



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
July 9, 2014 1:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

JULY 9, 2014 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Keith Howington, Chair
Debra Caldwell
Justin Gunther
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Stephen Merriman, Jr.
Marjorie Weibe-Reed
Tess Scheer
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Member Not Present: Ebony Simpson, Vice Chair
Reed Engle
Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian

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

City of Savannah Staff Present: Lorie Odom, Downtown Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Order](#)

Mr. Howington called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m., welcomed everyone in attendance, and outlined the purpose and role of the Historic District Board of Review. He explained that the Board has a very long agenda today and, therefore, laid out the ground rules for hearing the petitions. The petitioners will be limited to 15 minutes to make their presentations and the public will have 15 minutes to voice their comments.

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

2. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 14-002342-COA | 301 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Projecting Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Board Action:

Approve the petition for a principal use fascia sign and five (5) building identification signs for the Savannah Visitor Center at 301 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd (MLK) because the signs are visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

3. [Petition of Candice Leitte, Coastal Heritage Society | 14-002512-COA | 601 Louisville Road | Two Fences](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Fence Mesh Material Sample.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the petition to install two new fence sections for the property located at 601 Louisville Road, the Roundhouse Railroad Museum site, as requested because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye

Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

4. [Petition of Pierrot Baptiste | 14-002672-COA | 214 West Boundary Street | Freestanding Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the petition for a freestanding sign for the new restaurant, “Caribbean Creole Café,” which will be located within the Old Town Trolley building at 214 West Boundary Street as requested because it is visually compatible and meets the sign standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

5. [Petition of Signs for Minds | 14-002851-COA | 409 West Congress Street | Projecting Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the petition for a principal use projecting sign for the property located at 409 West Congress Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible, and meets the preservation and sign standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

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

6. [Petition of James Wubbena, Wubbena Architects | 14-002852-COA | 317 East Broad Street | Alterations](#)

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

Board Action:

Approve the petition for alterations and signs for the commercial building located at 317 East Broad Street with the condition that the front façade design be revised to continue the brick across the front façade where the existing door and transom are proposed to be infilled. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

7. [Petition of Christian Sottile, Sottile & Sottile | 14-002855-COA | 18 West Taylor Street | Alterations](#)

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

Board Action:

Approve the petition for alterations to openings on the rear (south) façade and the side (west) façade of the building located at 18 West Taylor Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval.

1. Provide additional information regarding the downspout.
2. Provide additional information regarding brick infill proposed at the center opening on the second floor, including: proposed brick and mortar to be used. Reuse the brick that is proposed to be removed on the ground floor be reused on the second floor. - PASS
3. Ensure that the new windows are inset not less than 3 inches from the exterior facade of a building OR that the inset matches the existing windows.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

8. [Petition of John Deering, Greenline Architecture | 14-002864-COA | 63 MLK, Jr. Blvd. Demolition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the petition for demolition of the non-historic building at 63 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard because the building possesses no known historical or architectural significance, is less than 50 years of age, and is not eligible for historic designation. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

9. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 14-002865-COA | 426 Barnard Street | Fascia Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the petition for a principal use fascia sign for the new business located at 426 Barnard Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible, and meets the preservation and sign standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

10. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 14-002866-COA | 202 East Bay Street | Fascia Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the petition for a principal use fascia sign for the business, "Laurel Canyon," located at 202 East Bay Street as requested because the sign is visually compatible, and meets the preservation and sign standards. - PASS

Vote Results

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

11. [Petition of Joel Snayd | 14-002868-COA | 535 East Liberty Street | Alterations, Signs, Awnings, and Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

Approve the petition for storefront alterations, signs, and awnings for the property located at 535 East Liberty Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:
1. Ensure the storefront glazing is inset a minimum of 4 inches from the face of the building OR the inset matches the depth of the existing storefront glazing. - PASS
2. Ensure the door on the rear façade is inset a minimum of 3 inches from the face of the building and provide the color selection for this door and frame.

Vote Results

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

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

12. [Adopt July 9, 2014 Agenda](#)

Board Action:

Approve the adoption of the July 9, 2014 agenda. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

13. [Approval of Meeting Minutes of June 11, 2014](#)

Attachment: [06-11-2014 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve minutes of June 11, 2014. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Nicholas Henry

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

14. [Petition of Lott + Barber | 14-000634-COA | 540 Selma Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

Board Action:	
Continue.	- PASS
Vote Results	
Motion: Justin Gunther	
Second: Robin Williams	
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

Board Action:	
Continue.	- PASS
Vote Results	
Motion: Justin Gunther	
Second: Robin Williams	
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

Board Action:

Continue. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

17. [Petition of Andrew Lynch AIA, Lynch Associates Architects | 14-002348-COA | 22 Habersham Street | Addition](#)

Board Action:

Continue. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

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

Board Action:

- PASS

Vote Results

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

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

19. [Petition of Gavin Macrae-Gibson | 14-002860-COA | 31 East Jones Street | Additions](#)

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

Attachment: [Monterey Ward.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Quantock Row Historical Photographs.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Revised Submittal Packet 2 - 31 East Jones Street 14-002860-COA.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for several alterations to 31 East Jones Street. The current lot coverage is 75.8%. The proposed lot coverage is 83.8%. The petitioner has requested a variance from this standard and has provided the lot coverage of the adjacent rowhouses within the Quantock Row which range from 93.2% to 86%. While there are several parcels within this block that exceed the 75% coverage, there are many in the ward and in the adjacent wards that are in compliance with the lot coverage. She said that reasonable use of the property can be made without the variance. Therefore, if the variance is granted it would give special privilege to this property that is denied to other properties in the district. Consequently, staff feels that the variance is not consistent with the intent of the ordinance. Many standards are not met.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends that the petition be continued to allow for a restudy of the design and the proposal in order to bring it into compliance with the standards.

Dr. Williams stated that Ms. Harris said the entire south wall will be removed, but this building has already had additions. He asked Ms. Harris to clarify this.

Ms. Harris clarified that staff feels that the bay window addition is historic and the other additions that are proposed to be removed are on this side. The new additions would require that the entire wall be removed. It is not clear how much of the original wall still exists on this addition. But, perhaps, the petitioner could provide some clarity on this.

Mr. Merriman asked that when it is said that the bay will be removed and reinstalled, it is not that it will be detached and then put back. It will have to be disassembled and from

Drayton Street you can see that there are some rotten boards here. Will the pieces that are not rotten be saved and rebuild it?

Ms. Harris answered that she will defer this question to the petitioner as to how they intend to accomplish this.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Gibson said he and his wife bought the property several months ago. Their overall intent is to change the property from its current configuration as a six unit dwelling to a single unit dwelling as it was originally intended to be. Presently, the main house consists of four rental units and the carriage house consists of two rental units. The carriage house is abandoned inside and is uninhabitable. The windows have substantial termite damage and rot. The garden level of the main house is abandoned and is uninhabitable. There are two tenants on the these floors and the top floor is vacant and is in very dilapidated condition. Generally speaking, this property will require a lot of work to bring it back to an acceptable condition.

Mr. Gibson said the house is one of the row of five which was built in 1854 with a stucco base and red Philadelphia style brick above. It has a Victorian porch and he believes an Italianate style was added in the 1880s. As Ms. Harris reported, in their opinion, they too do not believe that the steps nor the brick or the railings are original. They want to return the original house to its more original condition as well as the sides by pushing back the shutters.

Mr. Gibson explained that as noted, the bay is an added element and, therefore, is not a part of the 1854 style. With regards to the back row, it is a remnant of the addition to the main house. Most likely, originally this was a sleeping porch [he will expound on this later] that was later bricked-in. It is 9 feet wide back to the original house wall. As the Board can see it is very plain; has no existing features in the brick work and one door is here that leads to an existing fire escape. They believe this was added in the 1960s. This house has been used as rental accommodations for approximately 50 years and has been largely unimproved over time with the exception of some wiring. They intend for the addition to come forward to the line of their neighbor's house and create a party wall. As the Board can see, the other properties step forward. They are asking that they be allowed to bring their house forward to the same point.

Mr. Gibson stated that regarding the carriage house, there are two levels. There is a gate and a stair up. Therefore, a unit is up and one unit is down. This is what contributes to the six units configuration. The intent is to leave the openings largely as they are and place the windows and the garage entrance down below. A masonry fence is here that will be retained where the gate was to allow for access to the second story. For the carriage house, they will close it off and continue the fence which will be more in keeping with how it was originally. Their intent is to relocate the bay onto an addition which will increase the size of the existing addition.

Mr. Gibson explained that as they know, Drayton Street is a very busy vehicular street. Because of this, they are proposing to remove the door and put it on the lane side where they believe would be safer. Their intent is to close in the fence as they want to put a door here for two levels for the carriage house with a garage entrance. Generally looking at the

house from Drayton Street, they can see that the existing carriage house is a white cube. A lot of what they are proposing to do with the back of the house has to do with the relationship between the carriage house and the main house.

Mr. Gibson stated that the survey of the property reveals that it is 100 x 24 along Drayton and East Jones Street. The application is for extending the house to meet the line of their existing neighbors and this would result in a variance application. He stated that regarding the three Sanborn maps he would like to offer a three dimensional analysis historically and chronologically of the building massing based on 1888, 1916 and 1956. He explained that the house as originally conceived the main mass from 1854 is a prismatic rectangle. To this was added most likely originally a sleeping porch. It is ten foot wide to the wall and nine foot interior space. At some point this was bricked-in and by 1888 a bay was built, which makes it not original. However, it is historic, but he wanted to point out that its characteristic as an addition, an architectural piece added to an addition, not to the original house. As the house became rental property over the last 50 years, the interior space has been renovated into kitchens, bathrooms and storage for rental tenants with fire escape and an addition on top which expanded the original addition. Mr. Gibson said their project is for an expansion of the series of additions so that the bay would be on this addition rather than that addition. However, they allow for the reading architecturally of the original addition. Therefore, one would read the original house, the original addition, the expanded addition and the bay window.

Mr. Gibson explained that the characteristic of the bay window is a rhetorical piece added on to the original addition. Therefore, in terms of the historical development, they feel that it is clear that they are preserving the bay and adding it on to the expanded addition. He said in relationship to the diagrams he has shown the Board, in terms of the front of the house, they intend to restore it to its former condition with the model steps; the shutters and railings which they believe are more historical and similar to the their neighbors. The overall site plan will maintain the court and the bay which has always acted as a rhetorical bookend in a way to the corner of Drayton Street would be preserved performing that special function.

Mr. Gibson stated that he wanted to point out an important aspect of the original addition. It is narrow, nine foot wide, and you cannot do much with it. Basically, the original house of 1854 consisted of two main rooms, stairs and landing. These two main rooms are set pieces. They have no plumbing, no kitchens, no mechanicals except for the fireplaces. This means that all of the mechanical elements have to be put into this addition which is already cumbersome and very tight for a single rental unit. The bay window has no organic relationship to the house plan and is not related as a large element for example to the large spaces of the house. It is actually bisected by the wall which causes it to be very hard to use. Therefore, there is a sense that the bay is definitely an added piece; not an organic extension of the plan. He said, therefore, he wanted to draw the Board's attention to the fact that the bay does not extend in spatial relationship of the interior and exists as an added gesture which is what they want to preserve. On the upper floor it gets even more narrower with a bathroom and a kitchen being there.

Mr. Gibson said they would consider taking off the addition as has been noted and add the interior plan which would provide enough space to put in modern kitchens, bathrooms and mechanical elements which they believe would be perfect to have for a house of this scale and value. He said they intend to restore the exterior as he has mentioned and to extend the

bay. He said regarding the false sense of historical development, he has tried to show that the sequence of additions are some that is historical to the house and keeping the bay added to an extension of the addition is something that they think is preserving its condition. Also, it cannot be confused with something new because it has substantial patina and would always read as a circular element. With regards to historical change, they do not believe that the three over one windows of the carriage house are original. As he has said, they will replace them with some more in keeping with the relationship of the two parts.

Mr. Gibson said the character of the main house south wall as he showed in the images, is a plain brick with no distinctive features and the top is a clapboard added structure. They intend to preserve the bay and relocate it. But, he believes that the existing brick on the south side is not contributing. He said regarding the deteriorated features of the bay windows and the carriage house, they will replace the windows in the carriage house as it is not an original. They are asking that the windows in the bay be replaced with double glazed windows. They want to do so because Drayton Street is an unusually noisy street. Regarding the chemical treatment, they will not change the stucco and with regards to reversibility, the bay window could always be put back at some future time. With regards to the variance issue, it is fundamental to the plan, the nine foot space be expanded so that the house could be used in a modern way. The justification for this is the literal interpretation section of the variance waiver clauses. The reason is the clause allows for unreasonable hardship. It would be extremely difficult to use this house as a single family without expanding and they would, therefore, have to keep it as a six family rental which is not their intention.

Dr. Henry thanked Mr. Gibson for wanting to restore this house. He congratulated Mr. Gibson on his presentation to the Board.

Dr. Williams explained to Mr. Gibson that a question was raised about how he would move the bay. Would it be disassembled or somehow cut it backwards intact?

Mr. Gibson answered that they have studied this closely and have engaged a contractor to look at this also. They believe it is possible to disassemble it into six parts; three parts per floor. They will carefully disassemble it into pieces and remove it from the site. It will be preserved in a shop and the parts that are currently deteriorated will be replaced. Actually the damage to the bay is not as bad as it could be; it is one of the elements that clearly has been cared for over time because of it being rentable and because it is quite visible. They will preserve this wonderful piece of architectural work. However, he pointed out that it is a bookend and it has the same Italianate style on the porch as on the back. Therefore, it just does not read now as a bookend from this point from here to here, similarly it will read as two bookends.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Paula Palmer stated that she and her husband own 112 East Taylor Street and they welcome any neighbor who will turn something from six rental units into a single family home. She said that Jones Street is probably the most rental congested street of all in the Landmark District, particularly 101 and 103 East Jones Street. Between these two buildings, they probably have more than 16 units. This means a lot of cars, a lot of people, a lot of parties, and noise. What Mr. Gibson is planning to do would be a great improvement to their neighborhood.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they are in favor of returning this building to a single family use. However, it is their position that a variance for increased lot coverage should not be recommended for this property. They agree with the staff's recommendations particularly to simplify the proposed railings on the stair and the gate below the stoop.

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

Mr. Gibson thanked Mrs. Palmer for the comments. He stated that regarding the HSF's comments, he has already stated that the intent of the house is to preserve the spatial relationship of the bay.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said they might need to look at this as a rear addition. The request is also for a variance request.

Dr. Henry wanted the Board to be informed of projects that they have approved in the past requesting a variance of 25% to 75%.

Mr. Merriman said he could not remember specific projects, but he knows these requests come up often. He does not have a problem with a small variance, but he does not like moving the bay and putting it back onto an addition. To him, this seems to have no regard for the standard.

Ms. Scheer said it appears that the 1970s addition has already brought it also even to the neighbor's house. Therefore, it appears that the petitioner is asking for the other half to be brought more even than that.

Dr. Williams said he gathers this is a part of the 75.8 percent. At least in terms of the variance, it appears that the Board is supportive of the idea of a rear addition. He believes that the railings are more compatible with the Queen Anne Italianate porch. Two doors down from this house is another Italianate porch with a railing. Dr. Williams stated that he would be happy to defer the railing to the staff to work with the petitioner on this.

Mr. Merriman said they are not going to reuse the same window that is here. He said that Board member Engle discusses a lot of the time about the materials. It makes a lot of sense; the original windows could still be reused. Otherwise, it is being said that it is an addition and they are going to use modern windows and at the same time they are saying they are going to move and relocate the historical pieces. But it cannot be both things.

Dr. Williams asked if it would help if the windows would be retained or replaced in-kind.

Mr. Merriman answered no. Is this not a character defining feature? It is historic as it has been here since the 1880s. Therefore, it has been here long enough to achieve historical significance. He believes that it has become a part of that building.

Mr. Howington said he has an issue with removing the bay. He does not review appliqué as preservation and regardless of bay; the spatial relationship to the interior when it was added to the exterior was an intentional placement of a feature on the exterior of the building. Therefore, if it was bookend as the petitioner has expressed with a front porch and a bay window and since 1888, it has been in this location as being significant. If it is in this

location and when you remove it and replace it onto a new addition, you are removing and destroying the original spatial relation which defines the character of that bay window and its relationship to the building. However, he likes the design of the addition; he believes it is a very nice contemporary complement for the building.

Mr. Gunther asked what the plan is for use of the garden level.

Mr. Gibson explained that the use of the garden level is threefold. Facing the court yard would be the garage; you would drive through the carriage house into the house. Then middle part would be the median. These are the kind of spaces which the original historic rooms are compatible with; but, yet, this is a part of modern life and they want such a facility. In the center, they will have the character rooms.

Ms. Scheer stated that if the bay remains where it is, it still does not allow much expansion and is not enough room next to the neighbor. Therefore, it really does not provide much solution.

Mr. Howington said he agrees. He said they need to comply strictly with the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Obviously, there is a conflict as some historic materials will be destroyed and replaced which will give a false sense history. The staff has recommended a continuance so that the petitioner can restudy this and try to find a better solution. There are some obvious things that need to be changed and there are some obvious questions as well. He said he does not know if the Review Board has the answer to this.

Mr. Gibson stated that the nine foot space which is the original addition to the house is incompatible with the space required for an elevator, mechanical system, bathrooms, handicap accessible bathrooms, kitchen and storage space. It cannot be turned into a single family unless there is space added to the house. He said that this is why the other houses have been expanded because almost the entirety of the house is the paired rooms which has no possibility of being used for these modern uses.

Mr. Howington asked if the elevator could be placed where the stairs are now. The space appears large enough for the elevator to be put there.

Mr. Gibson answered that the problem with this is that it would place it on the opposite side of the house circulation. Therefore, his short answer is no; it would not be possible because it would completely disorient the circulation within the house. They have studied all the possibilities of where it could be located. The only place that really makes sense for the elevator is for it to be off the main circulation area. If you think of the way the house is organized, it is a series of many pieces. There is Drayton Street, the stairs, the circulation and the rooms. With an elevator you need to put it adjacent to the circulation strip. Otherwise, it will create a diagonal line across the house that would not be architecturally pragmatic. He said in summary, they understand the paradox which Dr. Williams referred to, however, he believes that one needs to also take into account, perhaps, something that overrides the paradox, which for the house to move forward as something that contributes economically to the city as well as to the historical preservation of the street and to the particular identity of Quantow row, they ask that the Board seriously consider allowing them to move the bay as this is the only way in which they can return the house to single family. Without being able to do this, they will have to keep it as a rental property which as he has mentioned would be a considerable hardship to them and by denying them the availability to have a retirement property would so be a very significant amount of money required in turning the house into a usable rental property which is not their

intention.

Mr. Howington explained that the Board does not make its decisions based on economic hardship. He informed Mr. Gibson that the Board cannot request a continuance, but he can do so. He informed him also that he can ask for a vote today.

Mr. Gibson said they do not wish to ask for a continuance. They ask for a vote because they have studied this in great detail. There is no other way in which this could be economically feasible for them. If the vote goes against them, they will be forced to continue this as rental property.

Mr. Howington explained to Mr. Gibson that if the petition is denied and it comes back with the exact same thing, it cannot be heard before another year, but if something is changed, it can come back earlier.

Mr. Gibson said they have studied this. The project will not be feasible if it is only extended to the narrow strip which will only be 9 feet wide and 20 feet long. There is nothing they could do with an "L" shape leg like this. From an architectural point of view, it is useless and the bay window would be looking directly at the blank wall.

Ms. Scheer said she appreciates ordinances, rules and so forth, but she also thinks that on a bigger end they have a responsibility to these historic buildings. If allowing this expansion and the movement of the bay in the long run is going to take care of the building, she is in favor of that, but if it is going to put it in a more dilapidated long term state, she is not for that. She said she is a huge proponent of taking care of these buildings.

Board Action:

Deny the petition for alterations and an addition to 31 East Jones Street because the project does not meet the visual compatibility criteria, Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and Design Standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Justin Gunther

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Nay
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Nay
Robin Williams	- Nay

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Application.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Mass Model.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Material Samples.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Specifications.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction, for Part II Design Details of three attached 2 story townhouses on the vacant properties located at 703, 705, and 707 Tattnall Street. The townhouses from Tattnall Street will access to parking from Jefferson Street. Part I, Height and Mass was approved by the Board for review with Part II, Design Details:

1. Restudy the height of the front doors. [Staff clarification: the height of the masonry opening including the front door and the transom above.]
2. Resolve the north and south facades in an alternate manner (i.e. false windows to create a rhythm of green screen).

Ms. Michalak explained that the petitioner restudied the height of the masonry opening including the front door and the transom above; although it remains unchanged in the Part II submittal packet, staff recommends approval as submitted because the other changes that were made; the opening now appears compatible and proportionate to the remainder of the design. The petitioner added shutters to the openings on the north and south façades and moved the false openings near the corner of the building in approximately 2 feet.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval of the petition for New Construction: Part I and Part II of 3-attached, 2-story townhouses on the vacant properties located at 703, 705, and 707 Tattnall Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Revise the standing seam metal roof to have a maximum seam height of one inch.
2. Revise the stucco to have a "sand" (smooth) finish.
3. Provide color selections for the cable rail systems and shutters.
4. Ensure that the door frames and the window sashes are inset not less than three inches from the exterior surface of the façade of the building.
5. Remove the transoms from the ground floor windows.
6. Add shutters to the false/recessed opening on the ground floor of the rear façade.
7. Clarify the height of the fences.

Ms. Scheer asked if staff recommends shutters on the one recessed window, but no shutters on the other window.

Ms. Michalak explained that in the recess they want it to be like the other false opening. The false openings need to be consistent.

Ms. Scheer said they are consistent on one wall, but her eyes would be confused if she saw shutters just on one and not on the other seven.

Ms. Michalak said she believes that it will not be visible from the public right-of-way as it is behind the fence and it is in a recessed porch.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Coleman said they studied all of staff's comments and can accommodate all of the recommendations without any problems. They like the transoms on the front as they believe they add a little more contemporary look to the building, but he has looked at replacing it with larger double windows as they do create an adverse problem. He said regarding the issue of the colors and materials, the railings are stainless steel cable. The shutter color is to match the door as a dark color is here.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they prefer more definition on the face of the buildings. They think that a Bermuda style shutter is okay for this more contemporary style building, however, if it was to be included, it should have a horizontal center rail, hinges and hardware as requested by staff.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said he believes that the Board needs to be careful how they use the historic precedents in the district. He understands that the petitioner is okay with going either way with transoms over the windows, but he was just making a point in terms that when staff recommends against something.

Mr. Howington said that transoms are generally not above windows; but on contemporary buildings, of course, it is an opened/ended thing and he has no problem with that, but he believes the concern was historically on historic buildings there is typically not a transom unless it is an industrial type building. However, what has been commonplace is sometimes these historic windows are so tall that in order to save money the petitioner may put in a typical height double hung window and then put a transom above it; the cost of a taller triple hung window costs much more than a standard size double hung and transom window. Mr. Howington said, therefore, he believes that the Board has to be careful not to look at it as it is allowed.

Dr. Williams said his point is he does not believe that the Board needs to be too restrictive.

Mr. Gunther said if the shutters are Bermuda style, may be they need to be open a little in order to get some definition.

Mr. Merriman said he thought the shutters are Bermuda style and that they are open.

Mr. Howington said the shutters could be worked out with staff.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for New Construction: Part I and Part II of 3 attached, 2-story townhouses on the vacant properties located at 703, 705, and 707 Tattnall Street with the following conditions to be submitted to the staff for final review and approval:

1. Revise the standing seam metal roof to have a maximum seam height of 1 inch.
 2. Revise the stucco to have a “sand” (smooth) finish.
 3. Ensure that the door frames and window sashes are inset not less than 3 inches from the exterior surface of the façade of the building.
 4. Work with staff for the design of the false shutters.
 5. Clarify the height of the fences.
- PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

21. [Petition of Ryan Claus, Felder and Associates | 14-002319-COA | 26, 32, and 36 East Bay Street | Alterations and Balcony Additions](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Project Description.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Historic Photograph.pdf](#)

Mr. Ryan Claus was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting to alter balcony, windows and doors on the River Street façade of 26-36 East Bay Street as part of a larger interior rehabilitation. The petition was reviewed by the Review Board on June 11, 2014 and was continued in order for the petitioner to restudy the following:

1. The treatment of the historic balcony brackets;
2. The balcony railing design to be more compatible with historic railing both in size, massing and pattern;
3. The treatment of the historic windows on the fourth floor;
4. The design of the replacement door on the fourth floor to the east; and
5. The design of the replacement door on the fifth floor.

Ms. Harris stated that the petitioner has provided two options for addressing the brackets – both include leaving the brackets in-situ. Option A proposes putting new structural brackets around the existing brackets (essentially encasing them). Option B proposes to put new structural brackets on the interior of the balcony so that the balcony is hanging from the building, rather than supported from beneath.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the proposed project, with Option B (new structural brackets on the interior of the balcony so that the balcony is “hanging” from the building, rather than supported from beneath) with the condition that the historic window sashes that are proposed to be removed be retained onsite so that they may be potentially reused in a future restoration of the building, because the project is visually compatible and meets the Secretary of Interior’s Standards and Design Standards.

Dr. Williams asked if the size and scale of the replicated balcony is typical to the historic balconies.

Ms. Harris answered yes, with the addition of the additional railing at the top to meet code; otherwise, they are intended to be the same depth, same width, etc.

Ms. Scheer asked if the hanging rail is on the outside or inside of the balcony.

Ms. Harris answered that it is on the inside of the balcony.

Ms. Scheer asked if the hanging rail would still be visible.

Ms. Harris answered yes; it would still be visible through the railing system.

Ms. Caldwell asked if they know from an engineering level if there is one option that is safer than the other option.

Ms. Harris stated that she will defer to the petitioner to answer this question. However, she does not believe that there is a difference, but she is not an engineer and does not wish to speak to this.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Claus said they agree with staff’s recommendation for their project that the hanging option is the most visibly compatible option to retain the brackets and keep the look and feel of the façade. They also agree with the recommendation to retain the sashes and to reuse them. He said as far as the question about the structural stability regarding one versus the other, it does not make a difference to which one they use; at this point it is which one looks the best. They agree that the hanging option is best and will be located inside the railing and, therefore, will be screened partially.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with

staff's recommendation to use the hanging balcony option with the cross brace support being placed on the interior of the replicated historic rail so that the railing is not obscured from the exterior.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for the rehabilitation of 26, 32 and 36 East Bay Street, with the option of the new structural brackets on the interior of the balcony so that the balcony is "hanging" from the building, rather than supported from beneath with the condition that the historic window sashes that are proposed to be removed be retained on site so that they may be potentially reused in a future restoration of the building, because the project is visually compatible and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Design Standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: Justin Gunther

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

22. [Petition of Forrest Lott, Lott + Barber | 14-002756-COA | 421 Abercorn Street | After-the-Fact Playground Canopies](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submit Packet - 421 Abercorn Street 14-002756-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Letter of Support.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Letter of Support 2.pdf](#)

Mr. Forrest Lott was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for two awnings in a terracotta color proposed to be located in the playground area behind 421 Abercorn Street. The awnings are 14 feet by 14 feet square. One awning is approximately 12 feet, six inches tall, while the other awning is approximately eight feet

tall. The awnings are required to provide shade by the Georgia Child Care licensing Rules and Regulations.

Ms. Harris said on July 10, 2013, the Historic District Board of Review (HDBR) approved the seven foot, eight inch tall stucco fence around the playground. the playground equipment itself is not within the HDBR's purview, although the awnings are.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the two awnings at 421 Abercorn as submitted because they are visually compatible and meet the design standards. Ms. Harris noted that awnings normally are approved at staff level, but due to there being a lot of attention within the neighborhood of these awnings, staff is referring the petition to the Board to allow for public hearing and public comment. Ms. Harris said she has received a number of phone calls with the past months since the awnings have been installed, both for and against the proposal. She has received two supportive written letters that are attached to the Board's agenda packet.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lott said because this is an after-the-fact review, he wanted to let the Board know that the church has been before them several times as they improved the church property by adding canopies with the renovation to the Espy house across Wayne Street, and the addition of the fence. He said their understanding is as staff said was that the playground equipment did not require this Board's purview, therefore, when they were informed that the interpretation did not require review and when they were informed that the shades over the equipment was to review as awnings, then they prepared their submission. Mr. Lott said there was no intention not to apply as needed.

Mr. Lott explained that as staff noted, there is a state law that requires that childcare equipment serving the younger preschool population be provided with shade. There is also a requirement that the shade be a certain minimum height upon the playing surface so that staff can fit under there also. The color was chosen because they felt it was compatible with the red bricks in the neighborhood and with the terracotta roofs. The awnings are certainly not as high as they would be allowed under the height map for construction on this site. There are no real coverage issues here and they agree with staff that it is in compliance with the ordinance. Mr. Lott said, therefore, they are seeking the Board's approval for the two awnings.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Katherine Alpine of 114 East Taylor Street spoke in opposition of the awnings. Ms. Alpine said in their neighborhood they call the awnings circus tents. They are totally not compatible with historic downtown Savannah. They are tall, stand free and clear and are not awnings as attached to buildings. They interfere with the enjoyments of their properties. They probably also interfere with the value of their properties. The neighborhood, as well as she, feels that these awnings should not be allowed. The neighborhood is extremely unhappy with the circus tents. Therefore, they are asking that the church find other means of providing shade for the children.

Mr. Brian Palmer of 112 East Taylor Street spoke in opposition. He said that the meeting minutes of the COA pertaining to the wall required that the church present the

plans for the playground equipment, but they did not present them. Once the church was notified that a new COA was needed, they let it lapse to a point where they were actually served with a stop work order. It was at this time that they applied for a COA. They are not against the church; they are a good congregation and they do great things. Mr. Palmer does not believe that the church is in compliance with the number of children that are permitted here in accordance with the zoning regulations. If you look at the Espy house, there is pergola arbor type structure on the roof top garden that they have. He believes they are maintaining this throughout their future plans. They suggest that they use a similar structure in replacement of the tents; and they suggest a sound and a visually buffer as this would cut down on the noise coming from the squealing children at the day care. Maybe the church could plant a row of any type of evergreen visual buffer regardless of the tent structure would be helpful.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Palmer if the neighborhood's compromise would be to remove the tents and plant trees as a buffer.

Mr. Palmer answered they would prefer to have the pergola type structure and the Italian cypress.

Mr. Howington informed Mr. Palmer that the Review Board does not have a purview over how many children are here.

Ms. Paula Palmer of 112 East Taylor Street said she goes to great effort to maintain a very lovely formal parlor that is actually stunting to some people. Ms. Palmer said they go to great length and a great cost to have the life style that they have in this district. The tents are out of place and they are not historically appropriate. They maybe fine for many suburban areas, maybe even great for some local home parks, but not for the Landmark District and not within view of their parlor windows.

Ms. Tonya Bailey Smith owns the Great Savannah Race Museum at 411 Abercorn Street. She pointed out that they did the historic research and worked with the MPC staff on the red awning on the shop. However, the color is exclusive to shops and was not for other structures. Consequently, this color would not be appropriate to be on the back of their home.

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they wanted to suggest something that might make this palpable. Mr. Carey said that Wesley Monumental United Methodist Church is a good downtown neighbor and he believes that everybody present recognizes and acknowledges this. Wesley Monumental in the recent past has received preservation awards from the Historic Savannah Foundation. He believes that Wesley Monumental is a good steward of the property, however, in light of the great interest in this on the part of the neighbors, he wonders if there is not a little room for a little compromise. Could the tent be lowered? Could the color of the canvas be a more neutral color? Maybe a more ivory background color, similar to color of the wall or the Espy house.

Mr. Jerry Lominack said he was not speaking for or against the project, but was only expressing a big concern that he has. He has lived in the Landmark District for 50 years. His wife was born in this district and has spent her entire life here even before it was a historic Landmark District. They raised their children downtown and to hear people say

they don't want to hear the sounds of children playing and laughing in the Historic District is just awful. We should be begging people to come into the Historic District with young children and young families.

Ms. Sharon Galin of 426 Abercorn Street wanted to know if this would set a precedent. Would they want to see this type of structure throughout the Historic District? They know that a precedent has been set on River Street. If somebody is allowed to do something as being requested, what hinders someone else from doing the same thing?

Ms. Denise Grabowski said she is a member of Wesley Monumental and was not planning to speak, but she is a mother of one of those "horrible" children screaming on the playground. She is also an urban planner. Savannah is known around the world for being a model for a livable city. A part of what makes Savannah so livable is the diversity of the uses and a part of the diversity means different people of different ages and different uses. The church is growing and a large part of the reason is through the engagement of those children and having a vibrant downtown church, they are contributing positively to the vitality of the downtown district. A part of the vitality is the playground; this awning is an integral part of the structure of the playground equipment; it is not an add on and it does meet the compliance of state law.

Ms. Wray Williamson resides at 24 East Taylor Street. She is in favor of churches, children, and playgrounds. She believes that some compromise would be in order. She believes, too, that the higher awning could be lowered a little. Ms. Williamson stated that she believes that they also should be able to live together happy and maybe they could find some middle ground.

Mr. Chris Donegan lives at 107 East Jones Street. He does not have a view of the playground, but he is a member of Wesley Monumental. Mr. Donegan agrees with Mr. Daniel Carey. As a whole, he believes there could have been better communication. He is a homeowner and likes families moving downtown and the church is a part of the community. Maybe some compromise needs to be made here. He does not believe that it is a right or wrong decision, but it is important to the community that they all talk together and ensure that they get the information out in the public so that every one is aware of the situation.

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

Mr. Lott stated that a statement was made that they did not apply for the wall. But, they came before the Review Board and posted the property with the public notice requirements. A statement was made that the church did not respond on this issue until a stop work order was initiated, but as soon as the objection was made he received a call from Ms. Harris on the same and responded to her the same day. Mr. Lott said he got the name of the inspector who issued the stop work order and spoke with him. The inspector withdrew the stop work order the same day with the understanding that they would apply for the COA. The attempt to create a perception that the church does not play well with others is one thing that he wants to object to. He said that they will freely admit that when a large project is going through construction, it impacts the neighborhood. The wall did some things that they viewed as positive and enhancements to the quality of life along Taylor Street; one was that it eliminated vehicular entrance coming from Taylor Street into the church owned property. They also put a wall up so that it would act as a visual and an acoustic buffer to the activities on the other side.

Mr. Lott said in their view and the staff view, the awnings are compatible. They are not overhanging in the public's way. They are within the private property and are an integral piece of the playground equipment and to remove them would require the removal of the playground equipment itself. Mr. Lott said, therefore, he asks for approval as submitted.

Dr. Henry asked couldn't they all just get along. Could the church consider such things as have been proposed? He likes greenery and this is a matter of taste and not the rules.

Mr. Lott answered that he does not believe that there is an unwillingness to consider concerns. He believes the process they went through did consider a lot these issues. There is an intention to plant greenery on that side and as to the type, verticality and height of the greenery they are flexible to that. The acquisition of the playground equipment was not done lightly; it required bake sales and so forth on the part of the children's parents. There is a considerable investment in playground equipment. He told Dr. Henry that he believes he is correct when he says it is a matter of taste; someone might not like yellow convertibles parked on their street as they object to the visual compatibility. But, in his experience in these things such as awnings, paint colors, loose equipment placed within yards and so forth have been broad latitudes. There are many things in people's backyards downtown that do not suit his taste, but he believes that the fabric of the Historic District is far stronger than these awnings and it will survive.

Dr. Henry said to him this is not the issue. The issue is something that the Review Board cannot address. The issue is trying to get along with your neighbors and he believed the neighbors had some constructive suggestions.

Mr. Lott said he has not been involved in all the conversations with the neighbors and the church. When they built the wall, there was a demand that the wall not be built out as far as it is which is allowed. They talked about it and considered it, but there were a number of complaints. Mr. Lott said he understands about construction containers and these sort of things are inconveniences. They have worked hard to finish the activities that require an impact on Taylor Street. An infill project was done on Taylor Street that did the same thing.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Lott if the church would be willing to talk with the neighbors about the awning changes.

Mr. Lott answered that he could not speak for the entire church in that regard; he is only authorized to speak for them in this petition. This kind of thing would need to be directed to the Board of Trustees.

Dr. Williams said there is a playground at Jefferson and Wayne Streets that fronts Alice Street and that playground is bigger than Wesley Monumental playground. It has outdoor equipment, but it doesn't have shading device nearly as large as these awnings. He asked if the regulations changed or why is it that other playground has significantly smaller shading devices.

Mr. Lott stated that he could not answer that.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Lott what is the minimum requirement of square footage for

shading. Are these exceeding the minimum requirements?

Mr. Lott answered that he cannot answer that question either.

Dr. Williams asked if the Review Board is to evaluate whether or not these are appropriately scaled.

Mr. Lott said his understanding is that the Review Board is to evaluate whether the awnings are compatible with in the guidelines of Historic District Board of Review and not adjudicate whether they meet any licensing regulations for child care.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Lott if he heard him say that the removal of the awnings mean that he would have to remove all the equipment as well.

Mr. Lott answered yes and explained that the awnings are a part of the equipment.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Weibe-Reed said it appears that the larger structure has a different pitch than the single umbrella pitch. She guess this would be a question for the petitioner to answer why this is the case. She does not know whether the problem is the color, height or pitch. Maybe it is all of the above.

Mr. Lott explained that he did not measure the pitch; he submitted the drawings from the manufacturer of the playground equipment.

Mr. Merriman asked if it would be a true statement in saying that these are not custom-made, they take them as they come.

Mr. Lott explained that the church day care program solicited design built solutions from multiple vendors that met the activity requirements for the different age groups and these were the preferred solutions from the chosen vendor. They provided and installed all the equipment.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said having designed playgrounds before, she understands the parts that go into making these. She asked if it is the color that is so obtrusive to the neighbors.

Mr. Howington stated he believes it is the color and the height.

Mr. Palmer said the color is one objection. Unlike the shop awnings where they have the proportions in relation to the building that it is attached to; but this is like it is almost floating in the air with the four supports. If the color was a little more muted; if the material was not reflective as it is - because it is red and when the sun gets on it in the afternoon, it glows which makes it worse. Therefore, you cannot help from seeing it. When it went up in late April, the entire neighborhood was shocked.

Ms. Weibe-Reed stated that looking at the fabric, it is shiny, but as far as the color, she believes it could be compromised.

Ms. Alpine explained that the tall tent covers the slide. This is why it is so high up. The

only piece of equipment that would have to go away is the slide. The tent could be removed and another piece of playground equipment could be installed. She said in all seriousness, they do consider the church to be a good neighbor; but it is just that in this particular case, the church did not consider the neighborhood needs.

Mr. Howington reminded the Board and public that the Review Board is in Board Discussion and they need to stick to specific questions. He asked members of the public to refrain from accusations during their comments.

Dr. Henry asked if anyone has tried to contact the church.

Mr. Howington stated that since Dr. Henry asked a direct question, the church or someone has the right to respond to this question.

Mr. Steve Drinkwater, Church Administrator, said that no one has talked with him about this. He would have been the person that they would have probably seen. Their employees have been chased around the church and harassed, but no one has come to him directly. No appeals have been made directly to members other than a conversation where accusations were made to their pastor. He realized that they were not to do accusations, but one individual wanted the church to be burnt down.

Ms. Charlie Weeks, a member of Wesley Monumental, wanted to speak to a couple of questions the Board had about the design of the playground and the awnings. Ms. Weeks explained that the height requirement from the playground company that did the design indicated that the awning needed to be 84 inches off of the top; the highest circle where the children could play. There is a climbing tower that is designed to give children an opportunity to improve their large muscle coordination. Therefore, there are five different ways to climb up the tower and only one way to get down. The height of the awning is dictated by the top of the deck of the highest point for the climbing tower is 52 inches and as she has said, the awning is 84 inches off of the top deck.

Ms. Weeks said a question was also raised about changing the color of the awnings. She explained that they talked about several different colors for the awning. They discussed a light gray color or a light white color, but their feelings were that being in an urban environment, the awnings would always be dirty. They believed that the terracotta color would be more able to take the impact of being in an urban area. Ms. Weeks explained that as far as what the awnings are attached to, there are four poles that hold up the climbing tower equipment and the awning is attached to the same post that the climbing tower is attached to; they are not made of PVC, they are made of a fiberglass resin material and has a light tan color. They are also embedded into the ground to withstand weather issues.

Dr. Henry asked if another board besides the Review Board needs to be looking at the awnings. Are they too big?

Ms. Harris answered that she does not believe that another board would be looking at this. This is a call for the Review Board to make.

Dr. Henry asked staff if there is a law regarding this.

Ms. Harris explained that there are no specific standards that apply to this other than the

visual compatibility factors which are tough to apply because there is no historic precedent for this type of structure. This is not the first time that the Board has looked at something as this. Recently the Forsyth Park playground equipment development came before this Board [approximately two meetings ago] and in this review, the Board looked at the fencing as well as the awning structures. Consequently, this is not a brand new concept and the Board has used the visual compatibility factors in the past to when reviewing a petition such as this.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Harris if the awning at Forsyth Park is similar to the awnings being presented today.

Ms. Harris answered yes, the awnings are similar, but she does not have the height information and overall square footage with her now. But, she recalls that it is similar in size and scale and the awnings are green.

Dr. Williams asked the Board if they were comfortable with the visual compatibility of the awnings.

Dr. Henry stated that a lot of people believe the awnings are visually incompatible and this would have an impact on his thinking.

Mr. Merriman said as far as visual compatibility they can say that the awnings fit all the guidelines, but there is nothing to compare them to. If the Board was talking about a cornice or a door, they would look at others in the ward, but there are no other awnings like these in the ward.

Ms. Scheer said the neighbors believe the canopy could be changed to a basic tan color and lowered. If trees are planted here, it would come in handy because they would grow and there would no longer be a need for the canopies on the playground.

Mr. Howington said the red canopy whether it's tan, green or some other color, the reflexivity of the canopy would soon go away after a while because of the age and the dirt.

Mr. Merriman said he asked earlier that if the awning was removed would the equipment be taken away too; and the architect answered yes, but the neighbors have said that the equipment would not need to be taken away.

Mr. Howington said he believes the question is trying to reach a compromise. He does not know if the petitioner is willing to change the awnings to a comfortable color or want the Board to vote on the color presented. The neighbors have mentioned possibly a different color and planting some trees appear to be a compromise to the public. Mr. Howington said, however, this is not an option that the petitioner has to take, but he is asking the petitioner if this is something he wants to consider.

Mr. Lott said the church is not opposed to a compromise or an accommodation. The church is being challenged to undo what they have done. There are a magnitude of different issues that have been proposed. They can do plantings and when the plantings reach mature height, they will screen the objectionable color of what is here. He said that next order of magnitude is they could spend several thousand of dollars to replace the coverings with a

different color; although they felt the color they have now is compatible. They would all love to see a pergola with lovely growing vines on it, but this costs tens of thousand dollars.

Mr. Lott said they would ask since they feel that what they have done is compatible that it be approved as submitted and they would still be more than happy to discuss with anyone possible changes and they would have to take it back to the church and look at the funding implications. They would be happy to entertain any fundraising opportunities that people want to bring to them to help them mitigate this as well.

Mr. Howington said the petitioner has stated that they are willing to talk to the neighbors, however, the Board has the petition before them that they need to vote on.

Ms. Scheer asked if any of the Board members know if the City would plant a row of Italian cypress on the exterior of the wall.

Mr. Howington said the city plants in the tree lawn, but he believes this would be the church's property, Mr. Lott has said that the church would be willing to plant trees here.

Mr. Lott said they will contact the city.

Ms. Caldwell stated that she believes it is a good idea to contact the city about the trees.

Mr. Gunther said this is playground equipment, but they don't want to see this being referenced and similar things start going up throughout the Historic District. This is after-the-fact.

Ms. Weibe-Reed stated that she believes this gives them a perfect opportunity to develop guidelines in the Historic District regarding playgrounds. These issues will continue to arise as playgrounds development on vacant lots.

Dr. Williams said the precedence they have is the playground in Forsyth Park that opted for a green canopy. He believes that of all the colors suggested that the light grey is better.

Mr. Howington said he wanted to respond to the precedent; he believes it is a unique situation, it is a playground; and it is not a parking lot that will be a restaurant.

Ms. Scheer said this area is residential and for Forsyth Park you don't have such a concern. Therefore, this is a little different.

Mr. Merriman said he agrees with Mr. Lominack's comments about the children. However, the fact that this petition is after the fact denied the public their chance to comment on this issue. It is sad that the public did not get the opportunity to comment on this and if it had gone through the proper procedure, maybe it would not have been an issue.

Mr. Howington clarified that Mr. Lott stated that they came before the Board for all the other items; the fence and other improvements. It was discussed that the playground equipment was not a part of the Review Board's purview. Mr. Howington said, therefore, he does not believe that this was negligent by purpose, but negligent by not understanding.

Mr. Merriman asked who told the petitioner that it was not the Board's purview to review that.

Ms. Harris explained that they have a policy that playground equipment is not a part of the purview of the Review Board. She wanted the Board to hear this request as it went beyond the playground equipment. It was for a permanent structure that would be highly visible. A precedent was set for the Forsyth Park playground; the Board did not review the equipment, but looked at the structures that were associated with it.

Mr. Howington explained that his understanding is the Board needs to consider the two awnings that are visible from the right-of-way.

Mr. Merriman stated that if the petition cannot be denied on the basis that it is after-the-fact and it meets all the criteria, if it is denied what would it be based upon.

Mr. Howington stated that he would entertain a motion. He believes that the petitioner has met the criteria and may not want to ask for a continuance as he may want a vote. However, this could allow some compromise if the petitioner is willing to do so.

Mr. Merriman said the Board is to address whether they believe the canopies are compatible.

Mr. Howington said this includes the height and the color. He does not believe that the Board could suggest a pergola or a different color as this is not what the petition is before them. They need to vote on petition, accept a compromise, a continuance or whatever the petitioner may offer, but they, as a Board, cannot make a suggestion for the church to build a pergola.

Mr. Lott said the church is agreeable to talk to anybody in a constructive fashion about any modifications or changes that might improve things whether they could be done immediately or once sufficient funds are raised by whatever methodology. Their understanding of what they have presented meets the ordinance and meets the intent of the ordinance. They are happy to work with anyone, but they cannot commit to changes that they cannot fund.

Mr. Lott explained that what they ask is that the Board approve what they have submitted and they understand [this should be entered into the records] that if they make any changes to any of the parts that are visible from the public rights-of-way above the height of the wall that would affect the structure or awnings would have to come back before the Review Board for any change. He said that they agree to even a color change come back to the Review Board or the staff if this is what is determined by the Board. He said ordinarily this would have been only reviewed at the staff level.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Lott, therefore, he is asking for a vote today.

Mr. Lott answered that they are asking for a vote as submitted.

Mr. Merriman said if this comes back up again, the ordinance does not cover playground equipment.

Mr. Howington clarified that the petition is not for the playground equipment, but the canopies. He explained that what is before the Review Board is whether they believe the color, height and scale is visually compatible.

Mr. Merriman said he is very sympathetic to the church and he totally agrees with Mr. Lominack's comments, however, based just upon the question, are the canopies visually compatible? The Board would have ever approved this if it had come before them in the past based on the color and height as the canopies stick out badly. He said it saddens him to make a motion to deny the canopies, but based on the facts and what they are to consider as a Board, a motion for denial would be the right thing to do.

Ms. Harris asked for clarification from the Board on how the canopies are not visually compatible.

Mr. Merriman answered that the canopies are not visually compatible due to the height and mass. The color is the most minor of the three.

Mr. Howington stated that if a building was here, it would be within the height and mass and they would have to look at it as such, but because it stands out by itself [and he wants to be careful of that] and as an object, if the lot was built to its maximum, it would be well within the height limit and mass.

Board Action:

Deny the petition for two awnings at 421 Abercorn Street because the height, mass and color are not visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Nay
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

23. [Petition of Jerry Lominack, Lominack Kolman Smith Architects | 14-002849-COA | 660 East Broughton Street | Rehabilitation](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Jerry Lominack and Ms. Rebecca Fenwick were present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to rehabilitate several of the masonry buildings at the Kehoe Iron Works site. The two easternmost buildings, the central tower (Building B), and the two-story foundry building (Building C) will be stabilized and rehabilitated as part of this phase of the project. There are other phases that will come before the Review Board. On October 9, 2013, the Review Board approved the rehabilitation and an addition to the adjacent Machine Shop building.

Ms. Harris stated that when the staff report was originally published, she asked for additional clarification on how the concrete stoop would be connected to the building and whether it would be possible to remove it in the future. Since the publication of the agenda, the petitioner has come up with a solution which has the concrete stoop as being directly adjacent to the building, but it could be removed in the future without damaging it. This is an acceptable solution.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the rehabilitation of 660 East Broughton Street because the rehabilitation meets the preservation standards, visual compatibility criteria, and design standards with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Provide additional information to staff on cleaning specifications;
2. Windows that need to be replaced due to deterioration will be verified by the Preservation Officer;
3. Ensure that the concrete stair base is freestanding
4. Install a four foot by four foot test patch of the proposed repointing;
5. Ensure that the space between the balusters do not exceed four inches

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Harris to clarify what she was saying about the rear side of the Central Tower Building.

Ms. Harris answered that this building may be historic, its framing and concrete block. She showed a picture of the building and pointed out that it appears as an addition in the Sanborn Maps, but it does obscure character defining features on this façade and is at the rear, but is in poor condition. Therefore, staff supports that removal.

Dr. Williams asked what features are obscured.

Ms. Harris said she has toured the site and, therefore, is familiar with the interior. She does not recall if photos are included of this feature in this packet, however, the petitioner could probably elaborate on this. There are some original arched openings within this site.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Fenwick said they are happy to comply with everything that the ask has recommended. She entertained questions from the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Weibe-Reed stated that she believes it is fantastic that this building is being restore.

Ms. Scheer, too, was happy that this building is being restore. It has been abandoned far too long with nothing be done to it.

Dr. Henry stated that the staff did not have many recommendations and he thought this was noteworthy.

Dr. Williams said the work on this building will be done in phases. Therefore, he wanted to ask the petitioner a question. He asked Ms. Fenwick if there were any plans as what she has included in the packets a historic photo from this angle that shows the cupola. Are there any plans for the copular in the long term?

Ms. Fenwick answered that their client does plan to restore the cupola. As the Board sees, it is included in the historic photo.

Dr. Williams asked if this would be done in a later phase.

Ms. Fenwick answered yes.

Ms. Scheer asked if they have the cupola or will have to be redone.

Ms. Fenwick answered that the cupola will have to be redone.

Ms. Scheer said the cupola is the part that she misses the most. It is a very historic part of William Kehoe and his history. What will the building be used as?

Ms. Fenwick answered that the building will be used as event space.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for the rehabilitation of 660 East Broughton Street because the rehabilitation meets the preservation standards, visual compatibility criteria, and design standards with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

- Provide additional information to Staff on cleaning specifications;
- Windows that need to be replaced due to deterioration will be verified by the Preservation Officer; - PASS
- Ensure that the concrete stair base is freestanding;

- Install a four foot by four foot test patch of the proposed repointing;
- Ensure that the space between the balusters does not exceed four inches.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

24. [Petition of Christian Sottile, Sottile & Sottile | 14-002856-COA | 0 River Street | New Construction: River Landing Shelter](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Christian Sottile of Sottile & Sottile, LLC and Ms. Bridget Lidy of the City of Savannah were present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to construct a structure for use as an intermodal stop at the foot of City Hall between the River Walk to the north, River Street to the south, the African-American Monument to the east, and the Hyatt Ballroom to the west. The structure will serve passengers of the Savannah Belles Ferry, the River Street Trolley, and the Convention Shuttle Bus. It will be called the "City Hall Landing Shelter" and will also provide a central location on River Street to find visitor information, intermodal transit schedules, and arrival times. The Shelter will be ADA accessible, the finished floor will be raised (to match or rescue existing brick pavers) to the same height as the River Street sidewalk.

Ms. Michalak explained that an existing Georgia Historical Marker is located within the proposed footprint for this structure. It will need to be relocated on an appropriate site along the River Front. The proposed new site for the marker will need to be reviewed by the Historic Site and Monument Commission who will then make a recommendation to City Council.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval to construct a structure for use as an intermodal stop (at the foot of City Hall between the River Walk to the north, River Street to the south, the African-American Monument to the east, and the Hyatt Ballroom to the west) with the following condition:

- Revise the wood gates to be metal gates to be compatible with other fence and gate materials along the River Walk side of River Street (and to meet the design standards). Resubmit to staff for final review and approval.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Lidy came forward and stated that she is the Director of Tourism Management and Ambassadorship with the City of Savannah. She was present on behalf of the Savannah Area Management Mobility Board commonly referred to as "SAMB." Ms. Lidy stated that this project represents something that has been in the pipeline for some time. It is a part of the 2006 Visitor Mobility Plan which was approved by the Mayor and Council to help with providing alternative mobility options for not only vehicles, but also for pedestrians in the downtown area, especially for the downtown visitors.

Ms. Lidy explained that the site came about as an opportunity to serve as something that would link not only the street car service, but a convention bus service as well as the Ferry to Hutchinson Island and other places downtown. The Visitor Mobility plan also forms "SAMB" and that board is comprised of individuals from the visitor community to include Savannah, Trade Center, Chatham Area Transit Authority and several hoteliers. This is a fantastic example of a perfect private partnership that has been in the pipeline since 2009 and now it is actually coming to fruition.

Mr. Sottile said regarding the context to the design implications of the project, everyone involved in developing this project felt the site was incredibly important to the City of Savannah being literally in the Bull Street right-of-way, the central corridor of the City of Savannah. He said that they spent an extensive amount of time studying and analyzing the site.

Mr. Sottile said they see this project as an opportunity to create an accommodating moment as a person reaches the end of a progression of squares down Bull Street and then proceed around City Hall and reach the river. However, they do realize that the landmarks are already there. This is not a moment for a monument of any type; therefore, it let them as a design motive to not try to do something with this project that would stand out in any way at all. In fact, City Hall does all the work that needs to happen to create a befitting landmark at the cap of the Bull Street corridor.

Mr. Sottile explained that the ways that one approaches this visually are both north, south as you come up Bull Street and around City Hall, and then east, west as you progress along the waterfront along the edge of the River Walk and also as you come down River Street. Therefore, there are a lot of different ways to approach it. The result and design as presented is intended to be very much a part of the existing River Walk environment. They carefully considered it in the context of City Hall as a backdrop and you can see it as being very quiet in the way it presents itself. As Ms. Lidy has said, they are thrilled to bring this forward and it comes with a lot of work, many committee meetings over a project that they feel has a tremendous opportunity to be a high quality asset to the permanent environment of River Street and the River Walk.

Mr. Sottile said they appreciate the staff's review and the comments that were brought forward about the gate. They have already been in dialog with staff and have presented a simple wooden gate and they are open to studying this under some additional scenarios that

may in fact still be appropriate to do a wooden gate, but one that has additional trim and is finished in a way that is compatible with the district or it may be a metal gate. Mr. Sottile stated that they are in agreement with the staff's recommendation and are please to continue to work on this particular element and bring it back for staff review.

Dr. Henry said this is an impressive project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for a structure for use as an intermodal stop (at the foot of City Hall between the River Walk to the north, River Street to the south, the African-American Monument to the east, and the Hyatt Ballroom to the west) with the following condition: - PASS
- Revise the wood gates to be metal gates to be compatible with other fence and gate materials along the River Walk side of River Street (and to meet the design standards.) Resubmit to staff for final review and approval.

Vote Results

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

25. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 14-002857-COA | 412 Williamson Street | New Construction Hotel: Height and Mass Amendment](#)

- Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [PREVIOUS APPROVAL- Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [New Franklin Ward Wharf Lots MAP A.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Draft Montgomery Stair Plans.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Letter against increased height.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of an amendment to Part I Height and Mass of a previously approved new construction hotel at 412 Williamson Street and separately recommendation and Finding-of-Fact to the Zoning Board of Appeals for variance from the Height Map. The variance is to increase the height one story above the earned bonus story at the northeast corner of the building in order to accommodate a restaurant/café and outdoor terrace.

Ms. Harris explained that the petitioner has stated that the request for additional height (both as an amendment to Part I and as a variance to the Height Map) was necessitated by the recent amendment to the Height Map by City Council to the property to the north of the project site. The Board approved the request to demolish the existing structure on the property on January 11, 2012. On April 11, 2012 the Board approved an addition “bonus story” above the height map based on the provision that “*Multiple ground floor active uses permitted in the base zoning district (including but not , limited to real, office , lobby; restaurant) span the length of the façade on all street fronting elevations(not including lanes) and maintain individual primary exterior entrances.*” Part I, Height and Mass amended was approved on September 12, 2012. Part II, Design Details was approved on November 14, 2012. A one year extension was granted in October 2013 and the current approval will expire on November 14, 2014. Additionally, she mentioned that although the Montgomery Street Stair plans are not a part of this purview, when this proposal of Parts I and II were reviewed previously, a lot of discussion among the Review Board was held regarding the plan. This is City owned property and is not directly tied to this development, but the city has continued to work with the developer and property owner to continually develop the plans for the Montgomery Street Stair. While this is not directly a part of this specific proposal, staff included the plans in the Board's submittal packets.

Ms. Harris informed the Board that the petitioner has provided a detailed massing model and during his presentation to the Board, he will explain what was previously approved for Parts I and II; and will also explain what they are now requesting pertaining to the changes to the height and mass and their separate request to the variance from the Height Map.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the request to amend Part I Height and Mass of a previously approved new construction hotel at 412 Williamson Street because the amendment meets the visual compatibility criteria and design standards. She reported also that staff recommends denial to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for a variance from the Height Map. While staff feels the additional story is visually compatible, it does not meet the criteria for a variance.

Ms. Harris stated that staff received a letter from Ms. Siegel in opposition to the proposed height increase. The letter is attached to the Board's agenda.

Mr. Howington asked if this petition is approved today, would the expiration date be extended one year from November 14, 2014.

Ms. Harris explained that as long as action is being taken on a project such as the building permit is applied for or there is measureable progress, the review time will keep getting extended by the demonstration of measurable progress.

Mr. Howington asked that whatever is approved today would be extended one year.

Ms. Harris answered yes.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay came forward and stated that accompanying him were **Mr. Dave Moore, Sr. Project Architect and Attorney Rusty Ross, the legal counsel for Rockbridge Capital**. Mr. Shay said he wanted to begin his presentation by explaining to the four members who were not present during the entire year of 2012 when this project was approved for the existing entitlement. He will then walk the Board through what is entitled now and what is requested by referring to the model.

Mr. Shay showed the Board the model that was presented in 2012 for the approval of Part I, Height and Mass for the building. He said [pointing to two areas] at that time and it is true today that areas are vacant; there are no buildings on either area. During that time, they made it clear that they thought the most important thing about their design was to analyze the buildings from the corners. This is difficult, however, because of the way they submit their drawings are flat elevations that the façade are going on. He said [pointing to corners] that corner, that corner and that corners are actually the way almost everybody will perceive the building. No will be able to stand and look at the entire elevation facing River Street all at one time. This was very much a part of what they relied upon in designing the building which was approved at that time. During that time, the Height Map would have allowed for a two-story building on that site and a three story building on that site. Therefore, as the Board can see, this corner and this corner, especially where the design specifically says that the guest rooms are on those edging would have a great view of the Talmadge Bridge and on a clear day would be able to look also all the way up the Savannah River to Tybee Island.

Mr. Shay explained since then, there has been a height map change that was approved by City Council that will allow approximately additional height. They measure height in stories and, therefore, the model is perhaps somewhat more finite than the actual story allows. But, in essence, the map has been changed so that the entitlement for the map would allow an entitlement that is identical for these two buildings as to what the entitlement already was for this building. He said the Board can see that this had an impact on what the buildings had intended for all along. What they thought was predictable turned out not to be as predictable as they hoped. Mr. Shay said they are desirous that Mr. Kessler's project is a great success. They are hopeful that these buildings will be elegant to look at from the back side, but they will not be viewed from the river. Therefore, they have been challenged to try to figure out how to recover from that and do so quickly because Rockbridge Capital has already "so to speak" gone to market and funded the project.

Mr. Shay then showed the Board what is being proposed today for the height and mass Part I change to the existing entitlement which does not require a variance. He said he was politely asking the Board to vote on two motions today instead of one. Mr. Shay explained that what has primarily changed is the room tower has gotten thinner and some of the areas that were recessed on the room have been pushed closer to the edge of the building. He said also [pointing to an area] this corner which was held down to two stories has been increased and Ms. Harris presented this to the Board. It steps down now from a height of five to four and now three whether than going to two. Actually, the believe that what has been modeled is more pleasing and that it is a gentler transition than slamming down from five stories to two stories. The other changes were done primarily to make the fenestration work. The net consequences in terms of the volume of the building that you can see above grade is actually reduced a little; but they had to increase some areas that are

actually subterranean to make it into hidden space and this is why it ended up netting out to almost identical within 700 square feet of the same architectural volume that is visible. He explained, therefore, the reason they are coming back asking for this is because in order to recover from the impact of having the views that was once predictable were moved, they needed to get a net increase of at least eight districts keys. They did so in the most lowest impact way that they could figure which was to continue to keep this building down here approximately the same height as the existing building across the way; although this is not a historic building and the Board can see in those sectional elevations that they are trying to make the building be a good neighbor to the existing buildings that are in the immediate vicinity. This is the first thing that he asked the Board to consider approving as a Part I only modification to the existing entitlement that is already in place now. The second thing Mr. Shay asked the Board to consider is to allow a slight increase of about 4,000 square feet heated area and another area of approximately 3,000 square feet of open space. The reason this is needed is because all of the people that stay in this hotel that at one time might have enjoyed the views that are on the corner would like for this guest experience to be able to go up on the roof into the space that is up there and be able to have a glass of wine and so forth and enjoy at least some of the view that is further to the east, especially.

Mr. Shay stated that the second thing they would like for the Board to vote on today is to make their recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals on that particular element. They need these separate because they need to be able to move forward as expeditiously as possible with being able to finish construction documents on this building. They will have to take their chance at the ZBA on whether or not this part gets approved. They are hopeful of coming back before the Review Board in September, 2014 for Part II on both of these elements. They are hopeful that the ZBA will see fit to approve this and then they will come back with the Part II modifications to the actual sections and the technical details. They have already been approved for that building, but would need to be updated for this building.

Mr. Shay wanted the Board to know that they like the staff's report because it says that at the end of the day that the proposed changes are visually compatible; and they agree. He said they think that having studied this now at great length, that this is a better building with the changes that they have proposed; not just because it has eight additional guest rooms, but because it is a better looking building and they think it should be approved for that reason if for no other. Mr. Shay said, however, where they have some differences on the staff's report is whether or not the criteria for the variance has been met. He asked the Board to consider their interpretation of these things before they make their final recommendation. At the end of the day, they are off to the ZBA and they would like very much to go with a favorable recommendation from the Review Board. The special conditions and/or circumstances are not purely financial in nature. But, it is to allow the applicant to use the land, buildings or structures more profitably to save money. Mr. Shay said again that they are not purely financial; actually the things that add some value to his client's financial situation are the eight additional keys which do not require a variance. They are seeking those without seeking a variance and the rooftop place is actually for the guest and the Board's experience [they will be able to go up there] and enjoy more of the view to some extent the river, look over the power plant, see a little of South Carolina, and be able to have a better visual experience for both the guests and visitors. This also looks better from the ground even if they are not interested in going up on the rooftop. Therefore, they believe that they have met this standard because it has very important visual consequences for the guests and the public. Mr. Shay stated that actually this does not save

money, but costs a lot of money in order to do these things.

Mr. Shay stated that the second item Ms. Harris pointed out the concerned the concept of literal interpretation. He read that the Standard says "*literal interpretation of the provisions of the regulations would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district within the same or immediately adjacent ward under the terms of the Ordinance and would result in unreasonable hardship on the applicant.*" He pointed out that the zoning district they are in is zoned B-B, water front district. He was not sure how the wards are counted along the river front, but he knows that when the Bohemian Hotel was granted a three-story height variance so that they could have additional hotel rooms and a rooftop bar and restaurant space in a similar circumstance. Mr. Shay said that whether the Review Board agrees if the variance should have been issued or not, it is in the same zoning district and is near-by their request. It is proof that at least one [he could probably go on and name a few others] hotel has enjoyed the same privilege. Therefore, this is not something that is only unique to this particular petition. Regarding the "minimum variance", the standard states that "*the variance, if granted, shall be the minimum variance necessary to make possible the use of land, buildings, or structures.*" Mr. Shay said this is the minimum that they can propose. They have proposed only 4,000 square feet. The adjacent property is going to be able to have an additional three or maybe four stories. They have not proposed entire stories and have not proposed anything other than what they need in order for this project to be viable and have reasonable use. They are not trying to get more than what is absolutely the minimum amount necessary. Therefore, in their view, they are being reasonable in seeking the minimum amount that they can seek.

Mr. Shay stated that the "Special Privilege Not Granted" standard says that "*the variance shall not confer on the applicant's property any special privilege that is denied by this Ordinance to other lands, buildings, or structures in the same zoning district.*" He pointed out that there are other buildings in the B-B zoning district that are near-by that have enjoyed exactly this privilege and more. Therefore, they do not believe that what they are requesting is something that is in violation of the idea of special privilege not granted. Frankly all the people that are in the B-B zone; all who are coming before the Review Board has the right to seek a variance. If the standard was literally interpreted to say that nobody could seek a variance because nobody else already has had the opportunity to seek a variance yet, then he does not know why they would have a zoning board of appeals. Regarding the "General Consistency," they agree with the staff that they have met this criterion.

Mr. Shay said they believe that all the criteria for the opportunity to go forward to the Zoning Board of Appeals if the Review Board so desires, a favorable recommendation has actually been met. The reason they are here is a very special circumstance. This was a process hat was actually initiated with this Board at the end of 2011. They went though a year of deliberations in order to be able to create a building that is already entitled. They were the first building ever to try and was successfully qualified for the bonus story under the menu of ways to qualify for it. This was awkward and hard for everybody to figure out to apply these standards to a site that was not a flat site, but 17 feet of sloping. However, they went through the process and were able to attain that. He said, however, the world changed on them, but he is hopeful that this would not happen very often where somebody would make the kind of investment that his client has and then come to find out that a rule change is in the process.

Mr. Shay said they feel that what they have presented to the Board is a building that

is actually better than the building that has already been approved. They would like for the Board to allow them to move forward with their project which frankly would be a little further along if it had not been for this unusual circumstance. He said he detected that Attorney Ross would like to withhold any further remarks unless the Board has questions for him.

Mr. Howington asked Attorney Ross if he wanted to make any comments.

Mr. Ross answered no. He just came to answer any questions or issues that the Board might have regarding their petition. However, he believes that Mr. Shay has done an excellent job in portraying what is being requested. It is not that they have vast problems with the staff's recommendations, but they do disagree on some points that are in fact open to interpretation. Attorney Ross said the main thing as Mr. Shay pointed out is that they had some game changers come in. He believes the economy slowed this project down a little, but when these guys came to him, they were shovel ready; they were ready to go; and needed a year extra [this was granted by the Board] to put the shovel in the ground. They are trying to live within the new world that they are in. He believes that they have, in a nice way, fixed up a corner of the Historic District that really needs some help.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that he believes this is another difficult dilemma. He believes that the petitioner makes a good case for what they want and it is circumstantial. But, nevertheless, they respectfully oppose the additional height and story. They also respectfully disagree with the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Carey explained that they are opposed to the proposed amendments to the height, mass and variance request because they believe that it really relies on visual compatibility. All of their thinking and all of their arguments are really under the umbrella of what is and what is not visually compatible. He said recent decisions by ZBA and City Council have allowed virtually everything proposed by large scale developments and those decisions have made it clear that the Historic Savannah Foundation needs to hold a firm line and say no when projects fail to meet the letter and the spirit of the existing ordinance. He realizes that this project may meet the letter of the ordinance, but he thinks the spirit goes a little beyond and this is what they are looking at. The message is really important and the message they need to send is to ZBA, MPC, and City Council that development is not a sacred cow and should not get carte-blanche treatment. Appointed bodies that are charged with reviewing projects should not be party to the wrongs being done. If the petitioner wants to use political channels to get what he or she wants, then so be it. But as long as the Review Board exists, they should exist for a reason. He told the Board not to sell themselves short; they are professionals and experts. They have been granted the discretion and authority he believes they should use it.

Mr. Carey said as to the element why this request should not be approved today, the full design was presented to this body and they approved the overall the height, floor-to-floor ratios, step-downs and so forth. The rooftop for a restaurant is virtually a brand new contract. You cannot stretch the building upward. It will be built at the corner. The reason you are including setbacks on the other floors and keeping floors to floor heights was to mitigate the height as much as possible and this goal was achieved. The building already includes a bonus story; therefore they do not believe it is appropriate to change this or add

additional height.

Mr. Carey said they understand and are sympathetic to the developer that this request is the result of a text amendment that was approved by City Council allowing more height to the neighboring property at the Power Plant site. He said that this petitioner went through the proper channels and design review process. City Council invited the petitioner to come before them and in fact chastised the petitioner for not doing so. He told the Board that he does not believe that they should take it upon themselves to do the work that City Council has carved out for themselves. He said let them come up with the ramifications for the situation they created. He said regarding the point of visual compatibility he believes there are two things. What is the context? Is it the existing context or is it the proposed context under which the Review Board should be making its decision? He asked in this regard, what is the visual compatibility compared to in this case. These are the questions he wants the Board to think about.

Mr. Carey said he understood that power points are as much on principal as anything, but he thinks there is consideration under the two areas of context, visual compatibility and consider the spirit of the law. He believes that a line needs to be drawn and a message needs to be sent.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Carey if he was recommending that both of the staff's recommendations be denied.

Mr. Carey answered yes.

Dr. Henry asked staff that if the Board approves the recommendation for the height would not this approve the recommendation for the variance request.

Ms. Harris answered no. These are two separate things. She explained that recommendation one has to do with changes which are permitted on the Height Map and staff is recommending approval of those changes. On top of this, the petitioner is requesting an extra story above the Height Map which would involve a variance. The variance is a separate request.

Mr. Christian Sottile came forward and stated that he was representing the Plant Riverside Development. He stated for the record that they are neither for nor against the petition that the Board is considering now. But, they wanted to clarify for the record that the model that the Board is looking at is a theory to what proposed. The model represents structures and a massive plan for the Plant Riverside Redevelopment that will not occupy 100 percent of the site. No structure proposed will exceed the height of the historic structure on the property. The model that has been presented to the Board shows a theoretic height that could be developed on the site.

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

Mr. Shay said he wanted to address Mr. Carey's concerns from the Historic Savannah Foundation. He said that he does not make reference to what the building will become. What is shown to the Board is in reference to the buildings that exist, including the historic building at this owned by Plant Riverside. He said he believes the drawings demonstrate that they are trying to relate to the visual compatibility. Mr. Shay said he does not want anybody to think that the model is the actual proposed buildings, but is to give the Board an idea of the relational height and what has been approved in the text amendment.

Mr. Howington said it is theory and the Board does not know what it will be; but they know the height of the model is correct.

Mr. Shay said he was asking the Board for two things today if they are willing to do so. The first thing is to approve the changes to the height and mass. The separate request is that the Board find a finding-of-fact on a variance for an additional story so they can go to the ZBA.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Howington thanked Mr. Shay for coming to the Board as he does always and go through the proper channel which shows that he respects the process and always look to the Board to make a compromise and reach an agreement. He said he agrees that the building ended up being a better building. It is smaller and the proportions look better to him, personally. Mr. Howington said he looks at this as two things. The policy of this Board is that the Chair does not vote unless there is a tie. But, if he did have a vote he would vote in favor of this as he believes this is a better building. He feels that the Height Map is in place for predictability, consistency and future understanding of what you are going to get. He feels that the Review Board is the steward of the ordinance and they should follow it strictly. Mr. Howington said regarding the variance request, two wrongs do not make a right. If he had to vote, he would vote against the variance, but it would not be a vote against Mr. Shay.

Dr. Henry said that Mr. Shay's presentation sums up the uncertainty.

Mr. Howington wanted it noted in the record that the Height Map is sacred.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for amending Part 1 Height and Mass of a previously approved new construction hotel at 412 Williamson Street because the amendment meets the visual compatibility criteria and design standards. - PASS

Recommend denial to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the Height Map because it does not meet the criteria for a variance.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams
Second: Tess Scheer
Debra Caldwell - Aye
Justin Gunther - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

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

26. Petition of Eric O'Neill, Homeline Architecture | 14-002861-COA | 518 East Bryan Street | Alterations

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Howington relinquished the chair and recused himself from this petition as he is an employee of Greenline Architecture. Mr. Merriman served as chair during the hearing of this petition.

Mr. Eric O'Neill was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations to the property located at 518 East Bryan Street. The alterations include changes to the first floor mud room, first floor back hall, and second floor open porch in order to accommodate a new elevator inside the building. All work is at the rear of the building along the lane. None of the first floor work is visible from the public right-of-way; therefore, staff did not include it in this report.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for the alterations to the property located at 518 East Bryan Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Add horizontal center rails to the fixed shutters that correspond to muntins on adjacent casement windows or French doors.
2. Remove the butt-boards on the east elevation; replace with brick to match the adjacent knee walls.
3. Remove the fixed casement-style window and replace with fixed shutters to be more visually compatible (rhythm of solids-to-voids).

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. O'Neill came forward and stated that he was representing Dr. & Mrs. Hutchinson. He entertained questions from the Board. But, first he wanted to go through the staff's recommendations and make comments so they all will know where they stand.

Mr. O'Neill said they are okay with the shutters; they will continue the brick knee wall to the eastern façade; they have already taken care of the window on the second floor. If the Board looks at the first floor plan, they will see that there is an existing window on the eastern wall where they are sitting their elevator shaft. They are continuing the center line straight up onto the second floor so that you will have a nice view looking into the courtyard. They are mindful of the proportions and sizes of the shutters.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. O'Neill, therefore, he is agreeable with the staff's first two recommendations, but not the third recommendation.

Mr. O'Neill answered yes.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked Mr. O'Neill if there was a way that he could have possibly made the third bay that he is enclosing look like louver doors as opposed to a center window with two shutters.

Mr. O'Neill answered that he had not considered this. They want to be able to maintain the center window so that you will have a view out of the elevator.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked if a glass elevator will be here.

Mr. O'Neill said on one wall, you will be able to see out the elevator. He explained that they have positioned the elevator to align with the existing window.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Scheer said with the glass in the middle, it will be a lot of weight on the back end.

Ms. Caldwell said she likes the idea of glazing all the way. But, with closing it in, visually there is a lot of weight on the back end, but she understands about the elevator.

Mr. Merriman said they are in the Board discussion, but if they have a specific question, they may ask the petitioner. He asked the Board if they wanted to know why it was placed there instead of some where else.

Ms. Scheer said she believes if the elevator was moved up against the house and the porch was left, it would be more aesthetically pleasing. Why was this not done?

Mr. O'Neill answered that they wanted to access the elevator from the garage.

Mr. Merriman said this would be more functional.

Ms. Scheer stated that she knows functionality will be here, but she hate to see the entire area closed up. As a person who once lived on this street, she would hate to see just a huge block. It would be nice if this was restudied to see if there is a way to leave more opening.

Mr. O'Neill stated that the mass of the porch is still there. They are adding the glass doors and windows, and adding the shutters where they thought they would be appropriate.

Ms. Caldwell asked that on the two shutter windows or bays is it for equipment. Why is that solid?

Mr. O'Neill said it is entering out of the elevator. They are trying to keep all of those solid walls. Mr. O'Neill said [pointing to an area] if they are going to be held up on this

window here and the elevator shaft facing east, they would ask that they come back to staff with a reconsidered design for that one bay.

Ms. Scheer said this house is not historic. The people who first built were cognizant about not enclosing the entire house. The next owners built the garage and the porch was still open. It was mentioned that the parking garage is behind, but when this is done, the house that is adjacent will have no light in their yard.

Mr. Merriman reminded the Board to stay on task with the petition as presented. He said if they leave the bay design as requested by the petitioner to restudied and come back to staff with a reconsidered design, they need to instruct the staff.

Mr. Gunther said he agrees with the brick knee wall.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked Mr. O'Neill why the casement and the French doors are on the other side?

Mr. O'Neill explained that the brick knee wall is wrapping around the existing porch. They are only adding the windows and shutters. As the staff has recommended, they will continue the brick knee wall to the eastern elevation.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for alterations to the property located at 518 East Bryan Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Add horizontal center rails to the fixed shutters that correspond to muntins on adjacent casement windows or French doors.
 2. Remove the butt-boards on the east elevation; replace with brick to match the adjacent knee walls.
 3. Replace the shutters and fixed window on the southeast and northeast corners with clad, double-paned, operable *Marvin Ultimate French Casement* windows with 7/8 inch wide simulated divided lites in *Stone White* to be more visually compatible.
- PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell

- Aye

Justin Gunther

- Aye

Nicholas Henry

- Aye

Keith Howington

- Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq.

- Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

27. [Petition of Josh Ward for Lynch Associates | 13-002609-COA | 422 Habersham Street | Request for One Year Extension](#)

Attachment: [Extension Request.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Extension Request-Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for a 12 month extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) issued on June 12, 2013 for alterations to 422 Habersham Street [File No. 13-002609-COA]. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

28. [Amended Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 14-001836-COA | 611 East River Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 611 East River Street 14-001836-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 611 East River Street 14-001836-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Joshua Beckler for Coastal Canvas | 14-002726-COA | 615 Montgomery Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 615 Montgomery Street 14-002726-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet \(final\).pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Tracy Harvey | 14-002767-COA | 612 Price Street | Staff Approved - Windows, Doors](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 612 Price Street 14-002767-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [COA - 612 Price Street 14-002767-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Elaine Berk | 14-002793-COA | 616 - 618 Price Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 616-618 Price Street 14-002793-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 616 - 618 Price Street.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of James Wubbena | 14-002854-COA | 317 East Broad Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 317 East Broad Street 14-002854-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 317 East Broad Street 14-002854-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Erik Puljung for Hansen Architects, P.C. | 14-002859-COA | 22 West Harris Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 22 West Harris Street 14-002859-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 22 West Harris Street 14-002859-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of John Deering for Greenline Architecture | 14-002862-COA | 606 Turner Boulevard | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 606 Turner Boulevard 14-002862-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 606 Turner Boulevard Street 14-002862-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Clegg Ivey | 14-002867-COA | 518 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard | Staff Approved - Window Signs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 518 MLK Jr. Blvd 14-002867-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 518 MLK Jr. Blvd 14-002867-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Gul Mirchandani | 14-002913-COA | 128 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Color Changes](#)

Attachment: [COA - 126 West Bay Street 14-002915-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 126 West Bay Street 14-002915-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Michael W. Savidge | 14-002936-COA | 510 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 510 East Oglethorpe Avenue 14-002936-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 510 East Oglethorpe Avenue 14-002936-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Doug Patten for the City of Savannah | 14-002961-COA | 410 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Repairs to the Stairs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 410 East Bay Street 14-002961-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 410 East Bay Street 14-002961-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of John Moore for Pier and Beam LLC | 14-002972-COA | 102 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Storefront System](#)

Attachment: [COA - 102 West Broughton Street 14-002972-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 102 West Broughton Street 14-002972-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Petition of Laura Potts-Wirht | 14-002985-COA | 18 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 18 West Oglethorpe Avenue 14-002985-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 1 18 West Oglethorpe Avenue 14-002985-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. [Petition of Jason Holifield | 14-002994-COA | 608-610 Price Street | Staff Approved - Roof Replacement](#)

Attachment: [COA - 608 Price Street 14-002994-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 608 Price Street 14-002994-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. [Amended Petition of Matthew and Ellsworth Hallett | 14-002995-COA | 452 Price Street | Staff Approved - Addition](#)

Attachment: [COA - 452 Price Street 14-002995-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packett - 452 Price Street 14-002995-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. [Petition of Caitlin Moultroupe for City of Savannah | 14-003020-COA | 132 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved -Masonry and Structural Steel Repairs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 132 East Broughton Street 14-003020-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 132 East Broughton Street 14-003020-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. [Amended Petition of Jeffrey Cramer | 14-003044-COA | 507 and 509 East Congress Street | Staff Approved - Eaves](#)

Attachment: [COA - 507 and 509 East Congress Street 14-003044-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 507 and 509 East Congress Street 14-003044-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

45. [Doug Patton for City of Savannah | 14-003062-COA | 4 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Historic Balconies](#)

Attachment: [COA - 4 East Bay Street 14-003062-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 4 East Bay Street 14-003062-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

46. [Amended Petition of Gene Carpenter | 14-003080-COA | 140 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Lattice](#)

Attachment: [COA - 140 Habersham Street 14-003080-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 140 Habersham Street 14-003080-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

47. [Petition of Brandon Hoffman for Sign-A-Rama | H-140626-60075-2 | 18 West Bryan Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Changes](#)

Attachment: [COA Decision - 18 West Bryan St - H-14-60075-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 18 West Bryan Street H-140626-60075-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

48. [Petition of Laurel Canyon Gifts Inc. | 14-003205-COA | 202 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Recover Existing Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 202 East Bay Street 14-003205-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 202 E. Bay Street 14-003205-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

49. [Petition of Twila Davis and Melanie Harmon | 14-003207-COA | 555 and 557 East Harris Street | Staff Approved - Color Changes](#)

Attachment: [COA - 555 and 557 East Harris Street 14-003207-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 555 and 557 East Harris Street 14-003207-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 7-9-14.pdf](#)

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

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Items Deferred to Staff 7-9-14.pdf](#)

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

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

52. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, July 17, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

53. [Next Meeting - Wednesday, August 13, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

54. [Other Business](#)

Dr. Henry said it has occurred to him that it is time for the Review Board to have a discussion with the various boards. He asked the Board what are their thoughts on writing a letter to the Editor regarding some of the things that has happened over the past few months or meeting with some of the boards. He believes they need to meet with City Council and advise them of their

concerns.

Mr. Howington said he believes it would be good to have a discussion. There needs to be a venue for this. Would it be a Pre-Council meeting? If so, he does not know the proper procedure for this.

Ms. Harris explained that it depends upon the type of meeting they want to have. If they want all of the Historic Review Board members to be present and all of the members of City Council, it would have to be a public meeting. Notices would need to be sent out notifying the public about the meeting. The meeting would be filmed and minutes would be taken. She said if a Board member has a personal connection with a member of City Council, they could meet with that person one-on-one. They would not be able to have a quorum. If it is a Council Workshop, the news media would be there. It depends on how the Board sees the conversations going. Maybe the Board would want the media there, but if not, then her recommendation would be to meet one-on-one.

Dr. Henry said he believes that a meeting needs to be held as soon as possible.

Mr. Howington said he likes the idea about everyone meeting with their Alderman. This sounds like a good way to do it.

Dr. Williams asked if this is regarding the Height Map.

Mr. Howington said it would be just the general process. He believes it would concern the understanding about the lack of things. He said the Review Board was appointed to make the decisions along with the staff and move forward.

Mr. Merriman said the public's perception of the Review Board is they are the big, bad guys. City Council is the good guys because every time something comes up, there is a promise of some more jobs.

Dr. Henry said he believes the Board needs to try to turn the public's perception around.

Ms. Scheer asked if anyone on the Board knows of another city that has a concept better than they have in Savannah.

Mr. Merriman said he attended the Historic Preservation training and he left the meeting believing that they had it together here in Savannah more so than the other cities.

Mr. Howington stated that he does not believe that all of the cities are as complicated.

Mr. Merriman said most of the cities do not have a design review board.

Mr. Howington said most of the cities do not have a staff either.

Mr. Thomson said they are successful one day; one decision; and one case at a

time. Unfortunately, he believes that some things have gone a particular way recently, but when you look at the big picture, this Board gets a lot of credit for keeping things in the right direction. The Historic District Board of Review is a board appointed by City Council. City Council is busy and they have eight million things and do not have time to learn the many different things. Mr. Thomson said he believes that it is his job to educate the public and show how the decision was made regarding the matter of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Thomson said he believes that individual members on the Review Board need to meet with individuals of City Council and other people. However, he believes they need to have a set of common talking points so the message is similar to what they all are doing.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Thomson if he was present during the meeting when the Zoning Board of Appeals returned the Historic Review Board decision about the building next to McDonalds on Broughton Street.

Mr. Thomson said he was not present.

Mr. Merriman asked Ms. Harris if she was present.

Ms. Harris answered that she was out-of-town, but Ms. Michalak was present.

Mr. Merriman said the comment in the newspaper was that the Review Board came to the meeting and the building was not historic, but when they left the meeting the building was historic. He said this is not what happened. He said he made the motion and read directly from the ordinance why it did not meet the criteria for demolition. Who made the case against Attorney Yellin?

Ms. Harris said that Jack Butler is the staff person to the ZBA. He presented the application and Leah, as the Historic Preservation expert, represented the Historic Review Board's decision.

Mr. Thomson stated that the ZBA staff recommendation was supportive of the Historic Review Board decision.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

55. [Adjourned.](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Howington adjourned the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen Harris

Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem