



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

110 East State Street
2:00 PM
Agenda

January 23, 2014 Historic District Board of Review Energy Efficiency Committee Meeting

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. AGENDA REVIEW

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. CONTINUED AGENDA

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

1. [Presentation by Hallie Currigan on SmartSide Trim and Siding](#)

2. [Continued Discussion on Windows in Historic Buildings](#)

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW
ENERGY EFFICIENCY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 23, 2014

In Attendance: Jerry Lominack (Committee Chair), Stephen Merriman (Committee Member), Robin Williams (Committee Member), Leah G. Michalak (HDBR Staff), Mary Mitchell (HDBR Staff), and Hallie Currigan (LP Building Products Representative.)

Presentation by Hallie Currigan regarding "Smartside Trim and Siding:
LP focuses on single-family new construction. The product is an engineered wood siding and trim. Hardi-Board (fiber cement) siding is their competition. They are the only engineered wood siding on the market right now. The product is termite and moisture-resistant; it is a renewable resource; it can withstand 135 mph winds; it is available in a smooth finish but not in a thicker profile. It has a 5 year, 100% warranty and a 50 year limited warranty.

Committee: Asked Hallie to bring back samples of the smooth finish product, which are painted, to get a better idea of the finished product.

Hallie: Agreed to bring samples to Leah and Ellen prior to the February 12th HDBR meeting. [Hallie left the meeting.]

Windows:

Jerry: Did the committee members visit the sites to look at the windows as provided by the product representatives after the last meeting?

Robin: He viewed three installations. The dark windows on the East Perry street new construction hides the increased depth of the double-paned, SDL windows better than the light colored windows on the McDonough Row new construction. He feels that the McDonough Row windows look fake. The Tattnall Street townhouses (new construction) are too “fussy,” with regard to the brick mold design, and they don’t look real.

Jerry: The United Way building on the northeast corner of Monterey Square, contributing building with double-paned SDL windows, look great. They are a Kolbe product. He said he “had to touch them to know that they are clad windows.” That they “have a more thought-out mullion.”

Jerry/Steve: Both feel that the standards/guidelines in the Preservation Briefs are vague.

Jerry: The Kehoe Metal building prompted this discussion. “So much of the original building is missing and because of the size of the windows, it doesn’t seem to make sense to do true-divided-lite windows. We should look at a ‘better’ window during that big of a project.”

Steve: “How would you [Jerry] propose crafting changes to the ordinance to cover a situation like this?”

Robin: “Before you answer that Jerry, can you please explain how the ordinance is now with regard to windows?”

Leah: Read all design standards that apply to windows.

Jerry: He thinks that modern windows should be allowed on contributing buildings on a case-by-case and/or ‘special case’ basis.

Steve: “We need to define what a ‘special case’ is.”

Robin: “Are we looking for new guidelines?”

Jerry: “Maybe additional wording in the ordinance? Not change what’s there?”

Robin: “Is our subcommittee goal to come up with a recommendation to HDBR for windows on contributing building? Maybe we should provide the Board with a catalog of profiles, product series, and previous manufacturer’s approved. Since the MW Pro

windows used on the Tattnall Street townhouses were preapproved but no longer 'look right'."

Steve: "I think, even if we do start allowing exceptions to the window standards, we should continue to use ZBA for variances."

Jerry/Robin: Both agree.

Steve: "So this brings us back to the right manufacturer then."

Committee: Should we add language to the ordinance? Or should we just add 'Chair language' for now? They decided they would prefer to just add Chair language – which the Chair would add to the language currently read aloud at the beginning of the meeting. Example language: Previous exceptions made by the Board are on a case-by-case basis and never sets a precedent. They would also want it mentioned that all exceptions still have to go to ZBA.

Jerry: Asked Leah if NewZO gives the HDBR more latitude to make decisions and/or grant variances that deviate from their ordinance?

Leah: "I am not sure, I will have to check and get back to you with that information."

Jerry: "Should we consider creating another subcommittee that helps Staff review the smaller details, such as windows, to help Staff?"

Robin: "If we did, would could do teams of 2-3 that rotate every couple of months."

Jerry: Wants to share a section of the National Park Service's, Planning Successful Rehabilitation Projects, Technical Preservation Notes. It was the "only" reference he could find that addressed the issue at hand for this subcommittee:

<http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/applying-rehabilitation/successful-rehab/windows-replacement.htm>

Replacement Windows Where No Historic Windows Remain

Replacement windows for missing or non-historic windows must be compatible with the historic appearance and character of the building. Although replacement windows may be based on physical or pictorial documentation, if available, recreation of the missing historic windows is not required to meet the Standards. Replacement of missing or non-historic windows must, however, always fill the original window openings and must be compatible with the overall historic character of the building. The general type of window – industrial steel, wood double-hung, etc. – that is appropriate can usually be determined from the proportions of the openings, and the period and historic function of the building. The appearance of the replacement windows must be consistent with the general characteristics of a historic window of the type and period, but need not replicate the missing historic window. In many cases, this may be accomplished using substitute materials. There may be some additional flexibility with regard to the details of windows on secondary elevations that are not highly visible, consistent with the approach outlined for replacing existing historic windows. Replacing existing incompatible, non-historic windows with similarly incompatible new windows does not meet the Standards.

Jerry: He has also been speaking with the National Park Service in D.C. about this as well.
Should we talk to the City Attorney about this Chair language that we are proposing?

Leah: Will talk to Ellen about the proper course of action.

Meeting Adjourned.

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

XIV. ADJOURNMENT