objections to the design itself in an isolated form], but for this particular house which is a simple circa 1805 wooden cottage in Savannah, Georgia, the proposed design is too grand, too fancy, too visually complex, and too self important. It is not sympathetic to the period and style of the house and destroys the symmetry of the duplex design. She said last month they should have looked at the front of the houses along with the backs of the houses because she believes this allows for a better perspective when judging visual compatibility.

**Ms. Carpenter** said she would show the Board some comparison drawings to help

illustrate this, but before she does, she wanted to comment on some points mentioned last month. Firstly, moving the back steps. The charm of the duplex is that the two houses are mirror images of themselves and moving the steps would destroy the architectural concept. Secondly, she believes that someone on the Board supported moving the steps to the center saying that sharing a staircase does not work. However, she lived in the house for 18 years and has had five sets of neighbors and sharing paired steps has never been a problem for either side. Thirdly, and most important is the fact that no design decision of Harvey Jones, the restoration architect, was ever made arbitrarily. Each and every single detail of his restoration, as well as all Beehive Foundation restorations, was backed by extensive research and reason an educated conjecture whenever evidence was lacking. She said that Mr. Jones based all of his decisions on what would be appropriate in Savannah, Georgia during the time period. If Mr. Jones found evidence to support a doublewide center staircase over a single paired single staircase, then he would have designed the porches as such. Although, she can only guess at Mr. Jones's intent, she feels certain that he based his decision to have the paired staircase on examples of staircases throughout Savannah. There are numerous examples of paired steps and shared stoops throughout the Historic District and the paired staircases in keeping with those. Ms. Carpenter showed the Board several examples of paired staircases throughout the area and exactly the same configuration as the back porch stairs are now. She said in addition all over town as this Board is aware, there are other types of paired steps where everybody shares the same portico and a double door entry.

**Ms. Carpenter** said last month a member of the Board mentioned that the refrigerator is in the way when you go in the back door which was another justification for moving the steps. She said this is partially true because when you go up the steps, you enter the door and the refrigerator is approximately three to four feet away from the door. But, this was not a part of the original restoration. The kitchen was added to the back porch by the previous owner and could easily be flipped to the other side of the porch opening up the south end of the porch as it initially was or better still the kitchen could be put back to where it was before it was moved to the porch. In doing this, it would allow the entire porch to be livable space. The staircase could remain where it is. Ms. Carpenter said, therefore, they do not believe that either the location of the refrigerator or having to share a staircase with a neighbor is a legitimate reason for destroying the symmetry of the duplex-style house.

**Ms. Carpenter** said this was not mentioned at the last meeting, but if a stair is moved and there is a double staircase coming down it runs right into a 30 feet tall -18 inch in diameter crepe myrtle tree. Either the crepe myrtle tree will have to be cut down or a section out of the north corner will have to be cut which is the double staircase. They do not feel that either of these options is a good solution.

**Ms. Carpenter** said except for the color scheme and the retention of the three bay pattern of the porches, they do not feel that the petitioner's proposal is visually compatible with this house nor either of the adjacent houses. She said they ask the Board to deny this petition in favor of a sympathetic solution for this unassuming Savannah style-cottage.

**Ms. Deane Donnigan**, property owner of 138 Habersham Street, said that she respects and appreciates the tremendous amount of work that her future neighbor, Ms. Carpenter, has pulled together. She also thanked the Beehive Foundation and the work of the Lane Family. Ms. Donnigan said her home is in the Washington Warren Square area and it would not be there without the work of the Beehive Foundation. As a matter of fact, her

own home at 419 East St. Julian is a house that the Lane Family restored basically from "the ashes." Therefore, she has a tremendous amount of respect for Mr. Lane's work. As she mentioned to the Board at the last meeting, this is one of the reason they spent a lot of time at the Beehive Foundation trying to understand this house story. It is very hard for them to understand how this house got to where it is currently after the most recent renovation.

**Ms. Donnigan** said she believes the most important thing to know about this house is that it has been vacant for a very long time. It was on the market for sale for more than a year and could not be leased or rented because people did not understand the floor plan of the house or believe the enclosure of the porch from the back is attractive. They do not see it for purpose to live in modern day times. She said they would not have chosen to do what was done to the house, but they are trying to do their best to make it livable again. As anyone knows who owns historic property, to have the property empty is one of the worst things, but from her own personal perspective in being a huge proponent of the downtown area, they want people to live downtown. This is what makes them a living historic district and not a museum. Ms. Donnigan said, therefore, she believes they have to meet somewhere in the middle. They would not have moved the kitchen where it is, but it is where it is. Therefore, rather than take on an expense as well as all the other expenses they are going to incur potentially because of some of the structural damages that have been done with the weight of the windows and how the last renovation was done, they will leave the kitchen where it is.

**Ms. Donnigan** said the reason this property remained empty for such a long time was due to the people when they look at this property, they feel that they cannot afford to make it work. Consequently, she asked the Board to consider their application in light of the appropriateness standard and vote from that perspective.

**Ms. Carpenter** said they totally agree with Ms. Donnigan, but all they are saying is that it can be done in a more sympathetic way.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Carpenter if her comments are predicated on bilateral symmetry of the two sites. Are the gardens identical?

**Ms. Carpenter** answered no.

**Dr. Williams** asked that from the centerline of the two houses, are the gardens divided down that center line.

**Ms. Carpenter** answered no.

**Dr. Williams** said from the plans that he has seen, Ms. Carpenter's yard actually spills well into the yard behind this house. Is this correct?

**Ms. Carpenter** answered correct.

**Dr. Williams** asked, therefore, the experience of exiting that staircase is different for the two properties.

**Ms. Carpenter** answered correct.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes that if Ms. Carpenter has invited the Board to look at the front, then he believes they need to look at the existing yard context. The movement of the stairs that is a part of this proposal has to be understood in the broader context and not just in the context of the symmetry of the two houses.

**Ms. Carpenter** stated that she considers the house to be the most important thing. She explained that it was done this way to have off-street parking.

**Dr. Williams** asked what caused the yards change.

**Ms. Carpenter** said before these restorations, the houses were very dilapidated. There were all sorts of additions attached on the back. But, when the houses were restored, all of the additions were taken off. Mr. Harvey Jones incorporated four off-street parking spots, which her property owns and she gave up permanent easements to the other two houses. She has an easement for her garden.

**Mr. Howington** invited Mr. Puljung to respond to the public comments.

**Mr. Puljung** thanked the Board for the supplemental information and stated that they thoroughly studied what was going on with the back porches. He does not want it to be put under the impression that they arbitrary in what they considered for this addition. Mr. Puljung believed that the aesthetics are all receptive. This is what they believe is a better solution to the porch enclosure as it currently exists and they have continued with the idea of reversibility. Mr. Puljung said he was hopeful that the Board would find as well a great job in meeting the design standards.

**Mr. Puljung** respectfully requested that the Board approve their submittal.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** asked how many proposed designs were the Board reviewing. The submittal package had an A, B, and C proposal in addition to the original.

**Mr. Howington** asked that the submittal package be shown on the screen.

**Mr. Lominack** said the petitioner is requesting that the original submittal be approved.

**Ms. Harris** showed the original submittal that the petitioner is requesting be approved. At the Board's request, there was a restudy with the historic window patterns; study 2 - a more simplified window pattern and study 3 which includes the fenestration pattern as proposed plus a vertical rail redesigned.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the Board has the option of recommending the approval of one of these designs.

**Mr. Howington** answered yes, but the petitioner has asked for approval of what he has submitted.

**Dr. Williams** said the Board can make a motion on the petitioner's request, but what if one of the other three options is more acceptable.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes it would be appropriate to ask the petitioner if he has a comment regarding which option is more acceptable to him. The Board can ask the petitioner directly if he would consider a substitution of parts or pieces of one of the alternates.

**Board Action:**

Approval of the alterations to the rear porch at 138 Habersham Street as originally submitted because the alterations are visually compatible and meet the design standards. The petitioner's studies of the alternative divided light patterns and altered railing design support the recommendation to approve the original submission. - PASS

**Vote Results**

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

13. [Petition of Harry Kyriakides | 13-006068-COA | 41-43 Whitaker Street | After-the-Fact Alterations](#)

- Attachment: [Application.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Staff Photographs - Existing Conditions.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [2006 and 2012 Photographs.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for alterations to the front façade of the building located at 41 Whitaker Street.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends denial for after-the-fact alterations to the

front façade of the building located at 41 Whitaker Street because the work does not meet the preservation standards, visual compatibility factors, or the design standards. The staff further recommends 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.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if the tile change was approved.

**Ms. Michalak** answered no. She said she could not find any records of approval for any work on this building with the exception of changing the canopies several times. Coastal Canvas applied several times to change the awnings.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Kyriakides** stated that he purchased the building in 1980. At that time windows were on each end of the building. He turned the building into a restaurant and lounge that was open 24 hours not realizing just how bad this street was. Mr. Kriakides said he ran into many problems during the five years he had the establishment open for 24 hours. He installed a balcony inside and put the kitchen on the side near the window. He closed the window because he did not want people to look into the kitchen. He had problems with graffiti being put on the sides and front of the building and holes being punched in the stucco. Mr. Kyriakides said to alleviate this, he put the tile there.

**Mr. Kyriakides** said the building was hit by a vehicle. The size is approximately is 5 x 5.5. It is hollow inside because originally a window was here. He put a smaller window here because he found that a two inch window was hard to break. When the window was installed, he was out of town, but told the workers to ensure the size of window and paint it a color to match the color that was already there. When he returned, he found that this was not done. He received a call from the City advising him that the work was done without getting a permit. They advised him to come to the Historic Review Board and seek approval.

**Mr. Kyriakides** said that he cannot match the top. This is the reason he put wood on it. He can try to match the tile. If the Board desires, he will remove the window or he will put a larger window there as it was originally. If he is allowed to stucco it, he probably will be able to come with a close color to the tile, but it will not be the same color. Consequently, it will be stucco and not tile. Mr. Kyriakides said he would like to have a window here because it makes it look better from the inside and he believes it would look good from the outside. But, it is left to the discretion of the Board. He just wants the Board to tell him what to do and he will do it either way. The area is so small, it does not make a difference.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Kyriakides if he placed a window and door where the hole was.

**Mr. Kyriakides** said the entire area was tiled. The door and window were going downstairs. But, the window shown on top was there. There is another window underneath the canopy, but you cannot see it.

**Dr. Williams** asked if a door was here originally.

**Mr. Kyriakides** said no, a window was here. It was a 6x6 window. He explained that in the

1930s, a window was here that went up to 20 feet. It had the big doors. But, there is nothing structured on either side. You can take half of the front off and then go into archway 20 feet high where the big doors and windows were. The original design had a window on the bottom and a big window on the top.

**Mr. Kyriakides** said he prefers to put a big window here to make it look good. He was going to do this, but he was told to put in a four inch window; however, the ones he found were a two inch thick window. It was a four-by-four, so he put that window there.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Jeff Cramer** came forward and stated that when Sushi Zen was opened, he did the drawings for the Historic Review Board. He does not remember anything about the doors, but knows that the request was approved.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Henry** asked the staff if they found any old photos of this building.

**Mr. Lominack** said based on the photos that the Board has seen today, the building looked better when it was Sushi Zen. Since that time, the building has progressively gone down hill. He said that he does not believe that the Board can suggest what should be done. The request is to approve what is here.

**Mr. Howington** concurred with Mr. Lominack and explained that a motion should be concerning what is here. It should be made plain to the petitioner that if he is proposing any changes, he would have to come back to the staff and Board with drawings and elevations sections as stipulated in the application.

**Mr. Lominack** said the staff recommended stucco, but he does not believe this is the solution.

### **Board Action:**

Denial of the petition for after-the-fact alterations to the front façade of the building located at 41 Whitaker Street because the work does not meet the preservation standards, visual compatibility factors, or the design standards.

- PASS

The Board recommends that the petitioner work with staff to design an appropriate alternative treatment for the project area and return to a future HDBR Meeting for review.

### **Vote Results**

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Nicholas Henry

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

14. [Petition of Reshma Shah Johnson, Shah Architecture | 13-006313-COA | 521-523 West Jones Street | Fence](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal packet- project description and photos.pdf](#)

Attachment: [O'Neil Ward.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

**Ms. Reshma Shah Johnson** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. the petitioner is requesting to construct at fence on a vacant lot at 521-523 West Jones Street. the proposed fence is setback approximately 12 feet from the West Jones Street and 21 feet one inch from West Jones Lane. It runs along the western property line.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the proposed fence at 521-523 West Jones Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Bring the fence closer to the West Jones Street property line (at least within five feet).
2. Use a masonry or metal material along West Jones Street as opposed to wood.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked staff if they were suggesting an alternate material on the West Jones Street façade.

**Ms. Harris** said the standards says "walls facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building."

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Johnson** stated that they understand the guidelines that have been put together for the materials that are being suggested for use on the main street, which is Jones Street. However, her client would like to use a wood material in keeping with the industrial nature of the area. Therefore, they are hopeful of achieving this modern interpretation with a wood fence design.

**Mr. Howington** asked Ms. Johnson if she had a comment on the staff's recommendation regarding bringing the fence closer to the West Jones Street property line.

**Ms. Johnson** said this recommendation could be achieved, however, they are trying to maintain a small footprint of an enclosed area. Therefore, this is why the size of the lot is the way that it is. They brought the fence back knowing that the material was not going to be continuous with the façade material as opposed now. If they brought it closer and still did not have the same material of the masonry continuous, they felt it would visually take away from the fact that it was not continuous. So, they purposely pushed it back to make a clear visual separation.

**Mr. Lominack** asked what is proposed to happen in the 12 foot space.

**Ms. Johnson** said there will be ground covered landscape. They are proposing a planter, but the landscape plan as not yet been developed.

### PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

### BOARD DISCUSSION

**Mr. Lominack** asked staff about the leeway the Board has on the fence.

**Ms. Harris** suggested that since there is a specific and measurable standard in this case that if the Board were to be inclined to approve an alternative material that it would be a variance from the standard and a finding fact would need to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).

**Mr. Howington** asked staff, therefore, the Ordinance states that the material "shall be" masonry.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes it would be a shame to deny something that isn't pretending to be done any other time. It is playful in a way. He finds it to be pleasing proportion and everything else. If it has to go to the ZBA, he would lean towards the Board approving it with the condition of how far back from the sidewalk it is. As it is recommended, he believes it would be correct to pull it closer to the sidewalk.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she remembers the Board approved a wood fence on Wayne and Harris Streets.

**Dr. Williams** asked staff if the Ordinance says "shall be brick or metal."

**Ms. Harris** explained that the Ordinance says walls and fences facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building; provided, however, iron fencing may be used with a masonry structure.

**Ms. Simpson** agreed that it is a wonderful design, however, they have an Ordinance to abide by.

**Mr. Lominack** said it is shame that they have an Ordinance that says they cannot do the better thing. The Board should have this leeway.

**Ms. Harris** said the Board will have the leeway when the New Zoning Ordinance is enacted.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the wood fence that the Board approved was painted to match the brick house. Therefore, they are not talking about the same thing. She cannot remember the circumstances surrounding the fence on Wayne and Harris Streets.

**Dr. Williams** asked what is the stain color.

**Mr. Howington** answered that the stain color is redwood stained cypress.

**Dr. Williams** said the color would blend in with the red brick.

**Dr. Henry** said the Board could recommend the finding fact to the ZBA.

**Mr. Howington** explained that if the Board feels satisfied with what has been presented is an acceptable solution, they can go to the ZBA with a finding fact which would be a part of the motion. He said everything is done on a case-by-case basis. This is a heavy industrial area.

**Ms. McClain** said they have the Ordinance and it is there for a reason.

**Mr. Lominack** said for the Board to take the Ordinance and use it based on a fear that it would set a precedent when it is the appropriate thing to do, is not a wise decision. He believes it should be done on a case-by-case basis. If the Board feels this is an appropriate solution, then they should support it. When the next petitioner comes along, the Board would look at their project the way, on a case-by-case basis.

**Dr. Williams** said the Board has approved petitions in the past contingent upon going to the ZBA.

**Mr. Howington** said if they don't agree with it and want to stick with the Ordinance, then the petition could be denied.

**Dr. Henry** said he does not believe that this would be setting a precedent. The Board would recommend a finding fact to the ZBA.

**Board Action:**

Approve the proposed fence at 521-523 West Jones Street with the condition that the fence is closer to the West Jones Street property line (at least within five feet), to be submitted to staff for review and approval, because the work is visually compatible and meets the design standards.

Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the standard in the

Historic District Section (8-3030) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance which states: *Fences, Trellises and Walls. Fences, trellises and walls shall comply with the following:*

*Walls and fences facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building; provided, however, iron fencing may be used with a masonry structure.* - PASS

Because the proposed fence is located in an industrial area and the wood material is visually compatible.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

15. [Petition of Jeff Cramer for Diversified Designs P.C. | 13-006329-COA | 33 East Broad Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to install two fences at 33 East Board Street.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the proposed fencing at 33 East Broad Street with the condition that the material of the fence along East Board Street be changed to wood and be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to construction so that it may meet the fence standard.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the proposed gate will be only iron. The drawings are so shaded in makes it unclear if something else will be there that you can see through.

**Ms. Harris** explained that her understanding is that it would be open. This is something that they can ask the petitioner to confirm.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Cramer** said that his client and he feel strongly about the brick fence at 33 East Broad Street. There are a lot of historical precedencies for brick entries on this street. All the property surrounding here were previously owned by the Savannah Gas Company. This company really liked brick fences.

**Mr. Cramer** stated that he made a map showing that not only are there brick fences, but the only things he noted were brick fences with predominantly wood facades. He said just by looking across the street, it would reveal that a historical precedent is here. There is a wood fence similar here, but it is not on a formal street. Congress Street is on the side of the house where you get more of a side and yard feel. It is not the formal feel you get on East Broad Street where a median and a lot of streetscape, brick walls and so forth are here.

**Mr. Cramer** said he tried to get his client to construct a wood fence; it would be easier for him, but the client is very intent on constructing a brick fence. Mr. Cramer stated that as said, there is plenty of precedencies already here to justify constructing the brick fence.

**Mr. Cramer** said regarding the gate, there will be half inch wrought iron pickets. Some decorative work will be on the gate. There is a gate across the street that is similar to the gate they are proposing.

**Ms. Simpson** asked about the height of the fence. Will it be as high as the fence across the street?

**Mr. Cramer** answered that they measured the fences across the street. Their fence is a little lower than the fence across the street. The fence will be approximately 5 feet - four inches tall. He showed the Board pictures of other brick fences and wood structures in this area. A brick wall goes completely around Trustees Garden. The Mulberry Inn also has a brick wall that is stuccoed with different material. He said he is aware that the Board has guidelines, but they really want to construct the brick fence in the front. The other fence is the one that will be on the side.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** said he believes that the petitioner has made a compelling case about what is compatible in the surrounding area. He asked if the Board would need a fact finding request to send this to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).

**Mr. Howington** said some of the houses in the area, especially the house next to the petitioner's house, have brick base. This is a wood house primarily, but has a brick face. He said arguably there is brick on the house and, therefore, is not completely a wood structure. Would this need to go to the ZABA?

**Ms. Harris** explained that she believes if the Board interprets it as Mr. Howington has said, it would need to be stated in the Board's motion as such.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes that there is an argument that a mixture of materials are on this building and, therefore, does not require ZBA approval.

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for brick, iron, and wood fences at 33 East Broad Street because the work is - PASS visually compatible.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

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

16. [Petition of John Deering for Greenline Architecture | 13-006343-COA | 114-116 West Congress Street | Rehabilitation and Alterations](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Various photographs MPC files.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Structural Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.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, chaired 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 for the rehabilitation of 114-116 West Congress Street which includes general brick repointing; stabilizing existing stucco; repair existing brownstone lintels, sills and pilasters; replacing existing downspouts, and installing new light fixtures. The building once housed the Sorry Charlie's Restaurant and served as a seafood market for many years.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the rehabilitation of 114-116 West Congress Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Brick:
  - a. Provide a sample of the proposed infill brick to be used;
  - b. Follow *Preservation Brief 2: Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings*;
  - c. Perform a material analysis of the existing mortar to determine historic composition and provide the proposed mortar mix specification;
  - d. Provide a four foot by four foot test patch of the proposed repointing as it will appear finished, including new infill brick, final finish pointing style, and relationship to the brick face. Install the test patch in an inconspicuous location.
2. Stucco:
  - a. Follow *Preservation Brief 22: The Preservation and Repair of Historic Stucco*;
  - b. Perform a material analysis of the existing stucco to determine historic composition and provide the proposed stucco mix specification;
  - c. Provide a test patch of the proposed stucco patching in an inconspicuous location;
3. Provide additional information on the proposed brownstone repair and on how the paint will be removed from the quoins and cornice;
4. Submit color samples for all finishes and awning fabric sample;
5. Provide door, window, and light fixture manufacturer's make and model;
6. Restudy the fenestration pattern on the ground floor west façade to better reinforce/align with the two bay rhythm on the upper floors.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Harris that when she says cornices if she was talking about the stringcourse at the top of the first floor.

**Ms. Harris** pointed out the stringcourse she was talking about. She stated, however, it would be ideal for the petitioner to confirm this.

**Dr. Williams** asked, therefore, if this is what is being referred to, there is no reference to the painted stringcourse at the top of the first floor.

**Ms. Harris** answered that this was not noted on the petitioner's drawings. She reported that the petitioner has not provided historic photographs of the building. But, as they all know, sometimes it is rather hard to get the exact building that you want in the photograph. But, there were some MPC photographs on file of the historic signage that the Board has seen. This will be restored. In regards to the storefront configuration, the petitioner is not trying to restore a historic storefront, but matching one of the older storefronts that is near here.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Deering** came forward and stated that they will provide staff with reports on the findings of the stucco and mortar composition, the infill recommendations, the cleaning material and the brownstone repair restoration material. He said that they do not intend to restore the brownstone completely. They will stabilize it and keep it in place.

**Mr. Deering** said in an answer to Dr. Williams's question, there is paint on the cornice. It is very old and looks like it is a part of the color of the stucco, but when they checked it, it is definitely paint.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the paint is on the end unit.

**Mr. Deering** answered yes. He explained that he believes the unit at 114 Congress Street was painted in 1988.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Deering if he was proposing to remove the white paint on the cornice.

**Mr. Deering** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** asked, therefore, the second unit will be different.

**Mr. Deering** said, pointing to a section, that the white paint would be removed here. They do not know if they will remove the paint that is on the bay. After they evaluate it, they might leave it on. He said, pointing to the cornice, that they will try to get this cornice to look more like the color of the other cornice.

**Mr. Deering** said they have worked on five of the eight bays in this particular range; and he believes evidence is there that they try to leave things as they are and not tamper with them too much.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** commented that she is happy to see that something is being done with this building. She commended the petitioner.

**Mr. Deering** said he, too, is happy to see that something is being done with this building. He has worked on it for about seven years and he is happy to see that someone is taking this building on.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Deering to convey the Board's appreciation to his client for restoring this building.

**Mr. Lominack** said often they see historic buildings that have gone through changes over time that have taken on this kind of richness as an overall patina. He asked Mr. Deering if they were trying to make it look like it was just built or make it look old.

**Mr. Deering** said they are doing what is called "restore it to new."

**Mr. Lominack** stated that it is refreshing to see this. He believes this is a good project.

**Mr. Deering** said it is good that the two property owners in this row have decided to let it be and not restore it too much.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked Mr. Deering how he felt regarding staff's comment #6 pertaining to restudying the fenestration pattern.

**Mr. Deering** answered that he would like for the Board to consider exactly what he submitted.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Bill Stuebe of the Downtown Neighborhood Association** said they, too, applaud the work that is being done on this property. They believe it is terrific. He said, however, given the 1820s date of this building, they wanted to emphasize their concern which is that any work that is being done moves towards that direction verses putting in modern picture windows and so forth. Mr. Stuebe said they are not suggesting that this is what is being done, but with regards to the new windows that are being put in on the eastern end of the building near the Lady and Sons Restaurant, all those windows were put in with multi-pane windows and here they are being replaced with two-over-two windows. He was, therefore, wondering if this is appropriate given the 1820 historic of the building when two-over-two windows would not have been possible.

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation** stated they are okay with the western façade and the arrangements that are going on. She does not know if the HSF has a better solution on how to treat that. She said that the HSF's Architecture Review Committee had a lot of discussion about that configuration. They would like to see the configuration be a little more similar to the windows that are being used on the other bays. She understands that the four windows is somewhat a continuation of what is going on in the other bays and not the row. Ms. Meunier said they see both sides of it, but it was a point of discussion for the Architecture Review Committee as they were wondering what would be most appropriate for this project.

**Ms. Simpson** invited Mr. Deering to make comments on the public comments.

**Mr. Deering** informed Mr. Stuebe that the two-over-two windows and sashes are historic as they already exist. This is why they elected to put them back. The six-over-six and nine-over-nine at the other end of the building had aluminum awning windows. Therefore, they went back to the premises of the 1836 openings and looked at this and it did have the nine-over-nine and six-over-six. This is why they put them back at the other end of the building. They have these sashes. The Congress Street side is not real windows.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Deering to point to the windows on the photograph that he was talking about.

**Mr. Deering** said, pointing to some windows, these were windows that were two-over-two, four-over-four, and six-over-six. All of these are being replaced with multi-paned window.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Deering to point to the ones that he said are not real windows.

**Mr. Deering** explained that all of these windows are just a two-by-four with a piece of plexiglass. They are not really windows.

**Mr. Steube** said the petitioner is putting in two-over-two. He suggests that they not be two-over-two, but six-over-six.

**Dr. Henry** asked if a particular timeframe was instituted when the Berrien House was restored. He asked Mr. Deering if they had this kind of concept.

**Mr. Deering** answered that they do not. He believes that the Berrien House is a different story. The Berrien House is a residence and they felt that these rows of buildings have changed so much over the years that they did not want to take it to a particular period of time, but to reflect as well as they possibly could the many changes that Dr. Williams has spoke of.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Deering if the one-over-one windows that are in the second unit are real windows.

**Mr. Deering** answered that those are real windows. He believes the windows were put there in 1980.

**Dr. Williams** stated, regarding the Barnard Street elevation, he believes that one of the units has a " linoleum" sign. He stated that in Mr. Deering's restoration plan, he has three transom lights and then one big window. He said one of the photographs on the Whitaker Street side shows this configuration.

**Mr. Deering** said that this is where they borrowed that from.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Deering why not use that on the Barnard Street elevation for the windows beside the doors rather than two sets of two-over-two; why not have the triple window?

**Mr. Deering** stated that his client really likes the idea of the double hung windows in this opening.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** said, as the proposal now stands, it will remove all the stucco with the exception of on the pilasters, although the petitioner has acknowledged maintaining the stucco. He said that whoever makes the motion he suggests that the stucco, where possible, be maintained.

**Ms. Simpson** asked the Board about the windows, as discussion was had on the windows on the storefront.

**Mr. Lominack** said one of the staff's conditions that he disagrees with is #6.

**Dr. Williams** said that sheet 10 shows one-over-one windows being retained on the

second unit and two-over-two as the petitioner mentioned. Are these the same one-over-one that is here or are these new one-over-one?

**Mr. Deering** said they are new one-over-one.

**Dr. Williams** said the existing door is being removed. He said that in the "linoleum" sign unit, the central bay and ground floor are shown as glass according to the page 1 photograph.

**Ms. Harris** said staff has the Sanborn Maps if the Board would like to see the original entrance configuration. The addresses were on the St. Julian Street and Congress Street sides, not on the Barnard Street side originally. However, the building has evolved to have entrances on the Barnard Street side as well.

**Board Action:**

Approval of the rehabilitation of 114-116 West Congress Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Brick:

- a. Provide a sample of the proposed infill brick to be used;
- b. Follow Preservation Brief 2: Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings;
- c. Perform a material analysis of the existing mortar to determine historic composition and provide the proposed mortar mix specification;
- d. Provide a four foot by four foot test patch of the proposed repointing as it will appear finished, including new infill brick, final finish pointing style, and relationship to the brick face. Install the test patch in an inconspicuous location;

2. Stucco:

- PASS

- a. Follow Preservation Brief 22: The Preservation and Repair of Historic Stucco;
- b. Perform a material analysis of the existing stucco to determine historic composition and provide the proposed

stucco mix specification;

c. Provide a test patch of the proposed stucco patching in an inconspicuous location;

3. Provide additional information on the proposed brownstone repair and on how the paint will be removed from the quoins and cornice;

4. Submit color samples for all finishes and awning fabric sample;

5. Provide door, window, and light fixture manufacturer's make and model;

6. Retain all stucco on walls where possible.

**Vote Results**

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Linda Ramsay

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

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 601 East Bay Street 13-006344-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Washington Ward.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Trustees' Garden Ward- ADJACENT.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Context Photographs.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps -6344.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff recommendation.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, chaired 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. On June 12, 2013, the Board approved several alterations and on September 18, 2013 staff approved further alterations.

**Ms. Harris** stated that on January 2, 2014, the petitioner attended the City's Site Plan Review meeting to present the project. There were a number of comments concerning the proposed gates on the East Broad Street and East Bryan Street sides which are proposed to open on to the public right-of-way. Particularly on the East Bryan Street side, there was a concern about trash collection vehicles blocking traffic to empty trash receptacles in the proposed configuration.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends continuing the petition in order to:

1. Restudy the roof shape and design to be more compatible with the contributing building 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;
4. Restudy the trellis to meet the standards.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Harris what would be a more compatible roof shape and design?

**Ms. Harris** answered that the roof shape does not meet the standards and is not visually compatible with contributing buildings to which it is visually related, especially with regard to the brick buildings. She believes, however, that there are a lot of options within this ward. It could potentially be a flat roof with a parapet. There are other options that may be compatible.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the building shown on page 12 is directly across East Broad Street.

**Ms. Harris** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** asked if this building would be counted as a part of the context.

**Ms. Harris** answered yes, potentially. She explained that the standards say it has to be on the same blockface. Therefore, it would not meet that standard. Because this is not a freestanding independent building, it is associated with significant contributing buildings on site, staff is recommending that they look to those buildings as an inspiration. But, there is wiggle room for this.

**Ms. Harris** showed the Board a picture of an existing building on the Trustees Garden Site that she was told was the inspiration for this design. It is not the intention to copy it, but it was an architectural inspiration. However, staff believes that there are significant contributing buildings on site that they could relate to. Therefore, these buildings should be looked at first.

#### **PETITION COMMENTS**

**Mr. Deering** explained [pointing to a structure] that this little structure was the inspiration for what they call the "Wedding Lawn Building." These two new structures are intended to be a backdrop for wedding use within the courtyard of the former Mulberry Inn. He

believes this is a great little accessory building. The building in Trustees Garden does not relate to its surrounding contributing structures at all architecturally; but, yet, they need an entrance in a canvas of other historic building. Mr. Deering stated that this is why they thought it would be okay for this building to use this as a jumping off point to design the little buildings in the courtyard of the Mulberry. The primary contributing building of the Mulberry is about 20 percent of the entire block. The rest of the block is a 1981 structure and a 1996 structure that really do not relate to any of the historic surrounding contexts. Therefore, they felt that working within the courtyard, it was okay to take an idea and expand on it and use a slightly different form, roof and so forth.

**Mr. Deering** stated that within this same block front there are only flat roofs with parapets. They are primarily the 1981 and 1996 buildings. But, within the next block, is the petition which the Board just saw, which is 33 East Broad Street. It has a hip roof; it is one-to-one or twelve-to-twelve roof pitch which is what they are proposing. He said one block away, it is contextually appropriate.

**Mr. Deering** said in designing these buildings behind a wall, they thought that having a one-to-one hip roof, which is primarily what you would see, would be an acceptable solution as they look like accessory buildings behind a wall. They are trying to improve the wall of continuity along Bryan Street. This hotel has four sides of public street. There is no good service portal and this is the only one they have; therefore, they are trying to get more wall. They are working with the Waste Management personnel on the trash collection. Consequently, they may be back before this Board with another solution for the wall on Bryan Street. He said, as Ms. Harris has pointed out, they want to have more wall and this is why they put the gate here.

**Mr. Deering** stated that they do not know what to do with the East Broad Street gate. The Building Code indicates that it needs to open outward. If you have 200 hundred people on the lawn they could escape to the public right-of-way. The City does not want them to do this. Therefore, they will have to work this out with the City officials.

**Ms. Simpson** asked Mr. Deering based on what he said and because of the City's safety concerns, if he wanted to request a continuance?

**Mr. Deering** said he would like for the Board to hear the petition.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked, what is the purpose of the 18 foot spikes?

**Mr. Deering** answered visual interest - celebratory elements.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they agree with all of the comments that the staff has made. They believe that the shape of the roof is an issue for them. They believe it competes with the architecture of the main building and possibly reducing the slope, so that it is not so steep, may address this issue.

**Ms. Meunier** said a comment for consideration that came to the HSF's committee is to actually use a wooden gate as opposed to a metal gate to shield the view of the dumpsters.

However, they will reserve this comment until they see a restudy of what might happen with the wall as they are not sure in terms of wall continuity if keeping the metal gate might be a better solution.

**Mr. Deering** did not wish to respond to the public comments.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Henry** asked staff if blockface meant all of the houses inside a block, but not across the street.

**Ms. Harris** explained that blockface means all the houses facing the block.

**Dr. Henry** asked staff, therefore, the example that Mr. Deering cited is irrelevant.

**Ms. Harris** said the rule says compatible.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she believes the roof's end with the material is the thing that makes it stand out as being not visually compatible with the surroundings.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes an attempt is being made here to make this a more important structure in relation to the main structure than it really is. If it was treated more as a landscape feature such as a pavilion type, it would be better. He said he believes it looks too important for the function that it is serving. Mr. Lominack said he understands the backdrop for weddings, but he was not sure whether the dominant side contributes to the wedding ceremony. He said he is not sure whether the parapet brick building is the right solution either. He believes it would become awful heavy also. Because of the scale and its relation to everything else such as where it is located, it should be treated more as a landscape feature rather than a building feature.

**Ms. McClain** said she sees Mr. Lominack's point; too much is going on here for the corner that it sits on. It is definitely not visually compatible with any of the adjacent structures.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she believes Mr. Deering was trying to say something, but at this point they can't hear from him unless the Board has a specific question, unless he is asking for a continuance.

**Dr. Williams** said all of the samples are showing a steep pitch to the roof; they have standing seam metal roofs. He said maybe if there was a slightly lower pitch, this might partially address Mr. Lominack's comment.

**Ms. Simpson** asked Mr. Deering if he wanted to ask for a continuance.

**Mr. Deering** requested a continuance.

### **Board Action:**

Approve to continue at the petitioner's request the petition for alterations at 601 East Bay Street in order to:

1. Restudy the roof shape and design to be more compatible with the contributing buildings with which it is associated;
- PASS
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. Redesign the trellis to meet the standards.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

18. [Petition of Neil Dawson, Dawson Architects | 13-006346-COA | 222 East Gordon Street | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Application - 222 East Gordon Street 13-006346-COA.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

**NOTE: Ms. Weibe-Reed abstained from discussion of this petition. She serves as a consultant to Dawson Architects.**

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

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations at the rear of the structure at 222 East Gordon Street.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the addition of shutters to all

windows on the south and east facades with the condition that they are sized to fit the window opening and the horizontal rail corresponds to the location of the meeting rail. The staff further recommends approval of the color change to the existing windows and trim on the condition that they be the same, rather than contrasting colors and denial of the enclosure of the existing rear porch, first and second levels with wood French doors with sidelights (visible from Wayne Street). Should the Board choose to approve the enclosure, staff recommends that the hardiboard features be changed to wood and that the balcony bracket details be provided to staff for review and approval.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the hardiboard would replace something.

**Ms. Harris** said it would be added to the existing structure. She said, with the way the standard is worded, she struggled with this as it says "that hardiplank is prohibited as a replacement material for existing wood." Technically, this is not an addition because the footprint is not increasing. Therefore, the standard is hard to apply here.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if the porch is currently enclosed.

**Ms. Harris** answered that a part of the porch is enclosed.

**Mr. Lominack** said from the photograph, it looks like it has been enclosed.

**Ms. Harris** showed a photo of the porch and stated that some time prior to 2011 the bottom portion was enclosed with T-111 and doors. Currently, it is not enclosed.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Dawson** came forward and stated that Mr. Matthew Weiner, owner, was present with him today and that he also would answer questions from the Board if he needed to do so. Mr. Dawson said he wanted to go back to the Sanborn Maps. He said there is an indication of some type of enclosure here. It has obviously morphed over time. Frankly, it is difficult to reconcile what is here with what is currently on site. Therefore, he wanted to show the Board the photographs.

**Mr. Dawson** pointed out that historic Savannah Grey brick is on this side and protrudes back about 30 inches on the side. A Savannah Grey wall is also on the other side. Therefore, it is indisputable that these two walls probably existed since it was built. Mr. Dawson explained that a wire-cut brick is here and it has been his experience that this is typically much later than what would have been indicated on the Sanborn Maps as a part of the addition. He said that he does not know why this is not picked up on the Sanborn Maps, but his experience has been that this brick is somewhere between the 1930s and 1960s.

**Mr. Dawson** said he does not believe that it is accurate to say that this would be the historic original appearance of the building. There was obviously some kind of infill that was changed over time. But, it is not reflected on the Sanborn Maps. Clearly, if you go back to what is "pink" on the most recent map in 1953, he does not know if it is to the extent of what is actually shown. Consequently, the current façade is not what he would consider the original condition of the building. When they approached the project, a part of their goal was to clean up the wire-cut brick pilaster that is somewhat an anomaly sticking out. Mr. Dawson said there is also a difference in the siding material. It steps

back and there is also siding in a place that normally would traditionally be some type of beam support for the porch structure. He said, pointing to an area, that there is also siding here that dies flush into the side of the Savannah Grey brick. He said even if it has achieved the age of significance, it's sloppy detailing. Therefore, a part of their goal is to clean this up.

**Mr. Dawson** said, on their proposed elevation, they have tried to frame the porch opening that is remaining with the hardi-pilasters. They set the doors back eight inches from the face of the pilasters. One of their thoughts was that the depth and the shadow line around there preserves the image and impression of the porch. Consequently, they felt this was an appropriate design and approach to make it read with the same mass and scale it had originally. He said that it is correct that porches cannot be infilled without either the use of lattice, screens or something of this sort. Therefore, their approach was to do it more like an addition although the pilasters are only four inches from the wall. There is no increase in square footage, but their thought was it would allow it to read with a porch kind of look and still be consistent with the overall theme of the building. Right or wrong this was their intent in developing the scenario.

**Mr. Dawson** said with regards to whether it should be hardiboard or wood, the standards say that "if it is modified or replaced, that it should be historic materials." But, they felt since it is new and is not actually being used as a siding material, but as a trim material, they felt the cementitious wall was appropriate. He said they have no problem using wood, but he believes that the durability and frankly the quality of the hardiboard has made advances, that this is now a superior product to original wood. But, if the Board feels the wood is more appropriate, they will use the wood.

**Mr. Dawson** said, regarding the paint color on trim versus the sash, they are willing to accept the staff's recommendation and go to a single color. However, they would like to mock this in the field and compare notes with staff.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** asked if this was an addition would the petitioner be allowed to have the glazing? Could an addition take the place of the porch and go beyond the wall?

**Ms. Harris** answered that she believes the Board would have to decide at this point if they were to review this as an addition is the solid-to-void ratio compatible with the rest of the building. She believes that since there is a lot of voids, it reads more as a porch. Ms. Harris said she does not disagree with this approach, but if the Board was reviewing it and said it is an addition, then as she said, they may want to look at the solid-to-void ratio as an addition and not as a porch. There is no specific standard that would prevent this from happening; it would be the visual compatibility.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the Savannah Grey brick is historic.

**Ms. Harris** said it does not appear on the Sanborn Maps.

**Dr. Williams** asked that they look at the Sanborn Maps. He said in 1953, the use of yellow for wood was abandoned. If they look at the porch below it is still there, but is shaded white. Therefore, where they see number twos on the back, one could assume that wood is there. What is interesting is this one, like the 1888, does not have the brick firewall. It is almost as if it reverts back to the first one. They do not see brick in the middle of the single house.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes something would have been there when it was built with that span, but it may have been replaced later. He said that wire-cut brick would have been a later generation. However, he believes that there would have been support somewhere with this kind of span. As far as the hardboard is concerned, he agrees with the petitioner that the products on the market now certainly do exceed the quality of the wood that you can get. Mr. Lominack said he has a problem with the shape, but he understands that it is covering up something else.

**Mr. Dawson** said if he could he would amend the petition and pull forward one inch so that it could be considered an addition and not a porch infill.

**Mr. Howington** asked the Board if they had objections to the petitioner pulling forward one inch and consider it an addition and not a porch.

**Ms. Harris** said she believes the first question the Board would want to ask is, is the porch historic to the building. If the answer is no, then it could be allowed to be an addition instead of a porch. However, if the Board considers it to be a historic feature of the building, then staff recommends adding an addition on the front of it.

**Dr. Williams** stated that the Sanborn Maps show that originally it was an open face forward of the house; a dotted line indicated that it would have been an open face not enclosed.

**Mr. Howington** asked if this was the entire width.

**Dr. Williams** answered yes, the entire width. He said about 60 percent of this width has been filled in. Therefore, only 40 percent is left of that open character. If it is an historic feature, it is a fragment of an historic feature.

**Mr. Lominack** stated that the way the siding and trim is treated, it is obviously a modification. Therefore, it has already been changed significantly.

**Mr. Howington** said that the solid to void has not been disrupted that much.

**Dr. Williams** said the lower story is not visible behind the fence.

**Ms. McClain** said she does not necessarily agree that it has been altered so much that the historical significance has been destroyed.

**Mr. Howington** asked Ms. McClain if she felt the alterations are negative to the structure.

**Ms. McClain** said she agrees with the staff's recommendation.

**Board Action:**

1. Approve the color change to the existing windows and trim on the condition that they be the same, rather than contrasting, colors;
2. Approve the addition of shutters to all windows on the south and east facades with the condition that they are sized to fit the window opening and the horizontal rail corresponds to the location of the meeting rail;
3. Approve of the enclosure of the existing rear porch, first and second levels with wood French doors with sidelights and hardiboard trim and details; and
4. Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the standard in the Historic District Section (8-3030) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance which states: - PASS

*Balconies, stairs, stoops, porticos, and porches. Balconies, stairs, stoops, porticos, and porches within the public right-of-way may be permitted with the approval of the encroachment by the Mayor and Aldermen and provided that the following criteria are met:*

*Front porches shall not be enclosed in any manner. Side and rear porches may be screened with fine wire mesh, lattice or shutters.*

Because the existing porch has lost its historic integrity and the proposed work is visually compatible.

**Vote Results**

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle - Not Present

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Nay
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Nay
Robin Williams	- Aye

## IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

## X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

19. [Petition of Matthew Allan | 13-006070-COA | 504 East McDonough Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 504 East McDonough Street 13-006070-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 504 East McDonough Street 13-006070-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

20. [Petition of Demetrius Huddleston | 13-006133-COA | 233 Abercorn Street | Staff Approved - Roof Replacement](#)

Attachment: [COA - 233 Abercorn Street 13-006133-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 233 Abercorn Street 13-06133-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

21. [Petition of Ralph Anderson | 13-006135-COA | 111 West Bay Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 233 Abercorn Street 13-006133-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of Litchfield Carpenter and Washington Dender | 13-006136-COA | 111 West Gordon Street | Staff Approved - Window Sashes](#)

Attachment: [COA - 111 West Gordon Street 13-006136-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 111 West Gordon Street 13-006136-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Louis Thomann for Newfield Construction | 13-006188-COA | 314 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Roof Replacement](#)

Attachment: [COA - 314 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-006188-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Patrick O'Hayer for Cobblestone Conch House dba Dubs Pub | 13-006192-COA | 225 West River Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Replacement](#)

Attachment: [COA - 225 West River Street 13-006192-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 225 West River Street 13-006192-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of Matthew Allan for J. Leander, LLC | 13-006202-COA | 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-006202-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-006202-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Amended Petition of T. Joe Duckworth | 13-006209-COA | 601 East Broad Street| Staff Approved - Stoop Amendment](#)

Attachment: [COA - 601 East Broad Street 13-006209-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 601 East Broad Street 13-006209-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Thomas Kincade City Market Gallery | 13-006259-COA | 211 W. St. Julian Street | Staff Approved - Color Change, Awning, Windows, Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 211 West St. Julian Street 13-006259-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 211 West St. Julian Street 13-006259-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of James Johnson for Marchese Construction | 13-006263-COA | 411 West Bay Street | Staff Approved - Alterations and Repairs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 411 West Bay Street 13-006263-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 411 West Bay Street 13-006263-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Frank Ptacin for City of Savannah Fire & Emergency Services | 13-006286-COA | 121 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 121 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-006286-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 121 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-006286-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Matthew Allan for J. Leander, LLC | 13-006290-COA | 212 Houston Street | Staff](#)

Approved - Rear Fence Design

Attachment: [COA - 212 Houston Street 13-006290-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 212 Houston Street 13-006290-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. Petition of Rick Glassman | 13-006308-COA | 109 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Brick Repointing, Windows, Doors

Attachment: [COA - 109 West Broughton Street 13-006308-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 109 West Broughton Street 13-006308-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. Petition of Louis Thomann for Newfield Construction | 13-006315-COA | 314 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Porch Repair

Attachment: [COA - 314 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-006315-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 314 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-006315-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. Petition of Tho Tran | 13-006321-COA | 118 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Color Change

Attachment: [COA - 118 Bull Street 13-006321-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 118 Bull Street 13-006321-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. Petition of Castle Investors No. 1, LLC | 13-006326-COA | 200 East St. Julian Street | Staff Approved - Doors

Attachment: [COA - 200 East St. Julian Street 13-006326-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 200 East St. Julian Street 13-006326-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. Petition of Brittany Dorsey for Ace Roofing & Remodeling | 13-006366-COA | 616 Barnard Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair

Attachment: [COA - 616 Barnard Street 13-006366-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 616 Barnard Street 13-006366-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. Petition of Josh Bull for Greenline Architecture | 13-006380-COA | 480 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Mechanical Grills

Attachment: [COA - 480 East Bay Street 13-006380-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 480 East Bay Street 13-006380-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

## XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 1-8-14.pdf](#)

**Mr. Howington** said attached to the Board's packet is a report on the work that was begun without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

## XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Items Deferred to Staff 1-08-14.pdf](#)

**Mr. Howington** stated that staff has given the Board a written report on the Items Deferred to Staff. There are four items on this report.

## XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

### Notices

39. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, January 16, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

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

## XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

### New Business

#### 41. [Other Issues](#)

**Mr. Howington** stated that there are a couple of things that happened today that he would like to discuss. He does not know whether they had the proper procedure. There was one item where they had a motion on top of a motion. Possibly, this should have been handled by separating the motion. There were a few items that a part of the Board agreed with and the other part did not agree with. Dr. Henry made a motion, Ms. Reed made a motion as an amendment which was an opposite. He believes that two of the items were a point of contention. The Board was sort of split.

**Mr. Howington** said in hindsight, he believes it would have been better to separate the two items and vote. The entire project was not looked upon as being unfavorable, but just a couple of the details. Therefore, in the future it might be possible to separate the items.

**Ms. McClain** said she believes that maybe the Board did not have a full discussion. Ms. Reed made an entirely different motion, not an addendum. Separating the items will take too long.

**Mr. Howington** said they did discuss the item for quite a while and looked like they were not getting anywhere. Therefore, he called for the vote.

**Ms. McClain** said at times it will be like this; half of the Board will believe one way and the other half will believe another way. Someone will make a motion and if that fails, then make another motion.

**Mr. Thomson** said the motion can be made or make a substitute motion which requires a second. The latter motion would need to be addressed first and then come back with an amended motion. They have had the parliamentary training. He does not think that after the Board has held its discussion that they need to come to a consensus to make a motion.

**Mr. Howington** said there was a detail with a brick feature. Dr. Henry made a motion that they remove the brick detail as a part of his motion. Then Ms. Reed said no, I like the brick keep it in there. He said possibly this could have been Dr. Henry's motion; then Ms. Reed could have made a motion to leave the brick in there. Then the Board could have voted on Ms. Reed's motion first.

**Mr. Thomson** said he will look this up. He has to call the person who conducted the parliamentary training and he will ask her about this.

**Mr. Howington** said Ms. McClain stated that Ms. Reed's motion was an opposite motion.

**Mr. Lominack** said a motion could have been made to amend Dr. Henry's motion; then the Board would vote on the amended motion first.

**Ms. McClain** said she will have a chart and a guide for the next time as sometimes they make motions on top of motions.

**Ms. Simpson** read that an amendment does nothing but make the motion a rejection of the original motion. It is not proper and is out of order. She said this is exactly what Ms. McClain told the Board.

**Mr. Howington** said technically, the Board did what it was supposed to do. The original motion was carried and Ms. Reed voted against it.

\*\*\*

**Mr. Howington** said he believes they handled the incomplete submittal of 307-311 East Huntingdon Street well.

**Ms. Simpson** said she wished the Board would have told the petitioner at the beginning when they voted to approved the agenda instead of having him wait more than an hour.

**Ms. McClain** said the Board in the past has discussed that if there is a petition that they want to take off the agenda or continue it, they would address it at the beginning of the meeting.

## **XV. ADJOURNMENT**

### 42. Adjourned

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, Mr. Howington adjourned the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ms. Ellen Harris  
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem

*The Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission provides meeting summary minutes which are adopted by the respective Board. Verbatim transcripts of minutes are the responsibility of the interested party.*