



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
June 11, 2014 1:00 PM  
Meeting Minutes

**JUNE 11, 2014 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING**

**HDRB Members Present:** Keith Howington, Chair  
Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian  
Debra Caldwell  
Reed Engle  
Justin Gunther  
Dr. Nicholas Henry  
Stephen Merriman, Jr.  
Marjorie Weibe-Reed  
Tess Scheer

**HDRB Members Not Present:** Ebony Simpson, Vice-Chair  
Robin Williams, Ph.D

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

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

1. [Order](#)

**Chair Howington** called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. He outlined the purpose and role of the Historic District Board of Review.

**II. SIGN POSTING**

**III. CONSENT AGENDA**

2. [Petition of Signs for Minds | 14-002274-COA | 5 West Broughton Street | Fascia Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal packet- drawings.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for a fascia sign at 5 West Broughton Street because the sign meets the sign standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.  
Second: Tess Scheer

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

3. [Petition of Edward A. Pynch | 14-002317-COA | 118 East Taylor Street | Covered Deck Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Application.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Material and Color Samples.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for alterations to an existing roof deck on the rear of the building located at 118 East Taylor Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.  
Second: Tess Scheer

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

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye

4. [Petition of Natalie Aiken, Hansen Architects | 14-002344-COA | 311 West Broughton Street | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Revised Submittal Packet - 311 West Broughton Street 14-002344-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 311 West Broughton Street 14-002344-COA.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for the proposed alterations to the storefront at 311 West Broughton Street with the condition that the storefront color be submitted to staff for review and approval, because the project is visually compatible and meets the design standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

5. [Petition of Walter Hopkins | 14-002345-COA | 24 Drayton Street | Projecting Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 24 Drayton Street 14-002345-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 24 Drayton St 14-002345-COA.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for the sign with the condition that the area of the sign be reduced to be 27 square feet or less because otherwise the sign is visually compatible and meets the sign standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Tess Scheer

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

6. [Petition of Christina Swenson | 14-002359-COA | 352 Lincoln Street | Garden Wall Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 352 Lincoln Street 14-002359-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Revised Electronic Submittal Packet - 352 Lincoln Street 14-002359-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [1978 Photographs.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for the installation of a vehicular gate to the privacy wall at 352 Lincoln Street because it meets visual compatibility criteria and design standards with the following conditions:

- PASS

1. Submit paint color samples for the wooden gate to staff for review and approval; and
2. Ensure that the new driveway materials match the existing sidewalk materials.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Tess Scheer

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

7. [Petition of Kim Chambliss | 14-002492-COA | 15 East Liberty Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Application - 15 East Liberty Street 14-2492-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for the sign at 15 East Liberty Street because it is visually compatible and meets the sign standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Tess Scheer

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

**IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

8. [Adopt June 11, 2014 Agenda](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the adoption of the June 11, 2014 agenda. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: Nicholas Henry

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

**V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

9. [Approval of May 14, 2014 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [05-14-2014 Minutes.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve May 14, 2014 meeting minutes. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

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

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

**Mr. Engle** said he wanted to make a comment about this petition as they have some members who were not on the Board when this petition came before them. A lot of pressure was directed to the Review Board to go along with the demolition. But, the Board held firm on their decision and did not approve the demolition. He is grateful for the way this is ending. A new owner was found and will put a new roof on the building. Therefore, the building will keep its original elevation.

**Board Action:**

Approval to be removed from final agenda. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye

## VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

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

#### **Board Action:**

Continue the petition to the July 9, 2014 meeting. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

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

#### **Board Action:**

Continue due to an incomplete application. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

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

**Board Action:**

Continue. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

**VIII. REGULAR AGENDA**

14. [Petition of Brett and Kim Turner | 14-001805-COA | 509 Whitaker Street | New Construction: Part I and Part II](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Material, Spec, and Color Board.pdf](#)

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

**Mr. Norman Lack** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioners are requesting approval for New Construction: Parts I and II for a one-story, two-car garage and trellis structure for the property located at 509 Whitaker Street. The petitioners are also requesting a variance from the "structured parking" standard to allow for the proposed garage along Howard Street. Part I of the petition was continued from the May 14, 2014 Board meeting in order for the petitioners to consider the following:

1. Restudy the relationship between the existing fence and the new trellis;
2. Lower the height of the trellis to meet the 11 foot maximum height standard;
3. Change the trellis structure's brick bases to stucco to match the house and the



- proposed garage;
4. Redesign the trellis to not extend forward of the front façade of the garage;
  5. Restudy/simplify the design of the roof/awning over the garage doors.

**Ms. Michalak** said the Board also decided that the petitioners could submit Parts I and II for review at the next meeting. She stated that the petitioners have addressed the concerns as follows:

1. The stucco cap on the easternmost existing fence column will be removed and the existing fence and columns will all be painted black; this proposal allows the existing fence to blend into the background and let the new trellis stand proud, physically and visually of the fence. Also, the plan is to grove Jasmine over the existing fence.
2. The trellis height has been reduced to 11 feet;
3. The trellis post bases are now proposed to be stucco;
4. The trellis has been pulled back two feet from the front façade of the garage;
5. The design of the awning over the garage doors has been simplified and reduced, in depth, to 1 foot-8 inches. The awning encroaches over the public sidewalk to the underside of the awning is 8 feet-5 inches.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a one-story, two-car garage and trellis structure for the property located at 509 Whitaker Street. Staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details for a one-story, two-car garage and trellis structure for the property located at 509 Whitaker Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

- a. Ensure that the garage doors are inset not less than three inches from the exterior surface of the façade of the garage.
- b. Ensure that the garage doors do not have a simulated wood-grain finish.
- c. Clarify the preferred window pattern for the garage doors.

**Ms. Michalak** also reported that staff recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for the following standard: *Structured parking within the first story of a building shall be setback a minimum of 30 feet from the property lines along all public rights-of way (not including lanes)* because the variance criteria are met.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Lack** said he was present to represent the Turners as they are out of town. He entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Lack, for clarification, to please address the staff's questions.

**Mr. Lack** explained that the lites on the garage doors have been changed to match the lites on the house.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said he believes the petitioners have done everything that the Board asked them to do at the last Board meeting. He thanked the petitioners for working with the Board.

**Board Action:**

1. Approve New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 1-story, two-car garage and trellis structure for the property located at 509 Whitaker Street.

2. Approval New Construction: Part II, Design Details for a 1-story, two-car garage and trellis structure for the property located at 509 Whitaker Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

a. Ensure that the garage doors are inset not less than 3 inches from the exterior surface of the façade of the garage. - PASS

b. Ensure that the garage doors do not have a simulated wood-grain finish.

c. Clarify the preferred window lite pattern for the garage doors

3. Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the following standard:

*Structured parking within the first story of a building shall be setback a minimum of 30 feet from property lines along all public rights-of-way (not including lanes).*

Because the variance criteria are met.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

15. [Petition of Shedrick Coleman for SHEDDarchitecture | 14-001838-COA | 703, 705, and 707 Tattall Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

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

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

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of three attached, two-story townhouses on the vacant properties at 703, 705, and 707 Tattall Street. The townhouses front Tattall Street with access to parking from Jefferson Street.

**Ms. Michalak** said the petition was continued from the May 14, 2014 Board meeting in order for the petitioner to consider the following:

1. Increase the width of the front door opening and opening above to match the width of the adjacent windows.
2. Restudy the height of foundation walls to improve the verticality of the buildings.
3. Increase the quantity of openings on the rear façade, possibly change to a 4-bay rhythm as this façade will be highly visible from Jefferson Street.
4. Reconsider the addition of openings on both the north and south (sides) facades.
5. Redesign the parapet wall at the box window on the front façade so that it does not cover the windows above.
6. Restudy the design of the rear porches.
7. Restudy the gates at the former lane.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval of the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of three attached, two-story townhomes for the vacant properties located at 703, 705, and 707 Tattall Street with the following condition to be submitted for review with Part II, Design Details:

1. Add openings to both side facades.

**Mr. Engle** said he could not tell whether the door openings were enlarged to be the same as the window openings.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that the windows were reduced to be the same size as the doors.

**Mr. Engle** clarified at this time, the Board is only considering the openings and not the doors.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that Mr. Engle was correct; the doors are three feet wide and the windows are now three feet wide. The windows were reduced to match the doors instead of vice versa.

**Mr. Howington** asked if the windows are aligned vertically.

**Mr. Engle** answered yes.

**Ms. Michalak** said the parapet walls no longer cover the windows.

**Mr. Howington** said concerning the comment of putting the windows on the north and south facades, he believes the Board covered that since they are on the property line, they could not put windows there.

**Ms. Michalak** said the staff still feels that this is not compatible. The facades will be highly visible which will be two very large blank facades with nearly 20 feet on one side and more than 20 feet on the other side. She said that the petitioner added some architectural features to this side.

### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Coleman** said at the last meeting they talked about the north and south facades being on the property lines. He said with their consideration of reducing the width of the windows, they looked to see if this would be in the best interest of the project. The only way to make up for the reduction in the width would be to add another story. However, they believe that three stories in this area is not visually compatible. The building would stick out too much from this standpoint. While the north and south facades are visible, with the south being more visible than the north, they do not think they are highly visible. Mr. Coleman said trying to put the infill window patterns on the sides to try to address the fact that they did not think that a blank façade was in the best interest to consider what staff said was important.

**Mr. Coleman** said they are hopeful that the Board will consider that they have addressed all the other issues. He believes the project is better due to the revisions that they made and hopefully the issues on the south and north windows facades based on the constraints of the site, will be considered. He entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Engle** said there is an entire side on the south that is deeded a parking lot that can never be built on.

**Mr. Coleman** stated, however, it is the property line.

**Mr. Howington** said Mr. Coleman explained this issue at the last Board meeting. He asked him to explain this again.

**Mr. Coleman** explained that the empty lot is a lot. The only way that this could be done is to move the property line three feet over, which would take away their joint parking for the units. The units are meant to be sold separately as individual lots. Each person would own their unit with the fourth lot being a shared parking lot. The surrounding neighborhood does not allow any opportunities for off-street parking. But, they felt that if they could not build on the 24 foot lot, it would allow them to do the parking. This would improve the overall neighborhood by taking the parking burden off the street.

**Mr. Howington**, for clarification, asked if there is also an easement that had to be maintained.

**Mr. Coleman** answered yes. They have a Georgia Power easement here which is why the lot is unbuildable as it takes up 20 feet of the 24 foot lot.

**Mr. Howington** stated that technically, this could not be moved.

**Mr. Coleman** said it could possibly be moved four feet, but they would lose the opportunity to have the parking.

**Ms. Scheer** asked if the north and south facades are to emulate false windows.

**Mr. Coleman** answered that the openings are inset two inches to make it appear that at one time they were openings that have been infill.

**Ms. Scheer** said she does not see any symmetry. Is there a reason for them being placed where they are?

**Mr. Coleman** said they were placed as such because if the rooms could have had windows on the adjacent side, they would have corresponded with where they could be if they could have had openings here. Therefore, it was not arbitrary, but basically looking at where they would put windows on the inside if they were really here.

**Mr. Gunther** asked Mr. Coleman if there was no other way to arrange the interior on the rear façade, the recessed porch and the false window to accommodate a true door.

**Mr. Coleman** answered that as they see on their floor plan, the kitchen comes out to that point based on this solely. Therefore, because of the width, there is no way for them to move it over. The window proportions could get closer together, but he does not want to jam the windows together to get the clearance.

**Ms. Scheer** asked Mr. Coleman what was his reason for making the windows narrower and not making the doors wider.

**Mr. Coleman** answered that basically with the issue of the height to mass being important, he discussed at the last meeting that the windows could possibly be narrower as this would help with the verticality. He explained that this allowed him not only to get the vertical feel, but he narrowed the bay a little which made that expression more vertical as well.

**Ms. Scheer** said the door still looks like an extremely tall narrow door. This is the point that the staff made as they recommended they want the door to be wider.

**Mr. Coleman** stated that what he recalls is that the door and window did not match. Therefore, they needed to make them go one way or another. However, he can change the height of the door. Presently it is an eight foot door. This is why it looks so tall. Maybe this is a consideration they will address if this is something that the Board desires.

**Mr. Howington** explained that maybe the door looks taller because a door is not shown presently as it is just blank.

**Mr. Coleman** said his client wants to have a flush metal door. This is why the door looks as it does.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation** said the Review Board has primarily brought up the same concerns that they had. The HSF, like staff, would love to see windows on the side façades. They understand that there will always be circumstances that one has to work with, but if it was possible to bring the building in three feet from the property line, they believe the north façade would be more important to add windows on this façade as it is much more visible.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Ms. Caldwell** said if the north and south facades cannot actually have windows, this is similar to what they see downtown with the infill or at least if a window was never there, it was put there for symmetry and consistency. Therefore if windows are unable to go here, she believes this is the next best thing. In her opinion, it fits with history.

**Mr. Howington** asked Ms. Caldwell if she was okay with the order even the one that is close to the front.

**Ms. Caldwell** said it looks a little awkward to her, but she understands where there would have been windows. But, it is a little off, which bothers her, but she is not an architect. Is this where windows would have been?

**Mr. Howington** answered it could have been, but the one that is closest to the edge may not be there. He is not sure whether you would have a window that close to the edge. Maybe this little piece could be deleted. This would bring the symmetry back.

**Ms. Caldwell** said she believes the deletion would fix this or add another and make them more symmetric.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes the windows may need to be restudied a little more. He believes the windows are an issue on the property line and he knows that in the past, they have had petitions such as this.

**Mr. Gunther** asked if the Georgia Power easement will be in perpetuity. Do they know this?

**Mr. Howington** answered that they do not know. He would say near perpetuity when Georgia Power is involved.

**Mr. Gunther** asked if there is some type of variance that would allow a change to occur here.

**Mr. Howington** explained that he believes the only thing would be if Georgia Power did not have the easement any longer.

**Mr. Gunther** asked that since the distance is here and there is a vacant unbuildable lot with more than three feet from the buildable property line, is there a way that the façade could be addressed through a variance of some sort to actually have openings?

**Mr. Howington** answered that he believes this is a good question. He believes it is possible, but would need more in-depth study as it is a national code issue.

**Mr. Engle** asked staff why did they recommend openings on the north and south façade if it is against code.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that staff feels that it is not visually compatible not to have openings; whether this meant fire proof glass or another solution. The Board approved this on new construction not long ago. Or, if the footprint changed and Mr. Coleman explained why he did not change the footprint.

**Mr. Howington** said he agrees that there is fire proof glass, but it is very expensive. But, the Board needs to be careful as they have had a more contemporary design petition on the eastside that had a blank wall because of the same reason and had another petition that had no windows because of the fire code.

**Mr. Engle** stated he believes the Board asked that a window be put on the first floor.

**Ms. Harris** explained if it was a fire rated window, it was not cleared by the Board. However, when staff got to the instruction documents, they approved it based on the code.

**Mr. Engle** said the option does exist that maybe there could be fire proof windows, but maybe not six windows. Maybe they could be put only on the front section.

**Mr. Howington** said this is difficult and is why it was removed. But, maybe in the motion, it could be said that this be restudied.

**Mr. Engle** said this is a very large blank wall. There are other options. The Board could ask for a green wall and have trellises. There are ways to break up this blank wall and he does not believe that it has been adequately investigated. You cannot put trees on a parking lot and, therefore, there will not be anything to break this up or soften it.

**Ms. McClain** asked if shutters could be put on the false windows to break this up.

**Mr. Engle** said their usual solution has been to have recesses and put closed shutters. He believes the recesses on the front should be recessed back about two feet so that they are not directly on the corner and put up false shutters.

**Mr. Engle** asked what is the width of the openings. The plan shows two feet at the corner of the house and is in alignment with the door. What does this mean?

**Ms. McClain** stated that it would be helpful if the petitioner answered this question.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Coleman to clarify this concern.

**Mr. Coleman** clarified that all the window openings and the door openings are 3 feet wide. The first floor openings are 3' x 7' windows and the upper floors are 3' x 6'. The front door is 3'x 8'. He explained that an option for the front door is to leave the head 10' and make it a 7' tall door and make a thicker transom.

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of 3 attached, 2-story townhouses on the vacant properties located at 703, 705, and 707 Tattnell Street with the following condition to be submitted to the Board for review with Part II, Design Details:

1. Restudy the height of the front doors.
2. Resolve the north and south facades in an alternate manner (i.e. false shutters, regular rhythm, green screen).

- PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell

- Aye

Reed Engle

- Aye

Justin Gunther

- Aye

Nicholas Henry

- Aye

Keith Howington

- Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq.

- Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

- Aye

Marjorie W Reed

- Aye

Tess Scheer

- Aye

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 26, 32, and 36 East Bay Street 14-002319-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Revised Submittal Packet - 26, 32, and 36 East Bay Street 14-002319-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Historic Photograph.pdf](#)

**Mr. Brian Felder** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to alter the balcony, windows and doors on the River Street façade of 26-36 East Bay Street as part of



a larger interior rehabilitation. On the third floor, the unoriginal fixed window will be replaced with double doors to match existing double doors on the façade. On the fourth floor, to the east, a new set of double doors with transom will be installed in a boarded opening and a balcony added. On the fourth floor, to the west, the existing windows will be replaced with a new set of double doors with transom and a balcony added. On the fifth floor, an unoriginal fixed storefront system will be replaced with double doors and a transom and a balcony added.

**Ms. Harris** said on May 13, 1981, the board approved alterations to the existing windows and doors, resulting in a large plexiglas window on the second story and the existing exhaust door. On June 12, 1981, the Board did not render a decision on the proposed alterations to the door at 21 East River Street and, therefore, the door was approved because the Board did not vote in favor of denial. Ms. Harris stated that in 2004, the structure suffered an internal fire which damaged a number of the exterior openings. It appears that several modern balconies were added as part of the post-fire rehabilitation, but staff was unable to locate COAs for that project. On November 9, 2011, the Board approved alterations including removing an existing exhaust duct, adding awnings, replacing doors, and balconies to the second floor. Ms. Harris stated that the project was only partially completed however, and the balconies were not installed, nor was the replacement door on the third floor.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends a continuance in order for the petitioner to address the following concerns:

1. The historic balcony brackets be retained;
2. The balcony railing be redesigned to be more compatible with the historic railing both in size, massing and pattern;
3. The historic windows on the fourth floor be retained;
4. Replacement door on the fourth floor consider replicating the historic window pattern that was here historically; and
5. The replacement door on the fifth floor be replaced with a an arch transom light pattern similar to the historic light patterns.

**Mr. Gunter** asked Ms. Harris to clarify the historic and the non-historic balconies.

**Ms. Harris** explained that based on her research, she could not find an approval for the non-historic balconies. Based on what she found, it appears that they were installed after the fire in 2004. In 2011, the Board approved another balcony design that was similar to the adjacent structure, but they were never installed.

**Dr. Henry** said he is enthusiastically in favor of the staff's recommendations.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked Ms. Harris if she was saying because she could not find evidence of the balconies being approved in the past that duplicating them today is not appropriate.

**Ms. Harris** explained that the existing balconies that were there whether or not they were approved are not historic and do not have historic significance. They know what the historic balconies look like because there is ample evidence. Therefore, staff feels that they should be looking to the historic balconies for guidance rather than new balconies regardless of the approval status. Ms. Harris said although she could not find the approval for the balconies does not mean that they were not approved, but that she was not able to

locate an approval.

### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Felder** said he is the architect for the project. He explained that he talked with Mr. Neil Dawson, the architect, for Vic's expansion. Mr. Felder stated that Vic's moved into two bays here and they are expanding on the third, fourth and fifth floors one more bay over which will be two windows. Mr. Neil Dawson was the original architect. He remembers applying for and getting the permits in 2004 after the fire when Vic's moved into these bays. At that time five balconies were put in of the more modern design. The balconies are very important; they realize it is an option to do nothing, but they are important to the users in the space. It is nice to walk out on the balconies and be able to look over and see the river.

**Mr. Felder** said they are fully aware that there is no need for conjecture, the parts are there of the existing historic balconies. There are pieces where the old balconies were; they know how they were built and how they look. They are aware that they cannot replicate the existing iron railings; they are too fragile. After he received the detailed staff report, he has been looking at a lot of the more contemporary commercial balconies. They realize they are doing damage to the historic existing fabric by taking these out, but they believe this is the best way to provide balconies to the business and to the user.

**Mr. Felder** said as the Board can see, over the years this has been altered for the various owners. The buildings are cut up horizontally. He said, pointing to an area, that Vic's only owns that piece. The 2011 approval was for a different owner, a different restaurant. There will continue to be a multitude of designs. The openings that they picked from the pallet is the existing window that they are replacing the Plexiglas that looks into the kitchen. These were slightly older in-fills for balconies. They will be willing to replicate the window to solve the problem. He said to answer the staff's question, the window that was here when Vic's purchased the building, they put the window back up. Therefore, they do have somewhat an historic window in the opening, which is what the Board sees in the photograph.

**Ms. Caldwell** asked if there is a way to incorporate the existing brackets in the new balcony for historic sake.

**Mr. Felder** answered yes, they could be there for decoration. But, they should not take them off; if they do so and apply them to the new balconies, then they will be adding a false sense of history. He does not want to, but they will be willing to replicate the old iron work. But, then they will end up with a third balcony solution on the façade; they were trying to harmonize a little bit with what is going on. The owner feels that it is important to have the balconies. He is willing to bend on shape. They also thought about moving the balconies over one bay so they could just leave this in place as ruins, but then they end up cutting into historic fabric elsewhere where there were no balconies. They think the best solution is to replicate the newer ones in these openings, even though it means modification and the loss of six brackets and two windows.

**Mr. Felder** said they are in agreement with a continuance and working through a solution.

**Mr. Howington** asked if there would be an opportunity to compromise and make the new balconies smaller in scale like the older balconies.

**Mr. Felder** answered yes. They can pull the balconies in a little.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked if there is a way to leave the existing bracket and build on top of it.

**Mr. Felder** answered there might be a way to do so. He explained that the balconies are strapped in about eight to ten feet into the building and then bolted. The balconies essentially act as a structural element, then it is tied back about eight feet into the existing structure. It is possible that they could cut the hole to get the plates in and retain the old pieces of iron underneath and leave them as a ruin. Mr. Felder said he would rather do this than attach them as decoration to the steel.

**Ms. Caldwell** said this is what she was saying. By its nature, this would control the population and weight. A larger balcony would invite more people.

**Mr. Felder** said in reference to the door openings, they were trying to provide some consistency and replicate all, with the exception of one that has a flat top. They are willing to do the arch top and divide it. They are trying to work with what belongs to Vic's and be consistent with what was done in 2004.

**Mr. Engle** said just because Vic's owns parts of three historic buildings does not mean that everything is supposed to match. It did not match in the beginning. Instead of trying to make it all branded Vic's, let the building speak for itself. He does not have a problem with having three different types of windows, three different types of doors, and three different types of balconies. It seems a little strange to him to be taking an example that is seven years old and saying because they do not want variety, that they are going to pick a modern non-historic balcony to be their prototype.

**Mr. Engle** stated that he finds it strange that the Board is being asked to ignore the Secretary of Interior's Standards when they are obligated by law to follow the standards. He believes the petitioners need to work towards being in compliance with the standards.

**Mr. Felder** said they are in compliance with the different features; they cannot recreate the iron balconies because they will not hold ten people.

**Mr. Engle** said different structural brackets, but they can put the same kind of balcony.

**Mr. Felder** asked would they then be creating a false sense of history by trying to halfway replicate. As he has said, they are willing to change the iron designs to do so, but what is the right answer?

**Mr. Howington** said Mr. Felder has agreed to scale the balconies down.

**Mr. Felder** said they will also restudy the handrails to match more closely what is there. He said he was speaking as a designer; for 20 years this building has been modified and each time it has been modified differently.

**Mr. Gunther** asked what is going on in the interior that is demanding replacing the original

historic sash with doors and a balcony on the fourth floor.

**Mr. Felder** said it is expanded dining space and the fifth floor is expanded banquet space. Therefore, they need doors to get the people out onto the balconies.

**Mr. Gunther** said he believes the petitioner would like to have doors, but they do not necessarily need doors.

**Mr. Felder** said they need the windows; he does not believe that they could navigate under the old double hung windows. The bottom sash would come up and then the person would come under there. He does not believe this would be appropriate according to the commercial codes.

**Ms. Caldwell** asked if the balconies were scaled back to the original size how many people would be able to be on there at a time?

**Mr. Felder** said he believes three to four people would be able to be on the balcony. The old brackets are there and they can scale back to that point which is approximately halfway from where they were.

**Ms. Caldwell** said if the brackets were the original size, it probably would not hold more than a couple of people. Would this be worth doing so?

**Mr. Felder** answered yes, he believes so. The owner feels very strongly about having them.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said she believes the real struggle is obviously they have the existing evidence of what the historic balconies look like, but the structural requirements and code are different today. She believes, however, that there is a little bit of a fine line in trying to replicate and recreate some aspect when you really cannot recreate the whole configuration. Ms. Meunier said she believes that making the scale and making smaller balconies is important. This would be something to pick up on from the older balconies. She is questioning replicating the railing pattern because it will be on a different new balcony. Ms. Meunier said she is also wondering whether the height could be the same and whether it would meet the code as some of the relationships will be changed with trying to take some parts of the old and put them on the new. The HSF is definitely in favor of keeping the historic brackets in place, if possible.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said he believes it is a wonderful experience to sit on a balcony, have a glass of wine and cheese, but the Board is here to protect the historic character, not to promote dining experiences. When you look at River Street today, you cannot tell what is real and what is not real. What the Board is doing here today is just one more example. They are now taking a seven year old non-historic example and making it the prototype for an alleged reconstruction of something that was there; this is not the way it is done. This violates the

Secretary of Interior's Standards that they are supposed to follow. If this does not fit within the standards, then they are not supposed to have them.

**Mr. Engle** said as being proposed, he cannot accept it. He believes it needs to go back to the petitioner for restudy.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Engle if he thinks it is acceptable to make the balconies smaller in scale to replicate the historic pattern of those, but not replicate the railings. He said he agrees with the HSF not to replicate the railing.

**Dr. Henry** said he realizes that the codes do not allow replicating a design element as they want to show the history, but the old ones are quite handsome. As far as he is concerned, the closer the petitioner comes to this, the better.

**Mr. Howington** explained that the Secretary of Interior's Standards do not want replication exactly unless you are restoring something. However, they can be built in the same scale and size in modern materials.

**Mr. Merriman** asked if it is true that when something exists but has deteriorated beyond repair, it can be replicated exactly.

**Mr. Howington** said it could be, but he believes that structurally much more steel would be needed to hold up then what were used in order to meet the current code.

**Mr. Merriman** said he believes the petitioner was saying that building the balcony structurally sound and then adding reconstruction brackets to match the others, although they do not actually support the balcony, but they appear as they support it, is more a violation of the standards.

**Mr. Howington** said he would not like the old brackets, but create a new design; however, it depends on what the design is like. There is an argument for and against replicating something similar or using the old and restoring it instead of joining the two together.

**Mr. Merriman** asked if they were looking at building the new balcony to match the seven year old balcony to be more like putting an addition distinctively different from the historic balcony so that when you look at it you realize it is different.

**Mr. Howington** said it will be the same scale of the older balconies, but newer materials.

**Ms. McClain** said rather than get into a lengthy discussion about design details, she agrees with Mr. Engle. At the very least, the petitioner should have met the standards. She, too, believes this needs to be restudied.

**Mr. Gunther** said the standards say that if material is deteriorated sufficiently to the historic evidence does exist, then a feature should be restored, recreated or a new design and integrated into the existing fabric. Therefore, there is sufficient evidence; original fabric does survive; the Secretary of the Interior's Standards would say restore that feature.

**Mr. Felder** again asked for a continuance and wanted to know from the Board if they want to add any additional concerns to the staff's recommendation.

**Mr. Engle** said he believes number two of the staff's recommendation should be stricken which states that "the balcony railing be redesigned to be more compatible with the historic railing both in size, massing and pattern." He said the Board wants the balcony reduced to the historic dimension as much as possible, not just redesign it.

**Mr. Felder** said he wanted to make two clarifications to be sure that they are clear as they may be at odds later. They have got to have steel to support the balcony to meet the current code. If they are going to have a balcony, they must provide access to it regardless of where it is and regardless of where the window is located. He said they made a design decision to promote this homogeny. It is fine if this is not the case. They will come back with a different balcony reduced in scale and scope. It will have steel, but he is going to stick with the departure so that it is noticeably different from what was here originally. But, he would like to retain the existing historic pieces under it as a relic; however, the windows must go so they can get access wherever they choose to put them. Even if they are moved over and leave the ruin, the windows have to go. He said he can create a door that will look like the window.

**Mr. Howington** asked if the windows could be put some place else; at least they would be saving the windows.

**Mr. Engle** said just because there is a balcony does not mean that people must have access to it. It is only if there is a functional opening there.

**Mr. Felder** said they want a functional opening there.

**Mr. Merriman** asked Mr. Felder if he was saying that he wants to know now if the Board is against the windows.

**Mr. Felder** said they have the Secretary of Interior's Standards and they have the Building Code. They have to support for 100 hundred pound square foot life loads and all those people. They have to provide access to anything to the public in accordance with the ADA and the Georgia Accessibility Code. Therefore, if they put the balcony there and it can hold humans, then they must have access to it. This means that some historic fabric and additional historic fabric is going to be lost to provide the access if they put balconies in any of these openings. If they move them over to the bay on the east, they will be cutting more into the brick and then they risk that historic fabric. If they put them where they are now, they will lose two historic windows.

**Board Action:**

Continue the petition in order 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;

- PASS

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.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Site Photographs.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Letter from Bee Hive Foundation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Letter from Beth Reiter.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a two-story addition on the north (side) façade of the building located at 22 Habersham Street. On September 12, 2012, the board approved an extension to the 1980s addition. The project never commenced. The Historic Savannah Foundation holds an easement on this property.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends continuing the petition in order for the petitioner to redesign and relocate the addition as follows:

1. Do not alter spatial relationships that characterize the property.
2. Revise the location of the addition so that it is not visible from Warren Square.
3. Redesign the second floor to appear as a true addition and not an enclosed porch.
4. Revise the selected window muntin to be a simulated putty-glazed profile.
5. Add horizontal rails to the shutters that match the location of window meeting

rails.

**Ms. Michalak** informed the Board that staff received two letters in opposition to the project. The letters were attached to their electronic submittal package.

**Mr. Gunther** asked Ms. Michalak to clarify what historic fabric from the 1850s addition would be lost with the new addition.

**Ms. Michalak** pointed out the existing first floor plan and said this window will be changed to a door opening. The other two windows will remain. She said, pointing to two additional windows, that they will change to a case opening and a linen closet.

**Dr. Henry** said he has gone through the Secretary of Interior's Standards that are in the staff's report and so far seven of the standards are not met. He believes this is a high percentage.

**Mr. Engle** asked Ms. Michalak if she felt that this is subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes. It is the siting and design that gives them the most trouble with the Secretary of Interior's Standards, it is not necessarily mass and height.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Lynch** said they do not have any opposition to revising the details to meet the staff's comments. He believes the bigger concern for them is the location of the addition. When they started this project they were concerned as it is a Mills house and they are respectful of the home. Any addition would be subservient in nature to the main house. They contacted the Historic Savannah Foundation as they were aware that they had an easement on the property. They did not agree to a concept, but talked about different strategies. Before they met they looked at a couple of different options. Initially, they looked at the proposed location. Secondly, they looked at basically taking off the existing 1980s addition and the third option was looking at something closer to the submission that was approved a couple of years ago. However, they struck this option as it would do too much damage to the existing construction. In looking at their two options, they believe that under the NPS standards that looking at the side of the house would be the least visible. Therefore, they felt it would be less visible from Warren Square. Mr. Lynch said they set it back 20 feet from the façade and tried to maintain as much of the original profile of the brick and roof line as they possibly could. Mr. Lynch explained that they felt if they were going to put this project on the southeast side that the visibility from Warren Square was going to be almost more given the size of the right-of-way from St. Julian Street versus Bryan Street where they have an enclosed wall and a tight right-of-way of the street. This is the reason why the addition was placed where it is.

**Mr. Lynch** said regarding the concerns about the porch, they felt by bringing this to the second floor somewhat tied the project together a little better and gave it a sense of transparency and more reversibility than if they were to have just a side addition that tied in directly with the 1980s addition or even the original house. They tried to lower it as much as they could and give it a flat roof and lower the ceiling height as much as possible to try to maintain this profile all around. Mr. Lynch entertained questions from the Board.



**Mr. Engle** said the design that was approved two years ago did not have the opposition as the one before the Board today. He asked Mr. Lynch why he did not restudy that design.

**Mr. Lynch** said that the design was a one-story addition to only the first floor which was essentially an extension of the 1980s addition over to the south side of the roof façade. The program is driven by some needs that they have which is to increase the space for their two children. Functionally, just putting the addition on this side did not really work for their clients. As they felt it would be more visible, the better option was to try to leave it on this side of the house where the square footage is really needed. They looked at some options where they would not have any addition and they would have to internalize some of these program components, they felt the defining character of the house is the center hall and leaving the rooms intact as they historically were. This is somewhat a mix of bathrooms and closets. They believed that leaving the footprint intact made more sense and not to destroy that. The fact that the character defining component of this house has been that it has been added onto over the years.

**Ms. Scheer** asked Mr. Lynch if he considered just going up one story on the existing addition.

**Mr. Lynch** said they looked at doing this, but the biggest problem they have is that they would have to do some major alterations to the first floor. They did not want to rip the roof off of the existing addition. Basically all three of the options that they looked at initially would create the same issues in terms that they would still have to take out a little of the historic material; although they try to minimize that in their submission and make it reversible as possible. They talked about whether they could reuse the windows and this is something that the owners will possibly be interested in doing. But, from a functional standpoint, this is probably the least viable option.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Gary Arthur of the Beehive Foundation** read a written statement that they are actively concerned and seriously alarmed that what is authentic about the Historic District's Hey Day and the 19th Century architecture is being hidden by such enlargements as the one now being proposed by the current owners. The Beehive feels that it would be a shame to cover up history by hiding the northern façade of the brick house. He said he had a written statement from Ms. Beth Reiter about the significance of this particular house. Mr. Arthur said Ms. Reiter wrote that "writing in opposition to the proposed addition that this significant structure is one of only five remaining 18th Century structures in Warren Ward. It stands on its own original trust lot with three elevations visible from a public right-of-way. Over the two centuries of its existence, the two additions of 22 Habersham Street have maintained the integrity of the north elevation and its relationship to the wall garden. The 19th Century brick addition respects the lines of the original wooden house from 1790. The small modern shed addition at the rear continues this telescope growth of the house. Like the 1830s brick addition does not obscure the prominent street facades. Building on trust lots is tricky and to place a one two-story side addition obscures the clear lines of the historic structure and creates a false sense historical reference as well. We need to protect the integrity of what is left of our 18th Century buildings."

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** confirmed that they have an easement on this property and as the petitioner stated, they met with both he and the owner on site to discuss the project in the early stages. In accordance with the terms of their easement, they are still in the process of evaluating the proposal. There are many things to consider and this is a particularly significant building as evidenced by what the Beehive Foundation and the letters that the Board has received. Therefore, this requires very careful action and they are trying to gather input from multiple knowledgeable sources to come to the best solution. One of the best solutions will come from the Review Board. As they have said many times, HSF believes this Board is a valuable process and they value their input. Consequently, they are interested in hearing the Board's thoughts and discussions on this petition.

**Ms. Meunier** said as she previously stated, this is a particularly significant building in this area where they have some of the oldest historic architecture and is something that they need to take into consideration and be very delicate with how they treat it. In addition to it being one of the only 18th Century freestanding townhouses in the district, it was also Mills Lane project and this simply speaks to the fact that he saw the need to save and restore this building because of its significance. Ms. Meunier said, therefore, they are trying to balance all of this along with the productivity and the continued use of this building.

**Ms. Meunier** said the HSF agrees with many of the staff's recommendations. They would not approve anything that did not meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards. They feel that adding the addition to the north elevation may negatively impact the integrity of the façade as well as potentially the primary façade from Habersham Street or from Warren Square.

**Mr. Howington** invited Mr. Lynch to comment on the public comments.

**Mr. Lynch** said the owners are aware that staff has recommended a continuation, but they want to ensure that they will not be going around in circles trying to get this accomplished if in the end no one will be happy with it. Therefore, when they leave the meeting, they want to know if they have a viable project.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said one of the opposition letters that the Board received appears to indicate that the Board should never approve any additions. This Board does not have the authority to tell someone that they cannot build an addition, but they do have the authority to tell the individual that they have to meet the design standards and the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Mr. Engle said this project as presented does not meet many of the standards. He believes the largest one extends beyond the north elevation and is visible from the street and he does not want to hear that there is a big tree; you cannot see it. The big tree could be gone tomorrow and probably will be. Vegetation does not count. If you pretend that a tree is not here, the addition is clearly visible and clearly does not meet the standards. It is visible from the front.

**Mr. Engle** thinks secondarily it is an egregious example of creating a false sense of history. This tries to pretend that it is an historic porch that got enclosed and a second floor porch that got enclosed. He would rather see a modern addition that clearly states we are not historic. This uses historic materials and everything about it is saying this is an original

part of the building and this does not meet the standards and does not meet their own design standards. This project has to go back to the petitioner. He is not designing it, but to him the ideal situation would be to rip down the later addition and start again and do it right this time. What they have now is not acceptable. There are too few of these buildings left. There may be about ten of these buildings left that date to this period. Why do they keep slipping away? It is with a little change here because the client wants it, but this Board has to say that the ordinance is here and the standards are here; and this Board cannot approve of not going by the ordinance and standards.

**Mr. Gunther** said he believes the challenge is there are three primary facades on this building, which makes any addition extremely challenging. He believes that the Secretary of Interior's Standards would argue preservation of this primary façade focusing any change on the eastern or rear façade. He agrees with Mr. Engle that focus should be on the secondary rear façade and preservation of the three primary facades.

**Dr. Henry** said that he cannot support this as is. Roughly, one-third of the Secretary of Interior's Standards are violated.

**Mr. Merriman** said he agrees with what the Board members have said. If there is any room for addition, it is on the rear façade, but he does not believe it will be anything like what the petitioners are hoping to get.

**Ms. McClain** asked if there a consensus among the Board members regarding the staff's recommendations; or is there anything the Board wants to add.

**Ms. Scheer** said it appears to her that the Board's consensus is to add onto the back of the building. This is a trust lot and it is very historic. Three major fires in their history have devastated the old buildings. So few are still standing and the east side of town was spared by these fires, this is one of those icons that still stands and are vital to our history. There are a lot more stories to this building in this area than just building an addition. This has linearly evolved.

**Mr. Gunther** said he was not designing this, but he was thinking about the Owens Thomas house and its second floor where there is a great central hall; two rear bays were added to the back of the house with access to the addition through the center hall. A window was changed to the back of the house to gain access to the rear and maintaining the importance of the central hall plan using this as an access point to the rear additions was great.

**Mr. Howington** informed Mr. Lynch that the consensus of the Board is to follow the staff's recommendations for the continuance. He said that Mr. Lynch has heard the Board's discussion and it appears that if an addition is proposed, that possibly the rear would be a better solution. He was saying this in reference to Mr. Lynch's question regarding how the Board feels.

**Mr. Howington** advised Mr. Lynch that the Board cannot ask for a continuance, but that he could. If he does not want to ask for a continuance, the Board will vote one way or the other.

**Mr. Lynch** asked for a continuance.

**Board Action:**

Continue the petition for a two-story addition on the north (side) façade of the building located at 22 Habersham Street in order to redesign and relocate the addition as follows:

1. Do not alter spatial relationships that characterize the property.
2. Revise the location of the addition so that it is not visible from Warren Square. - PASS
3. Redesign the second floor to appear as a true addition and not an enclosed porch.
4. Revise the selected window muntin to be a simulated putty-glazed profile.
5. Add horizontal rails to the shutters that match the location of the window meeting rails.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye

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

Attachment: [Staff report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Mercer Ward.pdf](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Submittal - Price Gwinnett - 5-22-14 revised.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petition is requesting approval of Part I: Height and Mass for three duplexes on the vacant lot located at the northeast corner of Price and Gwinnett Streets. Two of the duplexes will face Price Street and one will face Gwinnett Street. All duplexes will be two stories tall and have modest front stoops. The two duplexes along Price Street will have a pyramidal roof while the Gwinnett Street

duplex will have a side gable roof.

**Ms. Harris** said staff recommends approval of the petition for Part I Height and Mass of three duplexes at the northeast corner of Price and Gwinnett Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II Design Details because the proposal is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards:

1. Reduce the height of the the Gwinnett Street duplexes to be more compatible by reducing the roof pitch or changing to a hipped roof;
2. Add additional voids to the south façade of the south duplex on Price Street which faces Gwinnett Street to better address Gwinnett Street.
3. Restudy the west façade of Gwinnett Street duplex as this façade will be highly visible from Gwinnett Street, given that it is approximately 12 feet from the duplex to the west.
4. On the south façade of the Price Street duplex along Habersham Street increase the vertical to horizontal ratio to 5:3 to meet the standard; and
5. On the east façade of Gwinnett Street duplex, place the electrical meter on the north side of the fence to screen from view.

**Dr. Henry** said the proposed lot coverage is 46%. How is this calculated?

**Ms. Harris** answered that she believes it was calculated using all of the buildings as one parcel. Unless it was subdivided into separate parcels, you would have to take in account the whole parcel.

**Mr. Engle** said the staff is recommending fenestration on the west elevation, but it is on the property line.

**Ms. Harris** explained that staff is recommending additional fenestration on the façade that faces Gwinnett Street, even though it is on the property line, it is still allowed to have windows because there is a street in front of it. She said she was also recommending additional fenestration on this façade which is not on the property line, but is still one parcel.

**Ms. Harris** believes the longer term plan would be potentially to subdivide this property. But as the Board can see the property is still setback from the property line. However, the petitioner can better explain this.

**Mr. Engle** explained that this is an easement. If he is reading it correctly, the property line is right at the edge of the building.

**Ms. Harris** stated that the petitioner can better answer Mr. Engle's question.

**Mr. Howington** asked Ms. Harris to clarify the 5:3 ratio of the window that is not met.

**Ms. Harris** explained that this window [pointing to a window on a drawing] does not meet the 5:3 ratio.

**Mr. Gunther** asked Ms. Harris to explain her interpretation of the visual compatibility of the building in terms of visual compatibility of directional expression in its relation to Gwinnett Street and the historical development patterns and how this conforms or does not conform.

**Ms. Harris** stated that if they go back to the Sanborn Maps, she believes that they will find a variety of building orientations on this site. With the older Sanborn Maps, 1898 and 1916, she believes the ward would be considered more traditional where it would face the east/west with smaller cottage houses or carriage houses at the rear. When you get into the ward a little later, it is altered with the gas station and along Price Street and other areas, buildings that face Price Street rather than Gwinnett Street.

**Mr. Gunther** asked Ms. Harris does she believe that as proposed, the building meets the visual compatibility?

**Ms. Harris** answered she believes it does. If it was reoriented to face Gwinnett Street, it would also be acceptable.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Lynch** stated that he does not have any exceptions to the staff recommendations, but would clarify the item that Mr. Engle referenced. He explained that they have 12 feet from the face of the building to face of building. The property line is actually at the face of the building and there is a three foot utility and maintenance easement, but they have a firewall condition here. Therefore, the building is setback about five or six feet from the property line. Consequently, it will be somewhat obscured by the new building on the corner of Price and Gwinnett Streets. They will have a six foot masonry wall that will match the finish of the building on the corner. The visibility of this façade will be minimal. Mr. Lynch said he believes that the owner will be agreeable to adding some false shutters or something on the upper floors if necessary. Some of these same conditions are on adjacent properties.

**Mr. Lynch** pointed out the carriage house and the main house on the adjacent property facing Gwinnett Street. They will address the issue about the 5:3 window. He believes it is a little shorter than the typical window height because a kitchen is here and a counter is underneath, but they will address this in the floor plan. He entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Gunther** said in follow-up to his previous question to staff, he asked Mr. Lynch about the building relationships on the corner to Gwinnett Street and does he feel that the building interacts with the corner.

**Mr. Lynch** said they talked about this in the design phase with the owner. After they looked at the neighborhood, the predominant development is mostly oriented to Price Street. Therefore, this is why they chose this. However, when they looked at the Sanborn Maps, it was not clear one way or the other. So, they looked more to the blocks north of Gwinnett Street and came to this determination.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they agree with all of staff's recommendations, particularly regarding adding windows to the side facades of the buildings as well as reducing the height of the Gwinnett Street duplex by reducing the pitch. Additionally, the HSF suggests reducing the depth of the overhanging eave on the Gwinnett Street duplex and use more Victorian style brackets as opposed to the current Craftsman style treatment that it appears to have. They believe that in this area, there is more Victorian inspired detailing. She believes that this speaks to that,

but Victorian in style would be more appropriate.

**Ms. Meunier** said the HSF would not be opposed to reorienting the corner building to Gwinnett Street. She believes this would have been the more traditional pattern of development facing the east/west streets, but obviously as it has been talked about, there is sort of a precedent for both in this case. She said that the petitioner mentioned the masonry finish on the wall matching the Price Street buildings; however, the HSF questions what this material will be. Based on the form of those buildings, the immediate context that the simpler worker house-style of building that is seen in this area would be traditionally clapboard siding. Therefore, for Part II, this is a question for the petitioner.

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

**Mr. Lynch** said they have looked at a couple of options for the masonry on Gwinnett Street. He does not know if the owner is against clapboard, but was trying to mix the finishes. There is a precedent for masonry, stucco or clapboard all the way down Price. Mr. Lynch said some of the buildings that they were taking cues from were further down Price Street.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Lynch if their masonry would be brick or stucco.

**Mr. Lynch** answered that initially they wanted to make a brick façade, but the problem is the width of the lot does not allow them the additional 16 inches they would need to brick all four sides of the building. Therefore, they decided on stucco, but they will be glad to work with staff on this.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Lynch if the model is incorrect. He said either the building is in the wrong location or the site plan is incorrect.

**Mr. Lynch** said the building is setback about five feet from the property line.

**Mr. Engle** said once the building is pushed back, it raises the question of the line of continuity. The houses that the building would be adjacent to as they can see are on line, except for the front porches and stoops. This building is projecting out five feet farther than the other buildings. He cannot tell from the photographs or the site plan, except looking at these two houses, this building not only should be setback five feet to meet the site plan, but should be ten feet back to have the line of continuity along with the other houses on this block.

**Mr. Howington** stated that the site plan shows that both buildings are sticking out.

**Mr. Lynch** explained that the half-story cottage adjacent is setback a little further. They will be happy to push it back to be in alignment. He said as you go further down Gwinnett Street, most of the houses come out to the property line. They will look at a precedent for this as well.

**Mr. Gunther** stated that if Mr. Lynch pulls up the Sanborn Map, he will see that there has been some variation in terms of the line of continuity over time.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Gunther** stated that he agrees with the staff and public comments about the roof pitch

of the Gwinnet Street building. He believes it can be reduced to be in better conformance with historic precedent along the street.

**Mr. Merriman** said he agrees with the staff comments. He likes the project.

**Mr. Gunther** said he believes the building on the corner has more responsibility to Gwinnett Street than to Price Street even though historically there is some variation over time. Mr. Gunther stated that he believes this façade should be activated somehow to respond a little better to the corner and to Gwinnett Street. If you are traveling south bound by car, you would be focusing on the west side façade, but if you are a pedestrian at that corner, there is little relationship of that building to this intersection.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes that at this corner there is precedent for mostly facing Price Street, but he believes that historically, he echoes Mr. Gunther's sentiment as most of the houses on Gwinnett Street would face Gwinnett. But, he thinks the pattern has changed on Price Street. He believes that Gwinnett Street is the prominent street, but this is also acceptable as is.

**Mr. Engle** asked if it was said that number 3 of the staff's recommendation could not be done as windows could not be put there as it is on the property line.

**Mr. Howington** confirmed that this was said. But he wanted to comment on this. He knows this is in the ordinance, but they have examples all over the Historic District that on the property line there are facades with no windows. Mr. Howington said they definitely have an issue with the fire code regarding windows on the property line. This is one that this Board has to look at. There are some facades that are highly visible that call for false shutters. As he has stated, there are examples of facades on property lines on the side that have no windows. This would be a case-by-case basis, but there is an argument for not having windows.

**Mr. Engle** said this also depends on the materials. He said the Board might want to suggest that some type of detailing be looked into to break up the mass.

**Mr. Howington** said this is a secondary façade. He believes that the petitioner said clapboard siding might be an option as well after further discussing this with the owner.

**Ms. McClain** said that Mr. Engle discussed the line of continuity along Gwinnett Street. Would this be a part of their motion?

**Mr. Howington** stated that Ms. McClain was questioning if the Board would add to the motion Mr. Engle's comments about the line of continuity along Gwinnett Street. He explained that the petitioner said he would look at this and possibly push it back. But, they also discussed that this might exacerbate the issue of that building being further back and this building being up front. Mr. Gunther showed examples that historically those facades were setback.

**Ms. McClain** said the Board could ask the petitioner to restudy this.

**Mr. Howington** said this could be restudied, but they have a historic pattern where there is not a straight line of continuity.

**Dr. Henry** said he does not feel strongly about the line of continuity. He is in agreement with the staff recommendations.



**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for Part 1 Height and Mass of the three duplexes at the northeast corner of Price and Gwinnett Streets with the following conditions to be submitted with Part 2 Design Details because the proposal is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards:

1. Reduce the height of the Gwinnett Street duplexes to be more compatible by reducing the roof pitch or changing to a hipped roof;
2. Add additional voids to the south façade of the south duplex on Price Street which faces Gwinnett Street. - PASS
3. Restudy the west façade of the Gwinnett Street duplex as this façade will be highly visible from Gwinnett Street, given that it is approximately 12 feet from the duplex to the west.
4. On the south façade of the Price Street duplex along Habersham Street increase the vertical to horizontal window ratio to 5:3 to meet the standard; and
5. On the east façade of the Gwinnett Street duplex, place the electrical meter on the south side of the fence to screen from view.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: Reed Engle  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Abstain  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye  
Marjorie W Reed - Aye  
Tess Scheer - Aye

19. [Petition of Bub-Ba-Q | 14-002354-COA | 516 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | After-the-Fact Tent Facade](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Mr. William Latimer** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for a wooden tent façade located on the vacant lot (former Minis Street) adjacent (south) to his restaurant, "Bub-Ba-Q". The wood tent façade is 20 feet wide and 12 feet high. It has two openings, which are 94 inches by 8.5 feet wide each. It is setback approximately 15-20 feet from the facades of the adjacent building and the public sidewalk. The north side is setback 10 feet-10 inches from the adjacent building and the south is setback 9 feet-2 inches from the adjacent building. The tent façade is constructed from horizontal wood slats which do not appear to have any kind of finish on them.

**Ms. Michalak** said the tent façade was installed, in front of the existing tent, without a COA in December 2013. The tent was installed by the previous business owner (Blowin Smoke) in approximately 2009. Tents are only permitted as a temporary use per the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance. In section 8-3002, a temporary use is described as: "*Use, Temporary. A use which is primarily an outdoor activity, permitted for a specified period of time. An accessory outdoor use to a permitted principal use is not defined as a temporary use.*"

She said, therefore, the tent is not permitted. Since this tent has been installed for 5 years, it is reviewed as a permanent commercial building.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends denial of the after-the-fact petition for a wood tent façade located on the vacant lot (former Minis Street) adjacent (south) to the restaurant "Bub-Ba-Q" because it is not visually compatible and does not meet the design standards for a commercial building.

**Mr. Howington** said he had a theoretical question as the tent has been there for a long time and it appears to be a part of the business. He asked what happens if the petitioner takes the tent down for a month and then put it back up. Would it be temporary again?

**Ms. Michalak** explained that the City of Savannah handles permitting outside of Historic Board of Review. She said she does not know what are the City's stipulations in applying for a temporary tent.

**Mr. Merriman** asked Ms. Michalak if she reported that it had to be for a specified amount of time, which means that if you were going to put up a tent, you would have to state how long you would have it up.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that the person would get a permit for the temporary use for the tent and the permit would show how long you may have the tent up.

**Mr. Merriman** stated that Blowin Smoke had the tent up before Bub-Ba-Q moved there.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes and they did not get a permit.

**Mr. Merriman** said Blowin Smoke got their license with the City knowing that they had

the tent.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that Blowin Smoke put the tent up after they got their license.

**Mr. Howington** stated that the tent was put after Blowin Smoke got their permit, but basically there was no red flag until the wood tent was installed.

**Ms. Michalak** said back then she had to get some backup information on this. She said that her understanding is that they made an attempt to address the matter, but nothing happened. Ms. Michalak said, however, the second part to this which she feels was more pertinent is that the Use says "*an accessory outdoor use to a permanent principle use is not defined as a temporary use.*" Ms. Michalak said, therefore, she finds this interesting as the tent is obviously supplemental to Bub-Ba-Q use but not temporary. Everywhere else, umbrella tables and these sort of things are used. She realizes this is difficult as Mr. Latimer did not put the tent up.

**Mr. Merriman** said he was trying to figure this out. Did the people start the business without being able to use the tent that was being allowed by the City all this time, but now the City is saying that it can not be used.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that the City has not told them anything yet. This is coming from the MPC; she does not know what would happen going down the line. For example, if this was approved by the Board, the petitioner would have to apply for a permit.

**Mr. Engle** said everybody thought it was temporary when it was just a tent. But, now giant steps have been made.

**Mr. Merriman** said if the façade was not put on, they probably would have been okay.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Lattimer** said they actually are the third business to be in this location with the tent in place. Another restaurant opened up last year in late March. He believes the tent was in place at that time and the business closed in August. When the opportunity came up for him to come to Savannah and look at the location, they felt the outside environment created a nostalgic atmosphere. They have other restaurants in the Atlanta market.

**Mr. Lattimer** said pictures of the tent was there with blue water barrels sticking out front. It was an eyesore. They wanted to clean up the environment and make it more appealing and aesthetically pleasing. He said he contacted the City about putting the structure up and he kept getting conflicting statements. On one occasion, he was told that he was not in the Historic District, but he knew this was inaccurate. The one time that they did get an answer was when they were seeking to get a building permit. The City asked if they were structurally doing any alterations, plumbing, or electric and they answered no. He did not want to say that they were given information falsely, but they were told that they were probably okay to move forward. This is what they did. He stated that about two weeks after the work was completed, they got a stop work order notice from the City. They went to meetings with the City and they really did not have a problem with it and told them to go ahead and submit their application to the Historic Review Board.

**Mr. Lattimer** said they feel the outdoor environment is a great asset to their business. They recent opened their business here and have gone through quite a few challenges. He said that they want to add to the aspect of this end of MLK with redevelopment and they are looking forward to any recommendations the Board may have.

**Ms. Caldwell** stated that she was aware that Mr. Lattimer inherited the tent. She asked him if the lane was a part of his property.

**Mr. Lattimer** explained that their lease covers the courtyard. The tent was on the courtyard which he understands was formerly Minis Street. Dr. Evans owns the property and he believes that he bought Minis Street from the City and put in bricks.

**Ms. Caldwell** said she appreciates the idea of putting up a façade to cover the eyesore, but what is there seems like a bandaid. She was thinking about how the Green Meldrim mansion and the church built a walkway. Maybe build a solid structure that would complement.

**Mr. Lattimer** said when they spoke with the City, one of their issues was could it be something that could it be something that could be taken down with windstorms or hurricanes, etc. It was explained to them that it could not be necessarily a permanent structure on the front side of the tent. Any other words, they were asked that if something happened, could they readily take the tent down to avoid any injury or hazard in the area. He explained that they had a structural engineer come out and do a report on the place. Then everything that they had was approved with the exception that he recommended different hinges because of the way the façade is attached to the poles on the tent.

**Ms. Caldwell** told Mr. Lattimer that she was saying replacing the tent all together with a more solid structure.

**Mr. Lattimer** said from a financial aspect, it would not be feasible for them to do that. They do use it for dining and live entertainment, but with the dining room and kitchen they have here already, this was an added feature to the facility.

**Mr. Howington** asked if the façade could come down easily.

**Mr. Lattimer** answered yes; they could have it torn down in 10 to 20 minutes if they needed too.

**Mr. Howington** said he does not know if an easement is on the property. Dr. Evans owns the building, but he does not know that technically whether anything could be built here.

**Ms. Michalak** said that Dr. Evans actually owns this as a piece of property as well.

**Mr. Gunther** asked Mr. Lattimer that when he met with the City were there questions about permitting for the tent structure.

**Mr. Lattimer** answered no. When he spoke with the City something came up about the Historic Review Board. But, he will say that he probably contacted the wrong office at the time. However, he never would have moved forward with what he thought would turn out to

be a problem. He was not trying to disrespect the Review Board or the City. They want to be a part of the Savannah community and move forward.

**Ms. Scheer** asked Mr. Lattimer that if his wood tent is removed, what would he do.

**Mr. Lattimer** answered that if the tent is removed, he believes it would be detrimental to their business.

**Ms. Scheer** asked Mr. Lattimer if this means he will no longer have outdoor seating.

**Mr. Lattimer** answered that there would be no way to have covered seating there and as they have opened, their patrons really enjoy the outdoor area. It is good for their patrons to come there, be able to sit down out of the sun in a shady area and enjoy the outside environment.

**Mr. Gunther** asked Mr. Lattimer if the pigs are removable as well. He said that he likes the pigs.

**Mr. Lattimer** answered yes. He explained that they actually bring the pigs and the grill inside every night.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked if the tent could remain.

**Mr. Howington** said that is the question.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that the tent is not permissible.

**Mr. Lattimer** said at one time he was told it was a temporary structure, but now supposedly it is a permanent structure.

**Ms. Scheer** asked if it is considered a permanent structure because of the façade.

**Mr. Lattimer** answered no.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Merriman** said he believes the Board should deny the after-the-fact of the façade. However, they do not have to do anything about the tent. If the petitioner gets rid of the façade, the best thing is for him to apply for a temporary permit for the tent. He believes if that façade was not built, nobody would have said anything about the tent.

**Mr. Howington** asked the Board if they would consider that since it is moveable and can be broken down in 10 to 20 minutes, it is somewhat like a temporary structure.

**Mr. Merriman** said it is a temporary structure.

**Ms. McClain** stated that it is not a temporary structure, it is a building.

**Mr. Engle** said it does not meet any of the standards. A tent is a tent.

**Mr. Howington** said he would hate for the petitioner to be punished for something he had as a part of his lease with the assumption that there was a tent and now they have opened up the door and now the tent has to come down, which is detrimental.

**Mr. Engle** said he called the City and asked if they were aware of what is happening on MLK. He said that this Board has worked too hard on the wall of continuity and design standards and everything else for MLK for the last ten years to say that this is acceptable. It is not acceptable, but everybody did accept the tent. Now, maybe the tent should not have been allowed originally. Other people in the Historic District are building pergolas and putting in outdoor patios with tables, awnings and umbrellas which take care of the sun issue. This would be given preferential treatment because it is Dr. Evans's site. He believes if the site had been anybody else's it would not have happened. But, it is there and he does not believe that anybody cared anything about the tent until the façade went up. This is wrong.

**Mr. Merriman** said maybe they do not need to include the tent in the motion.

**Ms. Scheer** asked if the façade that is there now could be painted.

**Ms. McClain** said it is not visually compatible, nor is the tent visually compatible.

**Mr. Howington** said the tent reads as a temporary structure.

**Ms. Scheer** said she is still a little confused. The façade is the main issue, but the staff has addressed the tent also. Are they saying that they should not be addressing the tent and only the wood tent façade?

**Mr. Howington** explained that he believes the tent is a concern because it was installed as a temporary structure and now that it has been there so long, it has become a permanent structure, even though, theoretically it is a temporary structure. It is not temporary by permitting standards. He does not believe that the petitioner had any intent to break the rules. He believes the petitioner came in with the assumption that he had every right to do this as the tent seemed to be a part of the business. He sees the tent as a temporary structure even if it has been there for five years. Mr. Howington said personally, he does not have a problem with the tent.

**Ms. McClain** said the part she is missing is staff looked at the tent as being a permanent structure as it has been there for so long. It is altering the historic fabric of that entire area; it is just not visually compatible. If it is their job to consider this, she feels that they would be doing a disservice if they over look this and permit the petitioner to keep it up. There is a reason why staff included the tent in their recommendation. There is a way for the petitioner to come back and present a better structure if this is what he wants. But, today it is this Board's job to do away with the tent. It is horrible. She did not like it when it first went up; it does not fit that area. It is this Board's job to address that.

**Mr. Howington** said by comparison if the petitioner wanted to come back with a table with an umbrella on it, which would be temporary, would not be this Board's purview. He is not sure if this is visually compatible, but this is sort of temporary.

**Ms. McClain** said the petitioner may do so, but what is there now has been there five years and is now considered a permanent structure; is considered after-the-fact and is now before the Board. She believes that they should approve the staff's recommendation.

**Ms. Scheer** asked if the Board is saying that staff treated it as a building.

**Ms. McClain** said everyone that goes here looks at it as a part of the entire business. It is common knowledge that the tent goes along with the business. Therefore, to her, it is a permanent structure.

**Mr. Howington** said he wanted to get clarification from the staff. He asked if they considered the tent as a permanent structure because the City considers it a permanent structure.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that because of the way that section of the Code is written and how long the tent has been in place, staff reviewed it as a permanent structure.

**Mr. Howington** said definitively it is still a temporary structure.

**Dr. Henry** said the fabric has been there five years and, therefore, the City considers the tent to be a permanent structure. Now, since it is looked upon as a permanent structure, the Review Board has an obligation to deal with it.

**Ms. Michalak** said she reviewed this as a commercial building because this is what it is being used for. It has been there for five years.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Michalak what if the tent had not been there five years, would the Board still have jurisdiction?

**Ms. Harris** explained that if it was a temporary structure it would not have come to the Review Board for their review. Therefore, it is the length of time that makes it a part of this Board's purview.

**Mr. Howington** asked staff to explain why an umbrella is not a part of this as he believes it is actually the same argument.

**Ms. Harris** explained that they look at it in terms of fixed or removable structure. A fence, even though it does not have a roof, is still a structure. Any building, trellis structure, awnings all are structures; they have always said that things that are temporary such as playground equipment, planters, umbrellas that are attached to tables are not the purview of this Board. She said she believes if it was a large umbrella that is fastened into the ground and had a foundation to it, then it would become a structure and would be reviewed by the Review Board. For example, the playground equipment for Forsyth Park that was reviewed by the Board last month, the awnings rose to the level of being permanent because they actually fastened into the ground.

**Mr. Howington** said it is a fine line. However, if you build something that was temporary and it remains there five years, then it becomes permanent. But, a tent is arguably not permanent.

**Ms. Scheer** asked if they were talking about a structure that had been built not of fabric, but was built with aluminum or brick, would this Board be saying take it down?

**Mr. Howington** said if it did not meet the visual compatibility factors, they would be saying take it down as it would be a fixed structure.

**Ms. Scheer** asked if this is how the Board is defining this as a permanent structure.

**Mr. Howington** explained that the City would characterize it as a permanent structure because this is a way for someone not to be able to apply for a temporary permit, but keep it up for a number of years. A temporary permit is limited and once you pass that limit, it becomes permanent.

**Mr. Merriman** said the petitioner's application says that he is applying for after-the-fact approval for a wood false front that hides the existing tent beside the building. It does not say anything about his tent, but the façade. The Board needs to stick to the request; it is not altering any historic material and can be easily taken down without any damage to the thing that is there that is historic. The petitioner's issue with the tent is between him and whoever issues those permits with the City for temporary structures.

**Ms. McClain** said this is the problem here; it went up, but it never came down.

**Mr. Engle** said he believes the motion would need to clearly show that the Board is not taking any action on the tent. They would be rejecting the petition to build a wood façade; they are not endorsing or against the existing tent.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes it is fair to say that the Historic Review Board is not endorsing or against the tent.

**Board Action:**

Deny the after-the-fact petition for a wood tent façade located on the vacant lot (former Minis Street) adjacent (south) to his restaurant "Bub-Ba-Q" because it is not visually compatible and does not meet the design standards for a commercial building. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye



Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye

## IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

## X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

20. [Petition of Jennifer Deacon for Dawson Architects | 14-001187-COA | 548 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 548 East Broughton Street 14-001187-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 548 East Broughton Street 14-001187-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

21. [Petition of Rose Mae B. Millikan | 14-001558-COA | 31 East Broad Street | Staff Approved - Repointing](#)

Attachment: [COA - 31 East Broad Street 14-001558-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 31 East Broad Street 14-001558-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Amended Petition of Natalie Aiken for Hansen Architects, PC | 14-002035-COA | 223 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 223 West Broughton Street 14-002035-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 223 West Broughton Street 14-002035-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Jessica Paterson for Coastal Heritage Society | 14-002182-COA | 650 West Jones Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 650 West Jones Street 14-002182-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 650 West Jones Street 14-002182-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Amended Petition of Andrew Lynch | 14-002207-COA | 574 Indian Street | Staff Approved - Fence](#)

Attachment: [COA - 574 Indian Street 14-002207-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 574 Indian Street 14-002207-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of John Nakelski | 14-002208-COA | 24 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Changes](#)

Attachment: [COA - 25 Bull Street Ste 100 14-002208-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Amended Petition of Kurt Urban | 14-002293-COA | 204 East Hall Street | Staff Approved - Alterations/Privacy Fence](#)

Attachment: [COA - 204 East Hall Street 14-002293-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 204 East Hall Street 14-00293-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Brooke Jackson for Dawson Architects | 14-002252-COA | 342 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Exterior Egress Stair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 342 Bull Street 14-002252-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 342 Bull Street 14-002252-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Ameir Mohamad for Signs for Minds | 14-002271-COA | 128 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 128 East Broughton Street 14-002271-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 128 East Broughton Street 14-002271-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Amended Petition of Gretchen Callejas for Felder and Associates | 14-002313 -COA | 109 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd | Staff Approved - Rehabilitation](#)

Attachment: [COA - 109 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard 14-002313-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 109 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard 14-002313-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects, PC | 14-002424-COA | 100 West Bryan Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 100 West Bryan Street 14-002424-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 100 West Bryan Street 14-002424-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Patricia A. Otis | 14-002443-COA | 427 East Jones Street | Staff Approved - Color](#)

Change

Attachment: [COA - 427 Jones Street 14-002443-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 427 East Jones Street 14-002443-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Josh Beckler for Coastal Canvas | 14-002482-COA | 128 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 128 East Broughton Street 14-002482-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Tracy Crow | 14-002502-COA | 218 East Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 218 East Taylor Street 14002502-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 218 East Taylor Street 14-002502-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Thu Tran | 14-002572-COA | 118 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Wall Sconces](#)

Attachment: [COA - 118 Bull Street 14-002572-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 118 Bull Street 14-002572-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Patrick Phelps for Hansen Architects, P.C. | 14-002584-COA | 103 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Recessed Storefront System](#)

Attachment: [COA - 103 West Broughton Street 14-002584-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 103 West Broughton Street 14-002584-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Elizabeth Seeger | 14-002591-COA | 4 East Liberty Street | Staff Approved - Color Changes](#)

Attachment: [COA - 4 East Liberty Street 14-002591-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 4 East Liberty Street 14-002591-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Amended Petition of Jenny Mizejeski for Dawson Architects | 14-002658-COA | 201 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 201 West Oglethorpe Avenue 14-002658-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 W. Oglethorpe Avenue 14-002658-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Amended Petition of James C. Wilson for Beacon Builders |14-002685-COA| 544 East Liberty Street | Staff Approved - Garage Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 544 East Liberty Street 14-002685-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

## XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 6-11-14.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

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Items Deferred to Staff 6-11-14.pdf](#)

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

## XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

### Notices

41. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, June 12, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

**Mr. Howington** reported that he might not be able to attend the Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting on Thursday, June 12. He asked Mr. Engle if he would be able to attend the meeting.

**Mr. Engle** volunteered to attend the Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting on Thursday, June 12, 2014 at 3:00 p.m.

42. [Next Meeting - Wednesday, July 9, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

## XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

## XV. ADJOURNMENT

43. [Adjourned.](#)

**Ms. Scheer** said in the tourism business, they see many people from everywhere. One lady told her that Savannah is doing it right and was complimentary on the fact that not only are they saving a lot of buildings, but are rebuilding the city. She said they hear a lot about how beautiful Savannah is and they are happy that we are restoring, maintaining, and preserving. Ms. Scheer said she just wanted to share this with the Historic Review Board. The efforts of this Board definitely has a strong impact. She was very proud when the lady said that Savannah is doing it right.

**Mr. Howington** thanked the three new Board members, Ms. Caldwell, Ms. Scheer and Mr. Gunther, for their participation and comments they made today.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Howington adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen Harris  
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem