



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

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

NOVEMBER 12, 2014 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Keith Howington, Chair
Ebony Simpson, Vice Chair
Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian
Debra Caldwell
Justin Gunther
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Marjorie Weibe-Reed
Tess Scheer
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Member Not Present: Stephen Merriman, Jr.

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

City of Savannah Staff Present: Lorie Odom, Downtown Zoning Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

1. [Petition of Jennifer Klahr | 14-005018-COA | 202 East Broughton Street | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 202 East Broughton Street 14-005018-COA.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review

does hereby approve the petition for two principal use projecting signs at 202 East Broughton Street with the condition that the signs be raised to - PASS provide a minimum clearance of 10 feet above the sidewalk, because the signs are otherwise visually compatible and meet the standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.
Second: Ebony Simpson
Debra Caldwell - 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
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Not Present

2. [Petition of Hansen Architects | 14-005021-COA | 35 Lincoln Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [35 Lincoln St COA Application and Dwgs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a roof deck and stairs constructed of Ipe wood at 35 Lincoln Street with the following conditions:

1. The finish color(s) of the deck, siding and stair risers are provided and approved. - PASS
2. The height of the railing is reduced to 36 inches.

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.
Second: Ebony Simpson
Debra Caldwell - 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
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

3. [Petition of Joel Snayd | 14-005107-COA | 313 Abercorn Street | Color Change, Alterations and Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [2014_10_14_313 ABERCORN STREET_HRB SUBMITTAL3_RETHINK.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the proposed color changes, installation of six small copper Aspen lanterns from Carolina Lanterns and Lighting and a projecting principal use sign sized 20 inches by 20 inches with the condition that the sign's clearance be increased to 10 feet, because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Ebony Simpson

Debra Caldwell	- 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
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

4. [Adopt November 12, 2014 Agenda](#)

Board Action:

Approve the adoption of the November 12, 2014 agenda. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Debra Caldwell	
Debra Caldwell	- 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
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5. [Approval of Minutes October 8, 2014](#)

Attachment: [10-08-2014 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the Meeting Minutes of October 8, 2014. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Debra Caldwell
Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell	- 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
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

6. [Approval of Minutes Special Called Meeting October 8, 2014](#)

Attachment: [10-08-2014 Minutes Special Called Meeting.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the Special Called Meeting Minutes of October 8, 2014. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Debra Caldwell
Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell	- 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
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

7. [Petition of Shedrick Coleman for SHEDDarchitecture | 14-003482-COA | 407 and 409 East McDonough Street | New Construction: Part II Design Details](#)

Board Action:	
Continued as requested.	- PASS
Vote Results	
Motion: Tess Scheer	
Second: Nicholas Henry	
Debra Caldwell	- 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
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

8. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 14-003988-COA | 229 West Congress Street | New Construction: Part II Design Details](#)

Board Action:	
Continue to December 10, 2014.	- PASS
Vote Results	
Motion: Tess Scheer	

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

9. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 14-004581-COA | 412 Williamson Street | New Construction: Part 2 Design Details Amendment](#)

Board Action:

Continue to December 10, 2014. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Nicholas Henry

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

10. [Petition of Christian Sottile for Sottile & Sottile | 14-004597-COA | 200-500 West River Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

Board Action:

Continue to December 10, 2014. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Nicholas Henry

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
----------------	-------

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

11. [Petition of Facilicare Southeast | 14-005083-COA | 317 East Broad Street | Fence](#)

Board Action:	
Continue as requested.	- PASS
Vote Results	
Motion: Tess Scheer	
Second: Nicholas Henry	
Debra Caldwell	- 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
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

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

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 14-000634-COA.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Aerial Map 000634.pdf](#)

Attachment: [HSF Comments_HDBR 11 12 14.pdf](#)

Mr. Forest Lott of Lott Barber was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for Part II: Design Details for a five story multi-family residential housing complex with parking below. There will be one story of parking underground, one story of parking on the first floor, with retail at the street, and four stories of residences above. The total project size is

224,573 gross square feet with a ground floor footprint of 42,075 square feet. The building materials consist of brick and two colors of stucco, cast stone sills. Aluminum balcony railings, steel canopies, aluminum storefronts, and aluminum clad windows. Part II as well as signage were reviewed by the Board on October 8, 2014. The signage was approved, but the design details were continued. The Board's discussion focused primarily on the stucco color, a more substantial coping, and four inch door and window recesses. Additionally, the Board recommended approval of a variance from the 75% requirement of modular masonry materials which was subsequently granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Ms. Harris stated that the building has been revised as follows:

- Stucco color/configuration: The petitioner as provided several studies of alternative stucco colors and configurations. Their preferred color concept includes Plateau (the same as previously) and Basalt (which is a lighter grey than previously proposed).
- Casement, sliding door, and railing color: The petitioner has revised the color of the casement windows and sliding doors to be a clear anodized aluminum to better match the Basalt stucco color.
- The coping height has been revised to ten inches.
- The windows will be recessed three and one-half inches.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the petition for New Construction, Part II: Design Details of the project at 540 Selma Street because the project is visually compatible and meets the design standards.

Ms. Harris read the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) comments as they could not be present. (See the HSF comments below under Public Comments).

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lott confirmed that the openings that are in the brick portions are recessed. He thanked the staff and Board for their help with this project. Mr. Lott said that with their compliance of the last three details color, recessed the windows, and deeper coping, he asked the Board for approval of their project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Harris stated that the National Trust Conference for Historic Preservation is being held this week. Therefore, representatives from the Historic Savannah Foundation are not present at today's HDBR meeting, but they gave staff their comments to be read into the public record. Their comments are: "The HSF thinks that the revised toned-down color scheme that the applicant has chosen to move forward with for the stucco color on the upper floors is more successful. Regarding the design details of the building, there are a few points in addition to the staff report.

The HSF suggested increasing the relief of the stucco bands on the upper floors and perhaps adding more scoring or smaller bands with deeper relief to provide more shadow lines to break up some of the massing on those levels. The sills on the double hung windows within the the first two brick levels of the building appear to be located lower than the actual base of the windows and they suggest that the sills be placed in the proper location at the immediate base of the windows. It is not indicated in the final recommendation but staff asks, on page 5 of the report, for a clarification that the storefront glazing is inset four

inches. They agree that this needs to be confirmed before approval."

Mr. Gunther asked Mr. Lott to address the HSF's comment regarding the sill height on the second floor.

Mr. Lott said the sill heights on the second floor are illustrated as they have been from Part I all the way through. They prefer to leave the sill heights as is rather than have this continued for their seventh meeting.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. McClain asked if the Board discussed the sill heights earlier.

Mr. Howington answered that he does not recall that the sill heights were mentioned as an issue by the Board.

Board Action:

Approval of the petition for New Construction, Part 2: Design Details of the project at 540 Selma Street because the project is visually compatible and meets the design standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Tess Scheer
Debra Caldwell - 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
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Not Present

13. [Petition of Jeff Cramer for Diversified Designs | 14-001183-COA | 615 Habersham Street | New Construction Part II Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 14-001183-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Color scheme.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Stephens Ward.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Model photographs.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Public comment- email.pdf](#)

Attachment: [HSF Comments_HDBR 11 12 14.pdf](#)

Mr. Jeffrey Cramer was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of Part II: Design Details to construct five new townhomes, four of which face Hall Street and two face Habersham Street (the corner unit has a double entrance). The buildings are proposed to be two stories tall with a near full width front porch. Parking will be provided at the rear, with the entrance to the parking area provided off Habersham Street. The townhomes feature a regular, symmetrical rhythm with three pediments flanked by bay windows. The Historic District Board of Review approved Part I: Height and Mass with some conditions which have been met. Additionally, the Board approved the demolition of the non-contributing building at 615 Habersham Street because the building is not eligible for historic status.

Ms. Harris stated that on October 8, 2014, the HDBR reviewed Part II: Design Details and continued the petition at the petitioner's request. The Board's discussion focused primarily on the setback, materials, scoring pattern, configuration of the turrets, and porch width and roof along Habersham Street. She said the petitioner has revised the design as follows:

- The porch and roof on Habersham Street elevation has been reduced in size and simplified;
- The scoring pattern better portrayed;
- The window lintels, sills, and water table on a contrasting decorator's white (previously they were the same color as the stucco);
- The square windows on the Habersham Street façade are now rectangular;
- The main roof has changed from asphalt shingle to standing seam; and
- The gate width has been reduced from 14 feet to 12 feet and the material has changed to wrought iron.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of New Construction: Part II, Design Details for five new townhomes at 615 Habersham Street with the condition that the window sashes are inset not less than three inches, because the project is visually compatible and meets the design standards.

Dr. Henry asked staff to explain where the dark and light stucco will be placed on the townhomes.

Ms. Harris explained that the darker stucco is for the base of the main wall of the building and the lighter color is for the accent pieces.

Dr. Williams asked if the stucco color sample for color or is it also for texture.

Ms. Harris answered that her understanding is that it is for texture as well.

Ms. Harris read the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) comments as they could not be present. (See the HSF comments below under Public Comments).

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cramer thanked the Board for their service. He said today he will address the urban context of the project as there has been some talk about the setbacks and so forth. Mr. Cramer explained that there is a multi-family building and along Hall Street there are

residential buildings all along the street. On the other side of Hall Street, you will find the same thing. If they go east, there are single family houses and then you get into townhouses on the same side of the street, which is the north side; and over here, there are a lot of row houses. They noticed that it is more like a suburb of the original Savannah and it gets more urban as you go towards the east.

Mr. Cramer pointed out the single family row houses across the street. All of these are on the zero lot setbacks. A lot of the dwellings have steps and porches that are encroached. He pointed out a historic multi-family building in the area that has a setback of 2 feet – three inches and it encroaches 2 feet – 3 inches and goes back and forth on the front yard property line. He said that after looking at the different houses and multi-family dwellings around the neighborhood and in the district, they noticed that the historic multi-family, townhouses were either built on the property line, encroached or were right off the property line by a couple of feet. All the historic row houses are built on the property line and they encroach. The only unit that does not encroach is not historic, which is next to their building. Mr. Cramer entertained questions from the Board.

Dr. Williams stated that he was curious about the choice of black for the metal roofs.

Mr. Cramer said they used the black on Huntingdon Street for the stoops. His client likes the black; he likes the darkness of it.

Dr. Williams said this is not exactly a visual compatibility issue, but it seems that to him with black being on the main body of the house would make it that much hotter. He believes that the trend has been towards a lighter color roof.

Dr. Henry lives in this area and said that his roof is white.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Cramer to address the stucco color and texture. Will it be a smooth sand finish?

Mr. Cramer answered that they definitely want sand finish stucco. They will try to even make the cast stone look smoother to possibly bring out some of the aggregates.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Cramer, therefore, if the samples are a lot rougher than the stucco finish will be.

Mr. Cramer said they used conventional stucco; therefore, they are able to work better with the samples.

Dr. Williams said given the nature of the design, they would expect a smoother finish.

Mr. Cramer stated that they want it to look as much like real stone as they possibly can.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Cramer to comment on the condition of the windows in the staff's report to be recessed three inches to meet the ordinance.

Mr. Cramer answered that they will definitely accommodate this. Their walls are thick enough to recess the windows three inches.

Mr. Gunther stated that one of his concerns from the previous meetings was the articulation of the turrets on the Habersham Street side of the building as the joining of the roofs was a little awkward. Have you taken any time to consider this a little more?

Mr. Cramer answered yes. They studied this and they decided it was too busy.

Mr. Gunther said Mr. Cramer made reference that a large number of buildings in this area have inset turrets. But, they are not rounding a corner which as decoration as bow window tops. Mr. Cramer is rounding the corner with a turret that flattens out on this side and does not have any three dimension on it.

Dr. Williams stated he believes Mr. Cramer referenced this at the last meeting. He asked if these are units where the bays are inset from the corner.

Mr. Cramer answered yes. They are inset from the corner and have a big onion dome type roof; the roof goes around the corner, but makes no relationship as it turns the corner to the roof on the rest of the buildings which is somewhat similar to theirs.

Dr. Williams said this is more like another building in the district where the turrets actually articulate around both sides. He said that he cannot speak for Mr. Gunther, but this feels a little too flat and too industrial. It does not have to turn much; maybe a foot or so. Dr. Williams said he believes this is the point that the Board has been making with each of the iterations of this design. He asked Mr. Cramer if his concern was just coming back with one more facet on the corner makes the elevation too busy.

Mr. Cramer answered yes.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she is aware that Mr. Cramer is put in a predicament because the building is on a corner. It is her opinion that the petitioner has nailed it pretty well on the Hall Street side, but she believes the Habersham Street side could use more definition. However, she understands the petitioner's challenge.

Dr. Williams said he believes what the Board is saying is that it does not have to be as deep as what Mr. Cramer has done. He believes all that is needed is just enough to create a three dimensional only.

Mr. Cramer explained that one reason he put such a big cornice on the building was to wrap everything around somewhat as was done on the corner of Huntingdon and Habersham Streets. He said a lot of strange things were done here on the roof, but it worked out because they had such a big cornice line at the top of the building.

Dr. Henry told Mr. Cramer that he sympathizes with him on the difficulty of the lot, but personally he thinks the most comparable approach for the exterior would be to emphasize the turrets as much as possible.

Mr. Cramer said he was curious; the Board thought the other elevation he did with the full turret was too much; he is only trying to figure this solution. Mr. Cramer said he knows that it is not perfect every time he does one.

Dr. Williams said if this scheme had the central portion pushed back, would help the situation.

Mr. Cramer said he believes what the Board is saying is that it needs to flatten out in the middle after it does the turret.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Harris stated that the staff received one email and the Historic Savannah Foundation's written comments. The email was sent by an adjacent property owner to the north at 613 Habersham Street. She stated that the individual wrote that "615 Habersham Street is an

eyesore in the Stephens Ward and has been for some time. He has reviewed the proposal and is in favor of the townhomes. It is a vast improvement that will benefit the entire neighborhood. As a neighbor, he is grateful that somebody is finally doing something with the property and he was hopeful that the Board would approve the project."

Ms. Harris stated that the Historic Savannah Foundation was in agreement with the staff's recommendation.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. McClain said based on what she is hearing, may be a request for a continuance is needed in order for the petitioner to look further at the design.

Mr. Howington said he does not know how Mr. Cramer feels about asking for a continuance. He knows this petition has been before the Board a couple of times. He said Mr. Cramer has heard the Board's discussion; he does not know if Mr. Cramer wants to call for a vote today or a continuance. Mr. Howington explained that if the Board votes and it comes back differently then of course the Board could hear the petition again. He realizes that Mr. Cramer feels that he has worked the project to death and he does not know if there is another opportunity to express the turreted to give more definition to the Habersham Street façade. Mr. Howington said he feels that the Board is leaning towards a continuance, but Mr. Cramer could call for a vote.

Dr. Williams stated that he had a procedural question. He asked if Mr. Cramer calls for a vote and it fails to pass, could he come back with an altered scheme in response to the Board's suggestions.

Mr. Howington answered that yes, Mr. Cramer could come back. The rules are that if the petition changes the person could not bring back the same petition; but if it changes, then it is a new petition. The petitioner would, therefore, need to reapply.

Dr. Henry informed Mr. Cramer again that he has his sympathy; he knows he is trying, but he would be comfortable with seeing this one more time.

Mr. Cramer asked for a continuance.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review continued the New Construction: Part II, Design - PASS
Details for five new townhomes at 615 Habersham Street at the request of the petitioner.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Debra Caldwell - 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
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

14. [Petition of Pete Callejas, Homestead Architecture | 14-005065-COA | 312 / 314 Lorch Street | New Construction Residential: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Gaston Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Project Description.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Mass Model Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs and Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Variance Request.pdf](#)
Attachment: [HSF Comments_HDBR 11 12 14.pdf](#)

Mr. Peter Callejas was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a three-story duplex on the vacant parcels located at 312 and 314 Lorch Street. The site is landlocked by new construction to the east, a commercial business to the west, and historic buildings to the north, with no lane access. Each parcel is 26.5 feet wide. The western parcel (314) is 45.01 feet deep and the eastern parcel (312) is 46.4 feet deep. Ms. Michalak said the petitioner is also requesting a variance from the standard that states: Structural 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). This is to allow garage parking on the first floor of the buildings with access to garages off of Lorch Street.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part I Height and Mass with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board with Part 2: Design Details:

1. Increase the voids on the west façade and add voids to the east façade.
2. Align the fences with the front façade.
3. Reduce the raised basement floor to floor height to a maximum of 9'-6."
4. Add base moldings to all front porch columns.
5. Provide the baluster spacing.
6. Indicate the proposed locations for electrical meters.
7. Screen the rooftop for HVAC units

Ms. Michalak said the staff recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for a variance from the structured parking standards to allow parking on the first floor of the buildings with access from Lorch Street because the variance criteria are met.

Ms. Michalak read the Historic Savannah Foundation's (HSF) comments as they could not be present. (See the HSF comments below under Public Comments).

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Callejas thanked the Board for reviewing their petition. He said he would make comments on the conditions. They will locate the meters; they will have details for the balusters, and they will add a base to the columns. Mr. Callejas said he looked at rooftop screening in 3-D for the air conditioner. The rooftop units are pushed in towards the center. There is no way that it will be seen from Lorch Street. He believes you would have to be 170 feet away from the side elevation; the west elevation to see the top corner of it, but they propose that when the units are placed if they could meet at the site and see if the units are visible. Then if they are visible, they will be happy to add something. They will be happy to pull up the fences if it is essential. However, the line of continuity on that street goes in and out. He is not sure, therefore, if it actually defines the line of continuity continuous with the rest of the street. However, they will be happy to move them up to the front.

Mr. Callejas stated that as far as the height on their site, they interpreted that the 9'6" for the first floor was to measure the finished first floor, the expression of the finished first floor, and the expression of the ground floor which they have actually met that. The ground floor sits up off the grade about one foot. If they were to lower that, they would either have to have a slab on grade which would not be advisable or they would have to have 7'-6" ceilings which they do not want to do for habitable space. He said that the building next to theirs seems to meet the ordinance, but it is the parking garage. Therefore, they are looking at the buildings across the street that has similar configurations to what they are doing.

Mr. Callejas explained that the door is 6'-8" and the windows are approximately 8' head height by interpellation and if you look at an approximate second floor height in comparison to the ground floor heights, it is 12 feet. He believes this is appropriate and on the street it is compatible. This allows them to have habitable space on the ground floor. He said the side elevation is three and one-half feet away from the existing building, they propose to add windows to bring in natural light. This will not be seen from the street; there might be some evidence as you walk or drive by the front window. If you look at the windows, there are a lot of historic buildings that meet the guidelines that have aligning windows and space no more than two of the window widths and there are some that do not. There are a lot of buildings where facades do not have anything at all. They will add these to bring in natural light and they will not be seen. He said he is hopeful that this will be acceptable by the Board.

Mr. Callejas stated that on the other elevation which is exactly the same, they are willing to work with staff to find an appropriate solution. They will work with staff to see what else they can do to make it more appropriate and they have done things in the past where they added a false window that was like a shuttered window. If they need to do this to add some repetition and rhythm, they will do it; however, they do not want to overdo it because it will look somewhat hokey. The site by default ends up being an elevation that more or less addresses Montgomery Street because there is not a building next door to it. However, he believes that in time a building will probably be built here that will hide the elevation.

Mr. Callejas asked for some leniency for them to work with the Board to find out what is more appropriate and what they can do, what meets the needs of the building, the client, and the function of the space.

Dr. Williams stated that Mr. Callejas has two plans that are reflecting the traditional Savannah paired houses, but there appears to be an opportunity that has been missed in that

the front porches are being treated as two individual entities. All the other galleried front porches on this block and in the neighborhood are actually full width. If Mr. Callejas went to full width, he believes this would solve a couple of issues. Dr. Williams said if he went to central column rather than paired piers at the ground level with a dead space that is probably two feet wide, if he had a single pier and then a single porch column. The outer edges of the galleries could be extended like the other buildings on the street right to the outer line of the building which actually make the garage easier to get into as the pier would be further away from the garage door. This will give him a little more turning radius. Dr. Williams said the pairing of the piers and columns up the middle creates an unwelcome dead space, especially at ground level. He said if Mr. Callejas was looking for examples, he could look on Waldburg Street west of Barnard Street as there are two pairs of houses with continuous galleries that are two stories. He said he agrees with Mr. Callejas that the third floor does not need to be covered.

Mr. Callejas stated that initially they looked at this; the reason they split them were more of a code related issue because of combustible materials being within two feet of each other. This is the impetus of the separation of the two porches.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Callejas if he would need a variance to do what he suggested.

Mr. Callejas answered that they can explore this. When they initially did it, he felt that this was a much more appealing looking porch, but he was not considering what everybody else was doing; although there is enough variation in what is going on in the porches all around this area, in this ward, and in this neighborhood. He felt there was not necessarily one constant element. Most of them are as wide as the building, but there was enough variation that this would be just another variation among other variations of similar themes. They did do it wider and it may have helped somewhat, but they do not want to have three columns along the front with one in the middle; this would be awkward. Mr. Callejas explained that if they spread the columns out, it would solve some of the problems, but it does not solve the garage door being centered.

Dr. Williams said he was not talking about moving the garage door, but the width of the porches. He said if this was a stand-alone building, then it would not be an issue, but they are being paired in a coupled design. Therefore, it seems as if they are taking two things that are essentially individuals and create Siamese twins out of them. Dr. Williams said if they were both planned further to right, it would suggest that the two are individuals, but the petitioner is following the Savannah tradition of reflecting them which drives attention to the middle. Yet, the midpoint is a dead space. But, there is an opportunity here to alter the proportions. In fact in the examples on Waldburg Street, you can see that the central column is treated a little different than the others. This will give the petitioner an opportunity to play with this.

Dr. Henry asked if the bottom center post is removed, would the structure be sound?

Mr. Callejas said they would have to be sure that the beam was designed to support the load. He thinks it would be visually more awkward than it is already because one is missing. They are willing to restudy the porch configurations and see what other opportunities they can do and decide which one they want to present. They want to get it right; maybe they can work with staff to come up with something that they feel is more appropriate so that when they submit for the next meeting they will have something that they feel comfortable with and feel confident that everybody will be happy with.

Mr. Callejas told Dr. Williams that he sees his point, but he believes that what they have is fine. But, there may be some more opportunities and they are willing to explore it.

Mr. Gunther said to accommodate what Dr. Williams was suggesting, how drastic is it to move the windows, doors, and the interior space.

Mr. Callejas answered with the interior, they are a little tight. This is approximately a 23 foot wide building. Therefore, they are very limited. They have done a lot of exploration, but there are so many different combinations of room configuration that would actually work in this space. As far as the layout on the front, they can made adjustments to that as much as they want and they have done so already. The window spacing is the result of being centered on the columns of the porches.

Mr. Howington said if the window was off six inches from the middle, it would not be seen in this elevation.

Mr. Callejas said the garage door exactly to that point, in the elevation you see that it is a little off, but in real life when you are there in person, if you stand directly in front of one, you might perceive it if that is what you are looking for. But, then you would not notice the other because it would be off. In the scheme of things, they are 5 1/2 feet back in the shadow lines. Therefore, he did not think that it was that much detrimental as now it serves a function of he got it as close to the center as he could possibly get it.

Dr. Williams said following up on his comment earlier, if the petition pulled the outer piers and columns further, it would help to enhance the appearance of the garage being more centered. Presently, it is against the alignment of the pier. If the pier was removed, it would create the illusion that the doors are actually to the left a little more centered. In fact, he told Mr. Callejas that if he looks at the French doors on the third floor, depending on how he spaces them, but if the entire porch was nudged out slightly, he could actually get this central newel post on the third level a little closer to the midpoint between the French door and the window.

Mr. Callejas said he was open to exploring the front porch.

Dr. Williams said that from his point of view, all it would entail is that the two central columns and piers would be merged close together into one. The Board has had situations where some of the Part I elements were tackled in Part II. Therefore, in theory, the Board can approve most of Part I, but leave a few elements to be resolved at the Part II stage.

Mr. Callejas said maybe he can have three different variations and they can talk about them and see which one works better. He believes that the width of the porch and the alignment is fairly easy to do. He said he is happy to do whatever they need to be sure that everybody is satisfied with it and it does not affect the function of the budget.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Michalak read the following comments into the public records. "The Historic Savannah Foundation stated that they agree with all of staff comments and recommendations. Their additional comments were that overall they think the height and mass of the proposed structures are appropriate for the neighborhood.

HSF feels that the incorporation of garage doors on the primary façade is not appropriate in the Landmark District. The petitioner should seek a variance not to provide parking on the

site because of the special condition created by the location of this property. Furthermore, the rhythm of the porch piers at the base is interrupted by the garage doors to create an awkward arrangement. If the garage doors remain, they think they should be centered between the porch piers and could potentially be widened within the limits of the ordinance.

The small accent front gables proposed above the center access of each side of the duplex do not seem to contribute to the design and should be eliminated. Additionally, resetting the top level porch to be a covered porch may make the design more successful within the context of the area."

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Callejas to address the Historic Savannah Comments.

Mr. Callejas said overall they feel this is a very good architecture solution to this street. This is a connector street and not a main road. They feel the project is visually appropriate and that it is visually appealing. He apologized if the HSF did not like the little things on the top, but they like them. They looked at the building without them and they felt it was more appealing with them. As far as the columns, he believes it would look odd to have other than the outside columns to have no inner columns. Mr. Callejas said the garage is centered as he could possibly get it with regards to the floor plan. He said unfortunately he cannot make the hallway less wide to be able to not only get upstairs, but also to the back. He was hoping because it is setback 5 1/2 feet with a shadow line, you don't perceive it too much and it is not an annoying feature, but professionally and personally his opinion is that the center column is fine and is appropriate. He is responding to the ordinance and trying to meet the needs. Therefore, at this time, they are not trying to get a variance to not have offset parking; they are trying to provide the offset parking.

Mr. Callejas said there are a lot of porches in the neighborhood, on the street as well, that do not have covered third level porches. Some of them directly across and some on the next street. He said they actually explored this and felt that this was much more appropriate. This is what they came up with and, therefore, feel confident that this is an appropriate articulation of what they need to do.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry said he likes that the third roof on the top of the porch.

Mr. Howington said he believes that the Historic Savannah Foundation suggested that this roof be removed, but the petitioner likes it. He stated that he believes generally the Board likes it.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said it will be interesting to see what design comes back for the porch.

Mr. Howington said he likes the open porch as well.

Dr. Williams said that there are several two-story double porches on this street.

Dr. Henry said that he does not have strong feelings about it, but just believes that it looks better.

Mr. Howington said he believes that the petitioner has agreed to all of the staff's comments with the exception of the HVAC units. He agreed to look at the HVAC units after it is built as he believes that it will not be seen. The petitioner agreed to look at the voids on the west façade as well. He presented an argument for the raised basement to leave it as is. Mr. Callejas has agreed to all the other items.

Ms. Simpson said she agrees with leaving the top porch uncovered because of the context. She is leaning towards what the Historic Savannah Foundation said regarding the garage. The garage is in the front and she is aware that the Board looks at each project individually, but they see other people bring in projects as a second precedence with allowing them to have those front garages. She said she is a little torn on the accent gable on the front of the building; however, she can go either way with this.

Dr. Williams said he believes the best examples of the garage is on West Taylor Street.

Mr. Howington stated that he believes there are some of these types of garages on West Huntingdon Street as well where the new brick constructions are located.

Ms. Simpson asked, therefore, there are some of this type of garages in the area already.

Mr. Howington answered yes; there are some in this neighborhood.

Dr. Williams said the question is does the Board want more of these garages in the neighborhood.

Mr. Howington said he agrees that the garages will be screened as they will be set back five feet and, therefore, will not be as noticeable. Consequently, this does not bother him as much as if they were forward on the façade.

Dr. Williams stated that the design of the doors would be a Part II discussion. Maybe there are ways in which the garage doors could look less not like garage doors.

Mr. Howington explained that the petitioner would have to ask for a variance if he keeps it as is.

Mr. Callejas said he would request a variance. There are a lot of precedence of garage doors in this area. Some are placed more successful than others, but they took into consideration that there is one a few blocks on Montgomery where it was unsuccessful. The garage door was installed there, but you cannot drive in them. They want to ensure that their garage would actually be functional and designed so that there will be proper ramping and so forth.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

1. Approve the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a three-story duplex on the vacant parcels located at 312 and 314 Lorch Street with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board for review with Part II, Design Details:
 - a. Increase the voids on the west façade and add voids to the east façade.
 - b. Align the fences with the front façade to create a wall of continuity along Lorch Street.
 - c. Add base molding to all second and third floor

- columns on the front porches. - PASS
- d. Provide baluster spacing (maximum 4 inches) and height of the balustrades (maximum 36 inches).
 - e. Indicate the proposed locations for the electrical meters on secondary or rear facades.

2. Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from 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)*. This is to allow garage parking on the first floor of the buildings with access to the garages off of Lorch Street.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Justin Gunther

Debra Caldwell	- 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
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

15. [Petition of Christian Sottile for Sottile & Sottile | 14-005099-COA | 215 West Broughton Street | New Construction: Part 1 Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 14-005099-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Wall Section.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Application -215 West Broughton Street 14-005099-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Model Photos.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Historic Photograph.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- reduced size.pdf](#)
Attachment: [HSF Comments HDBR 11 12 14.pdf](#)

Mr. Christian Sottile was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of Part I Height and Mass for a new six-story mixed use building at 215 West Broughton Street. The building proposes a full basement, commercial/retail on floors one through three, and a residence on floors four through six. The first floor is designed with full glass facades on the north and south elevations so that one can see through the building to the lane and

beyond. The sixth floor is setback 30 feet from Broughton Street and 23 feet from Broughton Lane. A trellis is proposed within the 23 foot setback along the lane. An elevator overrun extends an additional five feet above the sixth floor along the eastern edge of the building. The petitioner is also requesting the following variances:

- A one-story variance from the Height Map (the property is in a four story height zone). Should the variance for the fifth floor be granted, the petitioner intends to meet the criteria for a "bonus story" for large-scale development for a sixth story;
- A one-foot variance from the minimum ground floor height of 14'6" (13'6" is proposed);
- A six inch variance from the minimum upper floor height of 10' (9'6" is proposed); and
- A non-centered entrance on Broughton Street (a centered entrance is required).

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends that Part I Height and Mass for a new six story building at 215 West Broughton Street be continued to address the following concerns and to allow the Zoning Board of Appeals to make a decision on the variances requested (see below):

1. Reduce the number of stories to meet the Height Map standards;
2. Restudy the ground level solids to voids to provide stronger solids so that the building is more "grounded" to be visually compatible.
3. Incorporate a central entrance.

Ms. Harris reported also that staff recommends approval of the following variances because the variance criteria have been met:

1. A six inch variance from the minimum upper floor height of 10' (9'6" is proposed). [Note: This variance is only applicable if the Zoning Board of Appeals approves a one-story variance from the Height Map. Should that variance be denied, this variance will need to be reevaluated as part of a revised design].
2. A one-foot variance from the minimum ground floor height of 14'6" (13'6" is proposed).

Ms. Harris reported additionally that staff recommends denial of the following variances because the variance criteria have not been met:

1. A one-story variance above the Height Map.
2. A non-centered entrance on Broughton Street.

Ms. Harris said staff has received several letters. One letter was not included in the Board's packet as it was received at the beginning of the meeting, but copies have been placed at the Board members' space. The letter was received from Mr. Reed Delaney, III. Mr. Delaney is in favor of this new six-story mixed use building at 215 West Broughton Street. Ms. Harris read the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) comments as they could not be present. (See the HSF comments below under Public Comments).

Dr. Henry said he understands that the building is going from four stories to six stories. Does this include the conservatory?

Ms. Harris answered yes.

Dr. Henry asked, however, it does not include the basement. He asked staff to explain how the petitioner arrived at the fifth story.

Ms. Harris explained that for the fifth story, the petitioner is asking for a variance from the Height Map for the fifth story. The Zoning Board of Appeals has to grant the petitioner's request and the Review Board makes a recommendation to the ZBA. At this time it has not been granted as the Board has to make the recommendation first.

Dr. Henry said he thought the petitioner was asking for the fifth floor because they were doing nice things on the ground floor.

Ms. Harris answered no; it only qualifies as large-scale development that can have a bonus story once they get to the fifth floor. Therefore, the petitioner has to get the variance in order to be eligible for the bonus sixth story.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Sottile stated that he is the civic design architect for the Argentinis building at 215 West Broughton Street. He said that this is a project that they have deliberated on for many months before bringing it to the Historic District Board of Review and he is very excited to show the project to the Board in a brief presentation of the design thinking behind this project and the rationale for the proposal. This is really a Savannah story and it is about a family. It would not be right for him to present the design without some brief remarks first from the Argentinis Family.

Ms. Renee Argentinis came forward and thanked the Board for listening to their story. Ms. Argentinis said they came to Savannah 20 years ago. She came first and did a site evaluation of Savannah and the surrounding counties. They decided to build their factory in Midway, Georgia which opened in 1996; but they bought their home downtown a year before the completion of their factory. They were committed to the city because of its generosity, its big heart, and the importance of Broughton Street and the family businesses that have existed there for years. She said her goal and Jac's goal was that they pay homage to the street; honor the people who built those buildings and made Savannah what it is today. Her family made a huge commitment, a huge sacrifice. She said that this will also be a family building. Their son is opening up his online business downstairs called "Metal Precious.com." They are continuing that history on Broughton Street.

Ms. Argentinis said they have one more thing that is very important to them, which is the Telfair Academy. When they looked at the property, they said they have to do something right. They had to make the building two-sided -- taking the history of the lane, but reinterpreting it so whoever is going to the Telfair looks over and sees their building. She said their building is a building of the heart. They have had three offers to sell the property and on the third offer she said that there is no money in the world that can be paid to them for them to sell this property. Ms. Argentinis said they would not sell because Savannah has been so good to them. She explained that they lost a son in 1999. This city helped them get through their loss and supported getting the 200 Club restarted. When they die, there are two things that will be said about her family. One is that they saved the Spanish Oak trees in Midway, Georgia and that old lady built a pond that they won an environmental award for.

She explained that 125,000 gallons of water a day is saved by them. They never thought they would win that award with the Coca Cola here, but sure enough a little company can make a difference. Ms. Argentinis said they hope that they can make a difference on Broughton Street.

Mr. Sottile explained that they are talking about the narrow infill lot on the 200 Block of West Broughton Street, a site that has long been vacant and sometimes used as an informal passage to Telfair Square. He believes this is one of the most intriguing site, but certainly is the smallest site vacant on Broughton Street in the redevelopment area. This is a challenging and unique site. Its context is one that is informed by Savannah very deeply. It is informed with the deep respect and understanding for the ordinance that they all abide by and uphold in maintaining the integrity in the National Landmark History District. This building is informed by family as he mentioned. This family came from Greece and Brooklyn, New York. Rarely, do they get to design buildings that represent family.

Mr. Sottile stated that this is a two-sided site with a view towards Broughton Street and ultimately to the bridge and the river; and a view south to Telfair Square and Telfair Ward. It is in fact one of the original wards of Savannah. Therefore, it has a long history with numerous buildings that have come and gone over time. However, they know today as the main street in the configuration of Broughton Street. Mr. Sottile said they have sought to understand some of those previous layers and that the staff has done a good job in explaining some of the layers, but the site they know today is the composite. It has the traces of the remnants of former buildings on it, which they are intrigued with and they have endeavored to study those. It also provides a passage through to the square visually of which they are very intrigued by that.

Mr. Sottile said that some of the ornaments that the Board sees on site today that remains are some of the cast iron columns of the former structure; a beam that spans around the site above the expression line remains on the site as well as remnants of the old party walls. He said, however, they see the site in its larger context facing Broughton Street and providing a view to Telfair Academy and the square. He said this is in part because there are currently no structures between the lane and State Street. However, they recognize that this is a condition that can change over time. There it is a good condition of their time and this moment, which they take very seriously because it is a direct view to the site from the square. As he has said, they spent an enormous amount of time thinking hard about this project. In fact, the uniqueness and the smallness of this site, they believe cause the need for a great deal of careful thought. They have studied the site and have looked at it in five foot increments of what the various views were as they move up both facing Broughton Street and the lane. Mr. Sottile said they have included some of this in the Board's packet.

Mr. Sottile pointed out that another building that is important to note as they consider the site is actually the structure that is directly across the street. He said that the building is one of the most wonderful façades on Broughton Street. It is one that they feel the design solution is proposed in a direct referential relationship; a measured contrast with its context both to the east and west and across the street. They have measured the context carefully; every structure within their own block and the lane. As archeologists, they mapped the walls of the structures that were on the site before as a way of better understanding the opportunity here and the idea of a building being a part of the larger continuum. He said, therefore, this is a ghostly mapping of the former structure on the adjacent party wall. They can see the openings that have been closed-in and see the beam pockets where the floor

heights were and this is inspiring to them. The design concept of the building seeks to propose a bold contemporary intervention in their own time, but at the same references a very old idea about architecture and its possibilities. Mr. Sottile stated that he believes that one word that matters most here is "humanism" and the way they think about the built-in environment. They looked back to Broughton Street and even structures such as the old National Bank building, which is a great loss to Savannah, was at the corner of Bull and Broughton Streets where the SunTrust Parking structure is today. This was a building that was known because it was a tall building which reminds them that cities grow and cities shrink. But, this is not why they included it here. Mr. Sottile said he never really studied it in detail before was the decorative program of the structure at the street level, which includes a series of figure of forms in the piers of the building. This idea of architectural and humanity are in fact a part of the same project. He said that one of the ways forward in a city known for a continuum of architecture is to propose ways to connect new technologies and new design strategies with everlasting principles. Therefore, they were inspired by those traditions and certainly buildings in Savannah. They have, consequently, gently approached this building as if it is in fact a person standing there at a dress in the blockface.

Mr. Sottile said the idea of developing a structure that would be slightly taller than the neighboring structures in the tradition of a visual rhythm in the skyline is an idea that they took very seriously from the beginning. It lead them to a design that would meet the sky with a great deal of conviction, it would open up the street level and provide a view through. In a sense, it would provide a complete solution. A solution with great deal of integrity both from a visual compatibility standpoint and a proportional standpoint. Therefore, thinking of the upper architectural as a high quality, intervention and thinking of the street level as a very engaging and transparent experience to maintain some of the memory of this site. He said the idea of an architecture finding a balance with each other and architects historically are included in their proposal is away of explaining though destining of where the sculpture and the architecture begin and how can a new building with new technologies explore that intersection.

Mr. Sottile said they began with the street level and took to heart the remnants of the former structure and leaving those elements on the site; cast iron columns and the beam as a starting point for the new building. He said just imagine a four-story structure floating above the street then that beam becomes the demarcation between the lower architecture and the upper architecture. They also, in studying the tradition of Broughton Street's best facades the expression line between the retail level and the upper levels is one of those moments where each building in its own way contributes a design thought; it is an addition to the vocabulary of the entire street. Therefore, they felt that this would be one of those moments; what if they build off that beam that is there and create an intervention that they are referring to as a cloud, really it is a canopy, that helps the upper architecture sort of visually separates from the street and sort of hovers up above the street. This would be designed with very modern intent, but in a way a very old idea. He said if the Board looks at the expression line of the adjacent structures, it is designed to carry across the horizontal rhythm from adjacent buildings. What would happen below the line would be very transparent and what would happen above would be a building constructed of the highest quality materials.

Mr. Sottile stated that the street level concept is to be more transparent which would also be in the tradition of Broughton Street. He said pointing to an area that this rendering is a

part of the visual thinking behind that idea; the uniqueness of this site is not that it is the only vacant site on Broughton Street that is this small and focused, but it is also like a view finder and a camera is pointing directly at the portico of the Telfair Academy. He believes this is what they appreciate most about this site. It is very challenging as an architect to put a building on a site that has certain intriguing qualities as an empty site, but they recognize that there is a missing tooth and this is an opportunity to repair the city in this area. Therefore, how can they design a building that recognizes this condition very fully and takes it head on and provide a solution that is tied to its context uniqueness of that site.

Mr. Sottile said this idea led to their façade design presenting a transparent central section is to allow that view finder, that camera shot through the building to the Telfair Academy, locating their two entries to the size of the building; one for the upper levels and one for the retail space below, and the cloud separating the upper architecture and then the upper architecture hovering just a little above the street level. He said as they moved into the design of the upper structure, they took to heart the structure that is across the street in its unified presentation of window groupings and also meeting the sky with intent and with a subtle and gentle set of lines. Mr. Sottile said they studied this façade in numerous considerations to come to the Board with this proposal. What they are looking at on the sketch is the conversation; this careful conversation between two buildings across the street, separated by at least 100 years. Mr. Sottile said a modern building is not an opposition. They want to put a building here that is entirely respectful of its place and in a way actually foretells new possibilities.

Mr. Sottile said they have studied this condition both from the street and from the lane; and they have given the lane a level of priority, not as high level of priority as Broughton Street, but a serious use of high quality materials. They are using limestone in the main façade of the building as well as steel windows. These materials in core details telegraph to the lane façade as well.

Mr. Sottile said the structure has been described in the staff report as a six-story building, but he wanted to be clear that this a five-story building. It is classified as a six-story structure by the ordinance and they are aware of that, but in intent there is no question, this is a five-story building. The sixth-story suggests an entire floor of a building, but this is not what they have presented. He said that they have designed a five-story structure with a rooftop conservatory, a garden structure above the building on the roof. Mr. Sottile said every time he hears six-stories, he shudders a little because it is not the building that has been designed. But, as he has said, technically he understands the ordinance's classification. In the design of the building, they have carried the structure inboard from the party walls to allow the building to cantilever its floor plates to allow the existing historic party walls to be evident to the use on the interior. Therefore, all historic elements remain in place. The design of the structure presents itself to the street as a four-story mass above the street level as a five-story building; the sixth level sets back from the main façade. They have collected the windows into a single element and they are proposing decorative program as well for the façade, both in the element of the expression line at the street level and in the upper architecture as the parapet concludes in the center of the building.

Mr. Sottile stated that the massing model has been passed to the Board and he entertained questions from the Board.

Dr. Williams stated that historically the original building would have extended out under

the sidewalk level. Would the new structure do this?

Mr. Sottile said there is in fact a granite perimeter that defines a light well and it is still in the sidewalk and they intend to restore it.

Dr. Williams said this was his question as a lovely granite that the neighboring buildings did restore and an opportunity here is to do the same. He said he believed that building actually extended out that far, but the plan showed it only going to the lot line.

Dr. Williams asked staff that if a design element is beyond a lot line, where does this fall under the Review Board's purview.

Ms. Harris answered that this will be a Part II element.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Sottile to address the staff's recommendations specifically. He was aware that he talked about reducing the heights and that he feels it is five-stories rather than a six-story building. He understands this argument because the sixth story sets further enough back and restudy the ground level solids to voids to provide stronger solids to be grounded. Mr. Howington said he also understands that he wants to keep this open and he explained that by saying they are going to float it. He also asked Mr. Sottile to explain the incorporation of central entrance.

Mr. Sottile said the staff noted that the height of the building is visually compatible according to the visual compatibility factors. He said primarily it goes back to the core idea that this building really is a person standing in the block. They feel the proportion is the key in developing that design and reducing a story from the building voids the entire concept completely. They approached the design with this idea in mind that this is a complete thesis. Therefore, in this case they agree wholeheartedly with staff that it is visual compatible. But, they respectfully disagree with the recommendation to remove a story from the building.

Mr. Sottile said he touched on the roofline variations. He believes it was mentioned that Broughton Street is a mixed of buildings of various heights. This is something that they appreciate, enjoy and uphold in the ordinance and in the Height Map. Mr. Sottile said something that Savannah presents to them very well and they feel that they have calibrated the height again at that fifth story level, which is the leading façade on Broughton Street. He said, pointing to an area, that the Board can see it in the model that rhythm is maintained. He said with the Argentinis building, the height of the parapet is actually 66 feet. Therefore, it is a five-story height that follows the tradition of the rhythm; and they believe this is the correct approach to achieve this design concept.

Mr. Sottile said the question about restudying the solids and voids at the street level, he will respectfully suggest that maybe they have overly romanticized the transparency of the street level in their application. They mean for it to be totally transparent, but this does not make it different than other buildings that are on Broughton Street today. In fact, even in the same block they see facades that are very different at the ground level than they are on the upper levels where the visual weight of the masonry sits over and almost impossibly transparent base. Therefore, this is not something that they think is misguided or inappropriate for Broughton Street. As a matter of fact, it is the Broughton Street way to do it and there are so many good examples of this. They intend to continue this tradition with this proposal. In

fact some facades that are actually below the expression line have no façade at all and is carrying the weight of the upper architecture. Some facades are entirely glass, this is a great diversity. Mr. Sottile said he believes they know this, but it was a reminder going back and studying the diversity of facades that have curvatures and square entries with no structure. He said, therefore, in this case they think the proposal is visually compatible and respectfully the request the Board's consideration of the design.

Mr. Sottile said he wanted to address the offset entryway. He explained that this is one of those issues that the ordinance is a good ordinance. The principle of a central entry is a good principle; now this is not the reason they did not propose it here, the uniqueness of this site and its context is the reason they proposed something different. They will not be the only building that varies from that standard of a central entry is context driven. An example is that one of their neighbor's has a corner entry for a good reason; it is on a corner. Therefore, the context drives the entry and the second entry adheres the other end of the façade and no entry in the middle.

Mr. Sottile said another example of a 30 foot building with two entries that are offset flanking the sides of a façade or another example of a building with an entry that is not centered on the property. He said that another example of a show window at the street and the two entries flanking that. Therefore, he believes that there is the richness and variety that are there is something that the street certainly accommodates and the context should drive that. So, they feel their variation would be appropriate.

Dr. Henry said this is a wonderful design. It is nice to see that high quality materials will be used. He said he was at one time involved in campus planning and he learned something about the necessity of proportionality relative to neighbors. He said that his chief concern is the height. He asked Mr. Sottile to give the height comparison on the east and west facades.

Mr. Sottile said he would elaborate on the specific height in sections. He explained that the five-story structure that leads on Broughton Street, is a 66 foot high façade. This is where the building concludes to the pedestrian. He said the parapet line is the five-story line in section, the rooftop garden structure is setback about 30 feet from the front façade. This is actually the entire width of the structure.

Dr. Henry asked if you would be able to see the garden structure from the street.

Mr. Sottile answered that you would not be able to see it from the street. He said that the street has a 75 foot right-of-way. Therefore, it would be impossible to see it from the street. The sixth level, the rooftop structure, is setback 23 feet from the lane façade as well and in fact is setback from the façade; therefore it is an entirely independent component of the building. It does classify as a six-story by the ordinance, but it is not a sixth-story in design intent. As it relates to the adjacent structures, Mr. Sottile said the Board can see in the two side views that they have taken the five-story line and deliberately carried it all the way across the block. They have seen more recent buildings that have a sort of nervous façade where it goes back and steps up and you get a zigzag saw tooth thing, he believes that this is not the way to approach this. This is a very confidentially five-story building that has this element added to it. With this mind, they carried the cornices back entirely from front to back. Therefore, the building ends at five stories. The addition is in fact very visually distinct from the core architecture.

Dr. Henry said he did some measuring and he included the conservatory which he thought was visible. To him, the west elevation was 23 feet higher than the adjacent building. The east elevation was 31 feet, 32 feet higher than the peak of the roof. He said the bump-ups at the end is all one foot in line as far as he could tell. Dr. Henry said these are heavy differences. His understanding was that the conservatory could be seen. Am I wrong on that?

Mr. Howington said he believes that Mr. Sottile is saying that you would not be able to see the conservatory from Broughton Street head on. You will be able to see it when you are further a way.

Mr. Sottile stated that from an angle, you would be able to see it.

Mr. Howington said the conservatory is similar to penthouses that the Board has reviewed in the past. Normally, they are setback from the front façade.

Mr. Sottile said looking at the model and looking from the street level, you can see the building line that comes across and then comes down, the rooftop addition sits in the center of the block. Therefore, from a long view down the street that will be visible, but from a pedestrian eye level you are viewing the front of the building and it would be concealed. In fact, they could have it much closer to the façade and it would still be concealed. However, they see the upper level as a roof garden and this is a structure within a roof garden. It is classified as a sixth floor, but it is not a complete floor.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Sottile if he knew the height of the taller building east of the vacant lot, the J. Crew building.

Mr. Sottile answered that they know the heights of the buildings because they measured every façade in their process. He answered that the building is 62 feet tall.

Mr. Howington said the building is four feet less than the five stories.

Mr. Sottile said the building across the street is a 68 foot structure which is taller. They are aware of this as the range of the buildings height on Broughton Street goes from 65 feet up to 90 feet normally; not counting the 11 story buildings that have been lost. However, the buildings on Broughton Street today are in this range. Therefore, they felt confident that the 66 feet height for the parapet was the right height.

Dr. Williams said if it was a four-story building at the same height it would not be an issue. When the ordinance was written, they specifically did not designate the story heights limited so that you could actually have a four story building that is even taller than this building. Therefore, this achieves roughly the same height as the double arched building across the street. Yet, it is five stories versus four stories. It is shorter with an extra story. Dr. Williams said he thinks that the problem with the Height Map is that it measures things in stories and not in actual feet to achieve this kind of variability.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Sottile to go back to the cross section. He is trying to understand how tall the greenhouse is. He said that the cross section shows eight feet.

Mr. Sottile answered that it is eight feet above the parapet. He stated that the total height of the floor is 9 1/2 feet. The parapet is 18 inches of exposed height. The height in section is 8 feet above the parapet, but 9'6" total. As staff mentioned, this will actually be a variation to come down from the minimum height of 10 feet for that level.

Dr. Williams asked, therefore, is the interior height of the entire structure 9'6." Since Mr. Sottile will be seeking a variance, there may be an opportunity here to drop the rooftop conservatory down a bit. If this could be done, it might help to appease some of the concerns regarding the visibility. Obviously, it will be visible from the Telfair area. How much height is necessary to function as a conservatory?

Mr. Sottile said they looked at the height very carefully recognizing that the balance is not in compliance with the ordinance in doing a 10 foot story; they do not see it as a story, but as doing something that would be appropriate. The 9'-6" include the structure needed. It is compacted as much as it can possibly be, but it can be taller than that. But, they feel this is the right balance.

Mr. Sottile stated that also in a broader sense with this project they talk about the uniqueness of this site as they consider the variance criteria in seeking the fifth floor. They respectfully disagree with the staff report as it is written that the site is not unique. He said in the context of today and filling a site that has been vacant for more than 20 years, he believes there is a reason that it is vacant. They wrestled with how to put a building on this site that is independent, it is very challenging as a 30 foot site, modern egress code, and accessibility code require an enormous amount of infrastructure in the building so that actual spatial constraints are significant. Therefore, they approached this realizing that as an independent building to be able to truly balance the programs, the spatial constraints of the site as the smallest infill site that is vacant on Broughton Street was one that necessitated doing a building that would be unique and would be a variation from the norm. Mr. Sottile said if it were a building being designed in conjunction with other buildings or if other buildings were demolished to create more footprint for it, then that would not be an issue for them; but as an independent structure, it would have a circulation system that could support a building three times larger or more. However, the reality is as an independent structure, they have to carry all that lost space to be able to make this building work. This is exciting; it is good to have independent buildings in this city.

Mr. Gunther said he wanted them to look at the lane side of the building for a moment. He knows that Mr. Sottile cannot predict what will happen in the future to the parking lots behind them, but he is sure that this was a part of their thought processes for the design. He asked Mr. Sottile that thinking about the future, how does this façade relate to the potential future development. He also asked him to speak to the visual compatibility of this façade in relation to what are the utilitarian facades doing for the rest of those.

Mr. Sottile said they all know that the lanes are utilitarian. This project straddles the line between being a public façade in the intermediate term may be for the next 50 years. He explained that they carried a component of the geometry of the central arch on the primary façade, not the entire arch, but carried a segment of the arch telegraphs through the building. Therefore, they can visually associate the rear with the front even though they are different, but there is some DNA between the two that is shared. They did this in a simple way. They present a single collective bay of windows in the center of the structure between the offset of the façade, but in the remaining portion of the façade they go to a rhythm of

punched openings, which relates it to the neighbors both to the east and to the west. Therefore, it is a way for this building to have its own centralized context related to its Broughton Street image, but also to tie it back and relate it to the window pattern and rhythms.

Dr. Williams said to put a little context on lane elevations, a little further to the east there is a building on the southwest corner of Bull and Broughton Streets; it is immediately north of the CVS and that lane elevation is actually better preserved than the other elevation west on the Broughton and Bull Streets elevations. It is unusual, but there is a precedence for buildings to actually carry the high style; the cornice; and the cast stone lintels. He said that all the details of the main façade were carried around and down the lane.

Ms. Simpson said the ground floor elevation does not have the openings.

Dr. Williams said it is hard to know how opening it originally was, but it definitely had openings because it had full height cast iron.

Mr. Howington said the building that Dr. Williams is referring to is on the southwest corner of Bull and Broughton Streets.

Mr. Howington said he likes the idea of the floating building, but Mr. Sottile mentioned in his presentation about the beam that goes across and the remnants of cast iron columns that use to be here and that they could still see those and why he departed from that is because the façade of this building kind of evokes to him sort of a crystal place kind of feeling. But, it totally departs on the ground floor from the cast stone coming down to the ground and floating which he appreciates as well. It totally departs on the ground floor from those cast irons coming down to the ground and floating which he appreciates, too. He asked Mr. Sottile what is his argument for departing from this. Mr. Howington said he understands the floating the building and he understand the arguments of separated entries and he thinks they are valid arguments. But, there is something about the grounding that he would like to see except for the cloud. It feels to him that some of that cast iron column should come down and be grounded.

Mr. Sottile explained that the cast iron columns remain on site in the design. In fact, the inset entries to the east and west are calibrated by having those columns there and through breathing. Therefore, you can see them fully expressed as they are originally designed. The glass sets behind them; those recessed entryways actually allow the breathing room around the columns. So, they stay in place and you actually walk by the columns before you enter the building. Mr. Sottile explained, pointing to an area, that they do introduce two other solid vertical elements in the façade that you can see here which actually carry the visual weight of the building. They have not entirely opened up the street level; they are focusing on the section in the middle being fully transparent. He pointed out where the crystal cast iron is located and it would have a sister that would be a more streamlined, more contemporary column that would pick up the rhythm and pick up the visual alignment of the upper architecture, the limestone arch that comes down and then the beam spans the balance of that space and the curtain wall sits behind the beam. Therefore, the beam is fully revealed as well. It is intended to have a light footprint and a light touch to the other remaining elements and they are interpreted. They have not removed them. In fact they have given them space so they can be seen fully. He said that this extends to the interior. Those little beam pockets, everything about the façade that has these ghostly memories; the former

structures are part of this building as human thread.

Dr. Williams said he believes that one of his questions has already been answered because at this point the sketches are more gestural than definite because they are in Part I. Dr. Williams said he wonders if there is an opportunity here to speak to being contemporary, but also to capture the spirit of the Baroque style. He believes that they run in the opposite direction and a part of the criticism that has been leveled against the design is the perceived lack of support. Dr. Williams said he wonders if there is a different contemporary solution. If they look at the way the façade is articulated, the central mass has this sort of secondary shorter, thinner outer component all the way out that appears to be recessed. Is it recessed?

Mr. Sottile explained that it is a slightly recessed panel. It comes out and then recesses.

Dr. Williams said in effect, they have the middle part of the building is somewhat proud of the outer bits. Therefore, he wonders if this is inviting the petitioner to think more about the central section being more augmentative of the ground floor with heavier piers; not thinner, but thicker. This would be more in keeping with the spirit of the Baroque to amplify, not trim.

Mr. Sottile said the rhetorical moment is the cloud in this sense. Therefore, the idea of the cloud, in fact, carries the weight of the upper architectures.

Dr. Williams said Mr. Sottile has said that these things are grounding the designs; they are the visually supports. Therefore, in a sense, Mr. Sottile is arguing it both ways that he is providing support, but then he is saying that the design rests in the cloud. He explained, however, what he is saying is that there is an opportunity to have supports that are augmented and it would solve some of the challenges that are being faced.

Mr. Sottile said they will be studying the entry in detail as they bring the design forward for Part II. He wanted to amend slightly what he said before. He believes that the sisters to the old cast iron columns are meant to not to take away from the impact of the cast iron columns and are not meant to carry the weight down. They are meant to carry the eye down; to trace the line down, but they intend for the parallelism of the old beam and cloud to be the thing that creates a unified composition separating the upper architecture. It is a little like the columns in front of the SCAD's Museum of Art where the lantern comes down. They do not propose the columns carrying the weight of lantern, but they help trace those lines down to the ground in a classical way. This is one of the ways that they will find the right switch and balance the façade as they study it in detail.

Ms. Simpson said what she is about to say maybe a Part II issue, however, they can see it in Part I. She said not the crystal palace piece, but the top story window is artful in nature which different than what they are used to seeing in Savannah. Even with the crystal palace piece and that art nouveau are architecture that we are not use to seeing in Savannah. Ms. Simpson was wondering how this would be perceived here.

Mr. Sottile said he believes this is a great question and they are working with the building on how to create sophisticated references to human aspects of tradition and architectural and then run with them in materials and execution in an entirely contemporary way. Therefore, this will be a building that has never seen before. This is the conversation that

they want to continue. He said if the Board permits him, he wants to tell a short personal story that hits home for him. He grew up in a building on Taylor Street and Monterey Square. The building was built in 1853 and is rather an ordinary building. The owners modified the building at the turn of the century, 1902, and created a wonderful addition. It was something that had not been before in Savannah and was amazing and was executed with this great sense of conviction, intent, and quality. He knew this because he has worked on the gutters and has seen the hand-crimped copper soldered on the side over the window heads. Therefore, the possibility of a small building doing some things that have not been done before in the City, he believes that the potential of this project is the right site to do that because it is such a stable context and the owners are asking the right questions and the commitment to quality is here. In fact, the fifth-story variance is not only for them saying they have that commitment, but it furthers the commitment because it enacts the large scale development standards which require high quality materials for higher steeple windows which are things that they are committed to doing. This is one of those single sites in Savannah to do something special and do something that becomes important for them in the future.

Mr. Gunther said he understood that transparency is apparently welcoming, but he wanted Mr. Sottile to speak to the modesty of the entry. He realizes why the entry is placed where it is, but it is a modest entrance for such a transparency structure that is meant to clearly interact with the street.

Mr. Sottile said he thinks that this is all that is needed. He believes that the visual effect of the building is providing the portal, the view part all the way through to the square. This says it all; the evidence of how to enter the building will be ample because of the view into the structure. Mr. Sottile said it will be a wider than average door because it is a single leaf. He believes that it specified as 3' - 8" and, therefore, it will have a generous width; it is not a double door. In their opinion, the importance of maintaining that view corridor was the principle objective of this street level design.

Dr. Williams said a four panel design seems to be sketched. Is this the anticipation in the central area on the first floor at the street level?

Mr. Sottile said they will find this out as they move into the detail. But, it will be a butt glass façade. Apple stores do this all the time, it is not exotic technology but they think it is the right technology and it is certainly the technology of our time.

Dr. Williams asked if it is possible to have this, but with the central two-panes operable as doors.

Mr. Sottile said there is not hardware to do this, they have been explored this before. It is remarkable, the weight of the glass requires hinging and lower and upper structure to those doors are surprising; especially given modern impact resistance and requirements of the building code. Therefore, they felt the right solution was to have a moment there that is absolutely pristine and clear and inside delivery.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Harris read the following comments from the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF):

"In general, HSF received the conceptual design for the proposed building in a positive light. We think that this particular vacant lot can be afforded some flexibility with respect to increased height. However, we have some concerns. HSF sees designs for a handsome and arguably successful infill building that is two stories above the standard.

HSF also sees the importance of respecting and defending the Height Map—not because it is the norm but because it is a rational, thoughtful and time-tested process that protects the context of existing historic architecture and the pedestrian-friendly feel of comfortably walking among humanely-scaled buildings.

We respect the petitioner and his creative approach, but a proposed 6-story building is not one but two stories above the standard. And in reading the application and staff report, HSF is not convinced that the criteria have been met to warrant a recommendation for a height variance—at least not for two stories in one bite as it were. Granted, the petitioner appears to have a sincere interest in designing and constructing an exceptional building and that is reflected by the thoughtful approach we see in their application.

The proposed height and mass of this building may not be as jarring as recently approved hotel projects and, in the end, it may even prove to be visually compatible. Broughton Street enjoys buildings with height variation and this creates a pleasing visual rhythm, so there is room for differentiation in height—as long as it is proportional. The question is, are 6 stories necessary? Could the proposed design be successful, for example, with 5 stories? If it can work with 5, then that's where the line should be drawn. A 5-story building affords the petitioner an extra story, does not throw out the Height Map and can be visually compatible with its context.

Regarding the extensive glazing on the ground floor facades of the street and lane elevations, HSF strongly agrees with Staff's recommendation that the ground level be restudied to provide stronger solids so that the building is more "grounded." The entirely glass ground floor does not appear to relate to the upper floors and we think the style and the design of the building warrant a more visually solid and structural base that continues what is on the floors above."

Mr. Michael Brown said this is awkward for him. He hates to disagree with Mr. Sottile because he likes his architecture and designs; especially the Argentinis site. Mr. Brown said he believes the idea is interesting and the infill is badly needed. The problem he has is the reality of it. He has four buildings on this block. The referenced building, J. Crew building, is actually lower than this building. This building is on a 30 foot lot and the J. Crew building is on a 90 foot lot. Mr. Brown said, therefore, a scale is here that he believes as to be contended with. This is a large scale development on a small lot. This is the smallest lot on Broughton Street. It is 16,200 square feet on a 2,700 square foot lot. It is 41 percent larger than his building next door, which is a lot. Mr. Brown stated that what confuses him as far as the Board is concerned is that they have the Chadborne guidelines from 1992 and the Height Map of 1997; he believes that they should be adhering to because they are guidelines. If they are not going to be adhered to, then they are worthless documents and what is the point of using them as a reference.

Mr. Brown said just as he was talking to Mr. Sottile earlier, frankly the façade is beautiful and it reminds him of early 20th century art nouveau Vienna. It has that feel to it and he is not sure this is bad; it certainly is compatible with, but he feels that the height is not compatible. Sadly, he feels that the only reason to deviate from the Chadborne guidelines and from the Height Map is for the benefit of the owner. He hates to say this, but he feels

that it would be to the detriment of him because it is so out of scale. However, in a positive note, the design is good for infill and he believes that a talented design architect like Mr. Sottile could design an appropriate building within the guidelines if they are required to do so. The references are a little misleading. The SunTrust building that was shown had 11 stories, but this building is 2,700 square feet and is a small lot. The SunTrust building was built on a 13,500. Therefore, the FAR ratio is not that far off.

Mr. Brown said he does not believe that it has a lot to do with Savannah that was not even here a 100 years before. Therefore he is not sure to reference made of this and he is not sure of the human scale if it has anything to do with the drama of the height of this building. It can still be a wonderful building, but as presented it is not appropriate. It sets precedence. Firstly, it is difficult to take a 30 foot frontage, take a 16,200 square building and consider it to be able to float. This just does not seem appropriate; he was not saying that the design is bad, but that the terminology is probably a little off. If they use that FAR ratio for this building, his building across the street, the Kress building, should be allowed to have a five-story increase because it is on a 120 by 90 lot. Therefore, theoretically, if he came in with a five-story height increase on the Kress building, it would be proportionate to this building. He is sure that the Board would not consider that as not being appropriate. Mr. Brown said he believes they have to take this under consideration. He said Mr. Sottile mentioned an interesting design line that has nothing to do with this building, however, it was brought up, so he will use it. Reference was made to Manhattan, New York and Brooklyn. There are six flights a day from Savannah to New York and it is filled with people from Savannah that want to go see New York architecture. Conversely, there are six flights a day from New York of people from New York that wants to come see Savannah's architecture. Therefore, he does not believe that you have to bring New York to Savannah; he does not think that is necessary. Also an interesting sidelight to the Greek aspect of it is that he has some experience in this and he owned a historic property in Greece for 21 years and he tried for two years to get a three foot by three foot masonry water reservoir on his roof and he was rejected. These are the people that really stick to their guidelines.

Mr. Brown said he does not understand what could be wrong with working in the rules and he would like for the Board to maintain the integrity of the guidelines that are in place. He was not saying that this isn't an appropriate design wise, but as he has said he believes it is totally inappropriate for height. The building across the street that was referenced to the 62 foot building to the north of it, is twice the size. It is on a 60 foot lot and this is on a 30 foot lot. It is lower in height than this building, even though it is on twice the lot size. It is higher than their building, the J. Crew building which is 120 foot by 90 foot. Therefore, it is five times the size of this lot and is lower. But, he agrees that the lane elevation on their building when they restored it, they put in normal size windows, he believes 10 feet; they put in balconies and reconstructed the metal shutters. Therefore, they had a finished lane façade.

Mr. Brown asked the Board to ask Mr. Sottile to reconsider and that he and the staff come up with an interesting design that will meet the Chadborne guidelines.

Dr. Williams showed the building on the monitor. He said it is a 30 foot wide building.

Ms. Caldwell asked Mr. Brown how he would feel if the building was exactly the same, but was four stories.

Mr. Brown answered that he feels it would be perfect. He said technically and by the rules

the building can be, but he does not believe that it would be appropriate.

Ms. Caldwell asked Mr. Brown if he was saying, therefore, that he does not feel the building is appropriate even if it was allowed.

Mr. Brown said no; not compared to the buildings that are on either side. If it was a building on either side such as the tempering that was just brought up, then he would totally agree.

Mr. Ruel Joyner came forth and stated not only are he and his family property owners on Broughton Street, but he is also a proud resident of Savannah. He is excited to see before the Board today not only just a project of this scale, but somebody that really cares about the city. Mr. Joyner said he wanted to echo something that Mr. Brown said which is this is going to set precedence. Yes, it is going to set a precedence of excellence. This is a very well thought-out, a very well designed project and building that has been done for months. A family is here that is asking for relief and for the wisdom of this Board to see why and be able to uphold that.

Mr. Joyner said their name is on the top of their building and when they did that there were some issues with it as some people were saying that they should not be allowed to do that because it was not there before. Mr. Joyner said they disagreed because when you put your name on your building you are showing pride and later on you will ensure that the windows are intact, painted and do not fall into disrepair. This is the type of commitment that the Board is getting from the Argentinis family.

Ms. Simpson said she noticed that the Height Map says four-stories. Therefore, why the petitioner is only asking for a one story variance. Why not a two-story variance?

Ms. Harris stated that the petitioner could have asked for a two story variance. She explained that what the petitioner is proposing is that once they get to five floors, then they qualify as large scale development. Under those provisions, then they can qualify for a bonus story. Only once the variance for the fifth-story is granted do they qualify for the sixth bonus story.

Ms. Simpson said she thinks this is excellent architecture and she would love to see what the Board will see at the meeting, but she agrees with staff comments. This is such an important project and she has such fond love for Broughton Street.

Mr. Paul Sinclair said he found this uncomfortable for him to stand before the Board; however, he felt that it was necessary for him to be here and share his concerns. Mr. Sinclair said his biggest concern is the height of the building and how it will impact his business. He has owned his building for a year. He and his nephew intend to open a restaurant and have residential on the second and third floors. For the last year they have been working on those plans. They envision having a nice wood deck up there and a little pergola where their patrons could enjoy the view, the lights and the breeze. This is primarily how the petitioners' building will impact them. He was not going to venture into whether the petitioners' building is appropriate for Savannah. He will leave this decision to the Review Board. Mr. Sinclair said that the petitioner is showing the Board their adjacent drawings to the development of the height, not the adjacent buildings to the height, but the petitioner is showing their building. He said that the building is more different than what

was displayed. It is more pronounced and is roughly 50 feet and from a visual standpoint if you are looking at the right, what they will see is really 79 feet. Therefore, the height structure is the elevator of the line. They have shown a nice view of the front to the back, but if you are looking to your left you are basically looking at all those structures that are 75 feet.

Mr. Sinclair said it is a little unfortunate because he was never approached about this building. When you talk about integrity of architecture, talk with your neighbors. May be if the petitioner had talked with them about some of their plans, if there is a problem with architecture, may be they soften this. There was no mention of any impact on the neighbors. He believes that they are disproportionately affected by the height of that building. On one hand it is a beautiful building he believes it is great that it will be built here, but as he has said he feels uncomfortable about the height. He is not against the building. May be the architect can meet with his architect.

Mr. Doug Weathers said he has been here in Chatham County for more than 65 years. The Argentinis came here voluntarily. But, he came to Savannah by the United States Air Force. He had never been to Savannah before. He came here on the train called "Nancy Hanks." He remembers the terrible smell of Savannah and asked the baggage handler what was that smell. The individual told him that smell was "money." He was told that is Union Camp. However, that smell is no longer here.

Mr. Weathers said he came here in 1951. This was the time when entrepreneurs were trying to get things moving. A gentleman by the name of Edward G. Knight was trying to get a television station started called WTOC. He was running a radio station for CBS and he was located in the old DeSoto Hotel. He eventually got the opportunity to build the first television station in Savannah, Georgia. They did not have a Metropolitan Planning Commission at that time. But, these guys were forward thinking and wanted to do something for this community. This is the way he sees the Argentinis family. They came to Savannah voluntarily and opened a plant in Midway that put many people to work. Mr. Weathers said in 1999 or 2000 they were trying to organize the 200 Club. This is an organization that takes care of the widows of police officers, firemen, and emergency respondents. They do this at no cost to them. Mr. Argentinis tried to do this because he had experience with this. Mr. Argentinis, Sylvan Byck and the current City Attorney, Brook Stillwell, wanted to start this 200 Club. Mr. Weathers said these men asked him if he would join them and that was his first meeting with Tac Argentinis, but he found out that he really likes to do things right. He has been up and down Broughton Street a million times just as the rest of Savannah has; and he came here Broughton Street was the hub of the Coastal Empire. Everyone who came to Savannah showed up on Broughton Street to shop. Unfortunately he saw the deterioration of Broughton Street, especially from Bull Street west to Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. The street continually went down. Now, an empty lot is there and here is a man who wants to bring his family here to the particular location, live there and build a building. The site is an eyesore now, but when that building is built, it will be very pretty.

Mr. Weathers said as an individual who has been in Savannah for 65 years, he sees no reason whatsoever why that building would not enhance Broughton Street. He wanted to guarantee the Board that the building would never go down; it will always be kept up. He knows Tac Argentinis and knows what he does. He asked the Board to please consider what Argentinis family is trying to do. He has seen the architecture plan and he is not an architect, but he knows what is good for the eyes and this building will be good for the eyes

and for Broughton Street. .

Mr. John Collins stated that his wife, Gloria, owns a business on Gordon Street. Mr. Collins said, he, too, has spent much time on Broughton Street. He has watched the changes over the years. He believes that what the Argentinis family will do here would be great. As members of the Review Board their responsibility is to approve things and make something that is good to really happen. Mr. Collins said it is the Board's job to control change and he believes that approving this building will be a positive change for Broughton Street.

Ms. Lisa Grove of the Telfair Museum appeared in support of the project. The museum has been in Savannah for many years. The Telfair Museum looks directly onto the lane. They are providing an investment in the neighborhood. They recognize that they have a stake in the future of Broughton Street and downtown. They believe the building will enhance the public square.

Ms. Jenny Gentry of Wells Fargo said she has spent a great amount of time on Broughton Street. She understands rules and regulations. She believes to approve a project of this quality will be the right thing to do. Ms. Gentry said she believes the dedication of the community and the thought that has gone into this project, is tremendous. She believes also that the long term benefit is huge. Ms. Gentry asked the Board to use their good judgment and consider the Argentinis Family project.

Mr. Steve Green said he has seen the deterioration of Broughton Street for many years, but now he is glad to see the return of this street. It is great that the Argentinis Family came here and invested in our city. A city is a living, breathing organism. He believes that Savannah is lucky to have Christian Sottile design a building that shows a different dimension. Mr. Green said, he, too, just as Jenny is in the banking industry. When someone comes into the bank to borrow money, they have to look at what the project is; look at the individual's character and look at what their intentions are. He is hopeful that the Review Board will do this as well. This is a very small lot and he appreciates the fact that they want to build a great building here. They have stated that they will use quality material on the building. Therefore, it will make a statement on Broughton Street and on the lane side. A small lot such as this is a real challenge. But, he believes a great opportunity lies here for all to see a signature building with a very unique style and design.

Ms. Alexa Frame said her mother (Rosemary Frame) served on the Metropolitan Planning Commission. Ms. Frame said she appreciates all the work that this Board does. She has lived in Chicago and New York . Ms. Frame said staff mentioned the height variance. She has worked with the Historic District Downtown. She understands this will be a mixed use. Ms. Frame said she is curious about the fact that they will have to offset the revenue generation that will be brought to this city. You have to look at the cost factor. If you cut the height back what will that do.

Mr. Thomson, MPC Executive Director, said he wanted to make it clear that this is the Savannah Historic District Board of Review. The Metropolitan Planning Commission is a different body.

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

Mr. Sottile said they certainly appreciate the comments that they have heard this afternoon. He said he listened attentively to the comments. Mr. Sottile said that FAR ratio was brought

up, but it is a zoning mechanism that they do not use in Savannah.

Mr. Howington said he wanted to make it clear that the Review Board has does not have any purview over economics. They review the visual compatibility and the height.

Mr. Sottile said that the building footprint is two-sided. In terms of height, 79 feet were identified in the staff's report. The 79 feet is the elevator overrun. In taking the elevator out, is 74 feet and to the top of the conservatory, it is 66 feet, but it actually steps back and down four and one-half feet along the east and west property line adjacent to the neighboring parcels. When they see the massing of the structure, this is included in the three dimensional drawings which will bear this out. The actual height is 61'-1/2 to that location. He was disappointed to hear it being said that an opportunity was not held to review their plans. They held outreach campaigns and felt that they had done their part to share with the entire community. At the Jepson Center, information was sent to the Broughton Street merchants as they were trying to let everyone know what they were doing. Articles were put in the newspaper about the project. Mr. Sottile stated that from a height and mass standpoint, their height is not that many feet. A four-story building could be built on this property with similar height.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry asked Dr. Williams and Mr. Gunther if they had a conflict of interest in this petition.

Mr. Gunther answered that he does not have a direct conflict in this project. Mr. Sottile works for SCAD, just as he and Dr. Williams. This is not a SCAD project. It is a project of a private property owner.

Mr. Howington said he believes just as was explained at the last meeting regarding Dr. Williams and Mr. Gunther working at SCAD and Mr. Sottile working there too is not a conflict of interest. This is not a SCAD project, but a private firm. This is viewed in the context of a private firm and a business entity.

Ms. McClain asked what position Mr. Sottile holds at SCAD.

Mr. Sottile said the reason he is here today is not because of SCAD. He works at SCAD as the Academic Dean and Project Design. Dr. Williams reports directly to him and Mr. Gunther reports indirectly.

Ms. McClain said there is a possible conflict. If Mr. Sottile is the Dean of SCAD, there is a conflict.

Mr. Thomson said they talked with the City Attorney about this and the actual test for conflict is generally a financial interest. He said certainly as professors at SCAD that neither of these gentlemen has a financial interest in this project. Now, what they advise that in order not to hear it from the grapevine that they state that there is a relationship in their employment that is not directly related to Mr. Sottile's independent business just for the sake full disclosure, but that either party say that they can be objective about making and objective decision. Mr. Thomson said they have had this tested many times on the Planning Commission. He is sure that if their performance evaluation showed something detrimental, they would know about it in the future. But, according to the City Attorney and other

precedent that they have been involved with this would not constitute a conflict of interest under the laws.

Dr. Williams said there is no financial relationship with SCAD.

Dr. Henry said he has been in this business and if you do something against your boss, you are in direct consequences.

Dr. Williams said there is nothing financial here. With all due respect, Mr. Sottile has been here at least four times since he has been a member of the Historic District Board of Review. Dr. Henry has been on this Board the same amount of time.

Mr. Howington said this was resolved at the last meeting and Mr. Thomson has elaborated that there is no conflict according to the City Attorney.

Mr. Thomson said there is always a perception of a conflict. This has been discussed many times on the Metropolitan Planning Commission. They always turn to the main rule and every body knows that rule, which is if you have a business relationship with a developer, but did not have a contract on the particular properties that was in front of the Planning Commission. One member did not mention this as a part of the preamble to the meeting. He should have stated that he has had previous business relationship with this developer, but I do not have one now and I can remain objective in my reviews of this case and be objective in my decision. If the member had done that, then there would not have been an issue, but he did not; and the opposition used that in the newspapers. Mr. Thomson said they went through the entire process of getting attorneys involved and written opinions and other things. Therefore, they have always advised that in these types of situations that the members put it out there for information.

Ms. McClain stated that the City Attorney has said that there is no conflict in this issue.

Mr. Howington thanked Dr. Henry for bringing this up, but he believes that it has been addressed.

Dr. Henry said it seems to be two things here. One is that a short building cannot be a beautiful building. He does not believe that this is necessarily true. As a Board, they have a serious responsibility to enforce height.

Dr. Williams said that certainly within the tradition of Broughton Street and this area including Telfair Square that buildings be dramatic in height. He believes that the petitioner showed that a building across the street with the double arches is taller than this building. The Temperance store is only four stories, but is taller. It has a two-story neighbor. It seems that the height versus stories is a stickler. Actually, it could be taller.

Ms. Harris explained it is the criteria of the Height Map.

Dr. Williams said the building is five stories because it has short stories. He believes they would have to look at it in a context of proportions versus absolute stories.

Mr. Howington said someone wanted to go a little taller, but the proportions were too wide and did not work. When it comes to proportions, the idea is the height and he agrees with

Dr. Williams that whether it is an encroachment variance or a height variance it more or less supports the other.

Dr. Williams said it looks like an opportunity is on the fifth floor to stepping back at the parapet level. He said on the sixth floor, they might want to ask the petitioner how critical is the greenhouse up on the roof. It seems like a nice place and there is a trellis behind it that is clearly visible from the lane. Therefore, he believes they need to perceive with the understanding as a five-story building.

Ms. Caldwell said they would love to see the historical building being given consideration. There are a lot of historical buildings around and the petitioners would be in their rights to go back as tall.

Mr. Gunther said he believes that they all are in agreement with the design as presented. He wanted to make sure that they are not sending mixed messages as a Board regarding the ordinance as recommending the floor height. They are embracing a good building, but he wanted to be sure that a mixed message is not being sent about the height. It has the perimeters of being potentially a four-story building.

Mr. Howington said he understands the ramifications of going beyond the Height Map. However, they have context. He said that his argument for this is that there is context across the street which is actually a taller building and down the street in the same block, there is a building that is taller than this building. Therefore, there is precedence in this same block for this height. It is not that they are going two stories or something that has never let a building of that height be around them. There is an argument for the compatibility in that the context.

Mr. Gunther said the Board would need to be careful in how they word this that yes in terms of height it is visually compatible, even though a number of stories is disagreeing with the compatibility.

Ms. Harris encouraged the Board to go back and reference the variance criteria in their motion decision. She said really the critical thing here is why is the Board supporting a variance or why they are not supporting a variance. The criteria on the staff report needs to be referenced.

Mr. Howington said the Board always need to stick to the rules that there are other methods and means of getting approval.

Ms. McClain asked that if they do not support a variance, what would be the reasons for that. She said she agrees with the staff's recommendations.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Harris what is the page number on the staff's report that shows the variance criteria.

Ms. Scheer said may be they need a green wall or something other than just a flat wall. May be some greenery will help. Bring the neighbors into it.

Dr. Williams said may be they need to revisit the massing.

Ms. Harris said in the staff's report the variance criteria start on page 12. She reminded the Board that the petitioner is asking for four variances. The Board needs to address all of these with the criteria. The ordinance requires that the Board make a finding for each of the criteria for the variance.

Ms. McClain said she believes the staff is on point with their recommendation. She agrees with staff. The Board needs to discuss the entrance. She agrees with staff that a center entrance should be here. She disagrees with the side entranceway.

Ms. Scheer said at Drayton Towers the center entry glass door is very heavy and has to be readdressed constantly.

Ms. McClain said she believes if more solid was at the bottom this would help. The glass could be changed to something else.

Ms. Scheer said she understood what was being said about the see-through, but once businesses get in there and people are there, you would not be able to see directly through to the Telfair Museum.

Ms. McClain said this is a beautiful building, but she believes the staff did an excellent job in relating this.

Mr. Howington said he gets a sense that the Board is somewhat split. Maybe the petitioner could ask for a continuance.

Mr. Sottile said they ask that the Board make a finding of fact as it relates to the visual compatibility of the structure. Then subsequently to that they will ask for a continuance to the petition.

Ms. Harris said the Board would need to address the variance criteria so that they may be presented to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Board Action:

1. The Savannah Historic District Board of Review continued Part 1 Height and Mass for a new six story building at 215 West Broughton Street at the request of the petitioner.
2. The Savannah Historic District Board of Review recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the following variances:
 - a. A one story variance above the Height Map.
 - b. A six inch variance from the minimum upper floor height of

10' (9'6" in proposed). [Note: This variance is only applicable if the Zoning Board of Appeals approves a one-story variance from the Height Map. Should that variance be denied, this variance will need to be reevaluated as part of a revised design.] - PASS

c. A one-foot variance from the minimum ground floor height of 14'6" (13'6" in proposed).

3. The Savannah Historic District Board of Review recommend denial to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a non-centered entrance on Broughton Street.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell

- Aye

Justin Gunther

- Aye

Nicholas Henry

- Nay

Keith Howington

- Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq.

- Nay

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

- Not Present

Marjorie W Reed

- Aye

Tess Scheer

- Aye

Ebony Simpson

- Not Present

Robin Williams

- Aye

16. [Petition of Matthew Allen, J. Leander LLC | 14-005100-COA | 427 East President Street | New Construction Residential: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Columbia Ward.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Panoramic Site Photograph.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Simpson left the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Mr. Matthew Allan was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a two-story, single-family residential building on

the vacant parcel located at 427 East President Street. The site is located on the easternmost portion of Columbia Square's southeastern Trust Lot; it is surrounded by streets on three sides and a non-contributing building to the west which sits on the property line. The proposed building is oriented to face East President Street with access to surface parking off of East York Street at the rear. The parcel is 41 feet wide by 61 feet -1.5 inches deep.

Ms. Michalak stated that the petitioner is also requesting a variance from the standard that states: Access to parking shall be from lanes or north-south service streets. When a property does not front a lane or north south service street, parking may be accessed from east-west connecting streets or trust streets. This is to allow access to the property's surface parking from East York Street, which is the east-west connecting street.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a two-story, single-family residential building on the vacant parcel located at 427 East President Street with the following conditions to be submitted for review by the Board with Part II, Design Details:

- a. Reduce the depth of the front door assembly recess.
- b. Ensure that the new driveway, off East York Street serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

Ms. Michalak reported also that staff recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the standard that states: " Access to parking shall be from lanes or north-south service streets. When a property does not front a lane or north south service street, parking may be accessed from east-west connecting streets or trust streets," to allow access to the property's surface parking from East York Street, which is the east-west connecting street, because all other properties on the same Trust Block access their parking from East York Street and there is an existing curb cut in the proposed location. Additionally, the north-south street (Price) is a one-way high volume street and not a preferable location to enter the parking.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Allan came forward and thanked the Board for reviewing their petition and entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Allan if he was in agreement with the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Allan answered yes.

Mr. Gunther asked Mr. Allan if he had any worries about the blank wall next door.

Mr. Allan said it was just painted and there is one window. He said the previous Board allowed the height of that building and, therefore, it is what it is.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

1. Approve the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a two-story, single-family residential building on the vacant parcel located at 427 East President Street with the following conditions to be submitted for review by the Board with Part II, Design Details:
 - a. Reduce the depth of the front door assembly recess.
 - b. Ensure that the new driveway, off East York Street serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

2. Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the standard that states: The applicant is also requesting a variance from the standard that states: *Access to parking shall be from lanes or north-south service streets. When a property does not front a lane or north-south service street, parking may be accessed from east-west connecting streets or trust streets.* To allow access to the property's surface parking from East York Street, which is the east-west connecting street, because all other properties on the same Trust Block access their parking from East York Street and there is an existing curb cut in the proposed location. Additionally, the north-south street (Price) is a one-way high volume street and not a preferable location to enter the parking. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- 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
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

17. Petition of Andy Lynch, Lynch Associates Architects, PC | 14-005105-COA | 515 Montgomery Street | New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 14-005105-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Gaston Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Owner Authorization Letter.pdf](#)
Attachment: [HDBR Application-2014-515 Montgomery.pdf](#)
Attachment: [HSF Comments_HDBR 11 12 14.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The model was passed around to the Board. Ms. Harris stated that the petitioner is requesting approval to demolish two existing non-contributing buildings and Part I: Height and Mass for new construction of a 59 unit, four story multi-family building. The building fronts primarily onto Montgomery Street, with a small facade facing West Gaston Street. Parking is surface and partially under the building and is accessed from West Huntingdon Street.

Ms. Harris report that staff recommends approval to demolish the two existing non-contributing buildings at 515 Montgomery and 408 West Huntingdon Streets because they do not meet the criteria for historic designation.

Ms. Harris also reported that staff recommends to continue Part I height and Mass for new construction at 515 Montgomery Street in order to address the following:

1. Add additional voids along the Huntingdon Street façade;
2. Eliminate the low walls along Gaston and Montgomery Streets and bring the building up to the lot lines;
3. Revise the window type to be double hung to meet the standard;
4. Ensure that the parapet has a string course and coping;
5. Reduce the width of the balconies to three feet to meet the standard;
6. Reduce the width of the curb cut to 20 feet to meet the standard;
7. Incorporate at least one additional technique to break down the mass as required by large-scale development standards for mass that are not met (only one standard has been met while two are required).
8. Provide additional height variation at least every 120 linear feet to meet standard;
9. Divide the frontage of buildings into architecturally distinct sections no more than 60 feet in width with each section taller than it is wide;
10. Ensure that the bays are not less than 15 feet or more than 20 feet in width; and
11. Ensure that the window sashes and door frames are inset not less than four inches from the façade.

Ms. Harris read the Historic Savannah Foundation comments into the record. (See the HSF's comments under Public Comments).

Dr. Williams asked if the standards are written for the Oglethorpe Plan with 300 feet long tithing blocks.

Ms. Harris explained that the ordinance distinguishes between the Oglethorpe Plan and the

greater Savannah Historic District. There are some standards that are particular to the Oglethorpe Plan. For example, the standards say that the maximum footprint within the Oglethorpe Plan cannot exceed 9,000 square feet. However, the other standards are intended to apply.

Dr. Williams asked what the total length of the building is.

Ms. Harris stated she believes it is 240 linear feet.

Dr. Williams said this length reminds him of Selma Street proposal. He stated that this property is not as long as the Selma Street site which was beyond 300 feet.

Ms. Harris said this site is within the Landmark District and the other site was not.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lynch said they have reviewed the staff comments. They do not take an exception with them. They have already talked with staff and submitted a revised design for some of the items. He realizes the Board cannot review them today. But, he believes many have been addressed including adding the additional voids along Huntingdon Street; they have added about six new openings along the elevation. Therefore, he believes this should suffice the concerns. Mr. Lynch said they will revise all the window types to be double hung. They will ensure that the parapet has a stringcourse. They are already meeting the standard to some degree on some of the projecting and pieces, they will ensure that they have this included on the stucco massing section. They have already addressed reducing the width of balconies to three feet from 3'6." They will reduce the curb cut to 20 feet; they have talked with staff about modifying the elevation. Mr. Lynch said that along Gaston Street, they will increase the height of the parapet to give it additional height variation.

Mr. Lynch stated that some of the comments they want to discuss today are item #2 which is the elimination of what staff calls the walls on the front side of the building. He said they probably should have been a little clearer in their presentation that these are actual stoops for the building. Mr. Lynch said there is a grade change of about 18 inches from the sidewalk up to the front entrances. There are nine entrances along the front and they are a little different from a typical multi-family project where they have individual entries on the ground floor to help break up the elevation instead of having a single point entry. There is a single point entry for the upper floors. There is one secondary entrance and one main entrance. Mr. Lynch pointed out the individual entries into the first floor units. Mr. Lynch explained that there is approximately a 42 inch separation from the entry door to the first step and there are three steps down. The property line falls beyond the edge of the wall. They have actually the canopies out so they match the property line and the projecting balconies are roughly two feet from the edge of the property line. Therefore, if you look down Gaston Street, it is typical of the street. Most of the historic and even the newer project are set back considerably from the property line. He said that since this is a large-scale building, they felt that the walls or raised stoops were appropriate. Therefore, they want to maintain that. They can move the building up to the property line, but it means that they are encroaching with canopies, balconies and the raised stoop areas. They did not think that it was appropriate to make them conventional wood frame stoops. They want, therefore, to maintain them as brick and try to integrate them with the building. This is what they thought would enhance the public realm and the interaction between the building and the street.

Mr. Lynch said they have a base middle and top in order to create some variation in the

façade and the materials. They have not done that here, but they can strengthen the cornice of the building if staff thinks this is necessary. Mr. Lynch said they technically meet the standard, but the intent of the set back is met. They have broken up the building in three distinct components with fairly large set backs. There is a lot of façade play both with the balconies, recesses and the building and they think the metering of the windows is right.

They think the stoops on the front only help to strengthen this. They want to maintain this as much as they can and will be happy to hear the Board's comments.

Mr. Howington said to follow up on the staff's comments, he asked Mr. Lynch to comment on the sashes.

Mr. Lynch said they will recess the sashes. He believes this is something they will look at under Part II. They looked at alternative techniques for breaking up the façade. They felt that at a certain point it would look almost contrive. He believes that the variation of the roof height will help a lot, but looking at it kind of flat on the screen does not portray this.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Lynch to talk about taking the end unit higher, the ones on the south and north sides. The unit on the middle to him seems to be a different unit; may be this could be taller.

Mr. Lynch said they felt that these are prominent architectural components of the project. They believe that if the corner pieces went up a couple more feet, would probably help differentiate it from the rest of the building. They could do this as well on the stucco end, but then it would mean bringing the height of the entire project up. Therefore, he thinks the variation of height as it plays off in materials should accomplish this. They did not show the rendering for the Huntingdon Street side, but they will be extending that façade several feet as well.

Dr. Williams said he was lost when Mr. Lynch said the other buildings on Montgomery Street are set back similarly. He asked Mr. Lynch to clarify that because he is looking at the Google street view and everything comes to the zero lot line.

Mr. Lynch explained they measured most of the stoops along Gaston Street from the curb to the face of the building is roughly between 12 and 15 feet. He said that they are trying to match that. They can bring the entire building up and push the stoops out into the streets and encroach.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Lynch if their front façade currently in line with the red brick building to the south or is it set back from this building and the row houses to the north.

Mr. Lynch said he believes they are in line with the building to the south. The low stoop walls are on the property line and all the projecting balconies come out to the property line as well and are within two feet.

Dr. Williams said his concern is that Montgomery Street is a generous street. It is a street that can support zero lot line. It is not like they are on York Street. In this regard encroachments are normal.

Mr. Lynch said he does not know if they would have a problem moving the entire project out three feet so that the actual façade would be in plane with the building. This should not be an issue. They think that trying to maintain the stoops was an important part of the project. He guessed what he was saying is that the other projects have stoops and they all are somewhat in the same spirit, but it is just that they are wood frame structures. They have

a more front porch feeling.

Mr. Gunther asked Mr. Lynch if he was addressing the zero lot line on Gaston and Montgomery Street or just Montgomery Street.

Mr. Lynch said on Gaston Street the building is setback because they did not have enough units that they wanted to extend out the additional 25 feet to the façade. On the corner they are increasing the height. It does not show on the model, but they are planning to increase the height.

Dr. Williams said the wall of continuity on Huntingdon Street is being addressed by an eight foot high wall. He asked Mr. Lynch that on Gaston Street are they pulled back from the zero lot or are they on the zero lot line. It looks like it is pulled back.

Mr. Lynch explained that it is the same configuration with the raised stoops. He said they will have to see if the encroachment would get too far into the sidewalk.

Dr. Williams said why not anchor it literally at the corner of Huntingdon Street on the zero lot line.

Mr. Howington said since that they are going to anchor that corner with a taller building, should it not be on the corner? What is the argument for making it taller if it is not on the corner?

Mr. Lynch explained that he believes the biggest issue they ran into was because of the odd shape of the lot and wanted to have frontage on Gaston Street. By the time they built out all the square footage they needed to make the project work, they did not need the room to it extend it all the way to Huntingdon Street. However, they felt the corner was important enough to continue the urban edge with a wall that would be consistent with the building. But, if they were talking about extending it all the way to Huntingdon Street, they would be talking about a substantial amount of square footage.

Dr. Williams asked if there are there two buildings.

Mr. Lynch said the buildings both are attached internally, but it is essentially one building. He said that an important part of the project is they would like to maintain some green space. He believes that in trying to create the urban edge accomplishes this.

Mr. Howington said the fence will be eight feet tall and this in a sense would create some wall of continuity.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The Historic Savannah Foundation's comments are: "HSF agrees with all of staff's comments and recommendations, particularly, to eliminate the low walls along Gaston and Montgomery Streets and bring the buildings up to the lot lines."

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Gunther asked if the Board would accept a brick wall as a wall of continuity for Huntingdon Street.

Dr. Williams stated that as he sees it, they do not have Gaston Street. Does this include Gaston Street at the four corners? This seems to be the defining corner, but they do not have this corner. They do have the other corner, but they are taking it. He wished they could

slide the entire building down. He would not want to see the parapet any taller.

Mr. Lynch said they looked at pushing it to Huntingdon Street, but the problem was it isolated that much more from the Gaston Street portion of the property. He said Huntingdon Street is almost a lane at this location. It is very narrow and is not a prominent street as Gaston Street. Therefore, they still think to anchor it as much as they can to the Gaston Street is important; especially if another building is built here. The void of a new building and their building would be that much more awkward mid-block than on the end where it allows them to step down. When they looked at the project, they felt the Gaston Street corner was actually a more prominent corner, but having a corner gives the opportunity that it would be tight a little. He said they can still look at doing this on the stucco portion of the building as well.

Dr. Williams said he saw what Mr. Lynch was saying as he is looking at the corners. It is very narrow and there is no sidewalk at the red brick building.

Mr. Lynch said it almost feels like a lane. Therefore, they believed that the Gaston Street corner was more prominent, but unfortunately they do not have the ability to use that corner.

Mr. Lynch said they would prefer to walk out with approval, but if they deal with the conditions in Part II, they would be okay with that. They just do not want to wait two months if it could be avoided.

Mr. Howington said the petitioner has agreed with mostly all of the conditions, including the low wall. If the Board approves, this means that they will be looking at Part I and Part II at the same time.

Dr. Henry said the staff's recommendation is to approve the demolition of the non-contributing buildings and continue Part I because of the conditions.

Mr. Howington explained that a motion could be made for approval to demolish the two non-contributing buildings if the Board agrees and that they could ask Mr. Lynch for a continuance with the ability to see Part I and Part II together.

Mr. Lynch asked for the continuance. He will bring back Part I along with Part II at the next meeting.

Dr. Williams said he was still reflecting on the nature of that corner at Montgomery and Huntingdon Streets. He believes that especially in light of moving the rest of the building to the zero lot line, he asked Mr. Lynch to explore how that can be handled.

Board Action:

1. The Savannah Historic District Board of Review approved the request to demolish two existing non-contributing buildings at 515 Montgomery and 408 West Huntingdon Streets because they do not meet the criteria for historic designation.

2. The Savannah Historic District Board of Review continued the petition for Part 1 Height and Mass of new construction at 515 Montgomery Street at the request of the petitioner. The Board determined that Parts 1 and 2 could be heard jointly at the next meeting. ^{- PASS}

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Justin Gunther

Debra Caldwell - 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

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

18. [Petition of Neil Dawson, Dawson Architects | 14-005106-COA | 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue | New Construction Hotel: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

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

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

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

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

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Applicant Presentation.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Weibe-Reed recused herself from participation in this petition. She works as an architectural consultant for Dawson Architects.

Ms. Jennifer Deacon was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 6-story hotel for the vacant property located at 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue and Ann Street, and is oriented to face West Oglethorpe Avenue as do the other existing buildings on the block face. The project qualifies as large-scale development and the petitioner is asking for the bonus story. An attached 5-story garage (7 levels of parking) is also requested; the garage is reviewed separately under File No. 14-005113-COA.

Ms. Michalak stated that the petitioner is also requesting a variance from the following

standard.

- *Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18 to 24 inch tall base of contrasting material, to the lintel.*

To allow the storefront glazing to extend to the ground.

Ms. Michalak stated that the applicant (Dawson Architects and Maupin Engineering) attended an SPR meeting on Thursday, October 23, 2014.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 6-story hotel on the vacant property located at 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board for review with the Part II, Design Details application:

- a. Breakup the mass on the blank east façade at the corner stair of the hotel.
- b. Clarify how the base (ground floor) will be differentiated from the middle and top; i.e. through the use of materials.
- c. Revise the distance between the windows to be not more than two times the width of the windows in the following hotel bays: two bays on the front façade, one bay on the west façade, and one bay on the east façade OR apply for a variance from the standard for these bays only. Grouped windows, instead of the single windows can also be used to decrease this distance.
- d. Provide the proposed height for the fence along the east property line that encloses the service yard.
- e. Locate and label electrical devices and refuse storages areas on the site plan.
- f. Add individual primary exterior entrances to the hotel conference room and the hotel breakfast area in order to meet the chosen criterion for the requested hotel bonus story.
- g. Revise the width of the following architectural bays to be between 15 and 20 feet to meet the standard: one bay on Oglethorpe (11' - 2 1/4") and three bays on Ann (5' - 10", 4' - 10", and 11' - 2"). OR apply for a variance from the standard for these bays only.

Ms. Michalak reported also that staff recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the following standard:

- *Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18 to 24 inch tall base of contrasting material, to the lintel.*

To allow the storefront glazing to extend to the ground.

Because the variance criteria are met.

Dr. Williams asked that regarding staff's recommendation b. which states "clarify how the base (ground floor) will be differentiated from the middle and top; i.e. through the use of materials" if this is in reference to the three bays on Ann Street and the one bay on Oglethorpe Avenue. Is there anything in the ordinance that says the base middle top formula has to apply to the whole building?

Ms. Michalak stated that this required under two different standards. It is required as a commercial standard and as a large-scale development standard. It would be required even if it was not large-scale development.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Deacon thanked the staff for their thorough review of the project and thanked the Board for allowing them to present their project. Ms. Deacon said pertaining to the Aloft brand, it is a division of W Hotels and it is designed for a younger, more modern clientele. The aesthetics are modern and is designed for a more technological savvy clientele.

Ms. Deacon said the first example is somewhat a standard type for a lot of hotels. The one she showed was in Jacksonville, Florida and is better than most hotels along the side of the interstate that one might see. But, it definitely does not respond to urban context. Therefore, they were given this as the base point, but after some trimming, they felt that it might work within the Historic Ordinance.

Ms. Deacon showed the Board an example of Aloft in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. She explained that they selected this one because it would give a less successful example of how the hotel prototype had been affected by design standards. They believe that there were some kind of masonry requirement for the design of this hotel. Ms. Deacon said she believes that the banding and materials lost some of the purpose that were more prototype intended. She showed the Board another example of the prototype. But, they also did not think that this was successful because they took that kind of modern corner element and then must have had some kind of requirement for adjusting the roof height. They took a literal interpretation of that and this did not coordinate with the base of the hotel.

Ms. Deacon showed the Board another example of a hotel in Ashville, North Carolina that they believe is very successful. This hotel is a larger scale than what they are dealing with. It has two lower floors and a parking area on the back, but they completely used contemporary design. The street area is at the pedestrian scale. Therefore, they definitely will use this as a precedent for what they were looking forward to use. They used this as their early precedent for how they might look at the entry canopy along Oglethorpe Avenue and they have standard prototype for vehicular entry; but they do not have a vehicular entry. They like the verticality of the bays, the use of materials that may be used in a modern way and they reviewed this as their cutoff point for them in terms of their design.

Ms. Deacon said she was glad that Dr. Williams brought this up, which is the separation on the first floor. They believe that the awning that they are proposing makes a definite reference to that standard of separating the base from the upper floors of the building. If it is uncertain whether these would deal with the intent of the ordinance, they will deal with this when they are looking at Part II Design Details. This could easily be handled through their materials for the first floor or possibly even a band that would separate the base from the top. She explained that a question that was brought up by staff was the distance between windows, excluding the tripod of the window. They feel that it will work; it is not noticeable. Rather than try to redesign the façade and create a bigger window bay there, they would prefer to ask for a variance and allow them to remain with the same separation that they have currently. Therefore, they will request a variance for revising the distance between the windows.

Ms. Deacon said in terms of car ramp, electric devices and service items they carved out a proposed service slide where they will locate their electrical equipment. They also located the dumpster pick up under the first floor ramp of the garage on this side that will have

access from Alton Street. Another issue that was brought up was this sort of blank elevation they have that would be seen from Oglethorpe Avenue and Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard, but the wall is on the property line and they really had not planned on including any openings here. This has to be a fire rated wall. They are looking at including materials in this area to respond to the basic requirements. However, they feel that this can be addressed under Part II.

Ms. Deacon said staff raised a question about some of bays. They can request a variance for the bays. She believes that they can make the argument that the overall bay is probably the 30 foot that is standard in the Historic District. The corner element has a proportional side. Therefore, they prefer to ask for a variance if this is the requirement, but they feel that the basis is here to justify it as a part of a larger pattern. The 5' - 10" dimension that was talked about she does not know if they would consider the extension of the ground floor there at the bay.

Mr. Howington asked Ms. Deacon to address the primary exterior entrances.

Ms. Deacon explained the entrances. She said they would consider the corner as their primary valet entrance for people to enter the hotel by car. They would pull in from Oglethorpe Avenue to Ann Street. A valet will be here to take them into the building. She pointed out the entrance under the canopy. It will be the primary entrance to the automatic door, which is the primary pedestrian entrance into the building. She said in response to staff's comment, they provided additional entrances along the outer area of the lobby and they provided a separate entry for the conference area. Both conference rooms are on the first floor. They can also open up the breakfast area. They are certainly willing to entertain the option of adding doors if it is the request of the Board. They feel, however, that there is definitely significant access into the building. But, they will leave this to the discretion of the Board.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Deacon that he believes she is okay with all of staff's recommendations with the exception of the windows, doors and bays.

Ms. Deacon answered correct.

Dr. Williams said he does not know if the brand and neon would be included in Part II - Design Details.

Ms. Deacon said this is definitely something that would fall under Part II. This is a part of the prototype that they do not want to include.

Dr. Williams said he was wondering about the neon on the lot line for example. The wall is an opportunity. He said they have a lot of neon. There is the Thunderbird down the street and her design actually evokes some of the assets of the old Lerner Building on Broughton and Bull Streets.

Ms. Deacon said when they were talking about what to do with the blank wall some of them said it would be great to something old to a referenced painted sign. However, she believes that incorporating some of those lighting elements might really be an interesting way to address that.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said regarding the base middle top division as the Board has already heard confirms that there is nothing in the ordinance that commands that there be full width across the façade. He said actually in spirit of the context being contemporary, he really likes and applauds the way that the design has been handled. He believes the design is great as is in meeting that standard. If they need a historical building reference, they can look at the Levy Jeweler's building. He feels there are too many doors.

Mr. Howington agreed with Dr. Williams about the doors. He personally does not believe that another door is needed along Oglethorpe Avenue. He believes the intent of the ordinance is met. There are seven doors across there.

Dr. Williams believes it is important to have some relief from the projecting elements. They just talked about using the lighting or signage. Obviously, it is a zero lot line, but depending on the materials chosen, it could really be an incredibly handsome simple wall. There is no signage in this design; but that is another opportunity. Dr. Williams asked staff if the petitioner would be allowed to put a sign there if it projects off the surface.

Ms. Michalak explained that in accordance with the ordinance, the petitioner would not be allowed to put a sign there. Technically, primary signs are only allowed on streets fronting a façade.

Dr. Williams asked if there is something that the Board can do in recommending this or if the petitioner can revisit this and seek a variance if this is something they want to do.

Mr. Howington said the petitioner has agreed to look at the blank wall and bring it back as another possible solution and/or a part of Part II.

Dr. Henry asked if the Board is in agreement with the windows and bays.

Dr. Williams said he was looking at the plan and it is obviously a single room/double room.

Mr. Howington said this happens in hotels and it is very hard to meet that standard. He believes the intent of the standard is there and as the petitioner said it will be very settled and not perceived at the separation. For instance, it happens in the neighborhood across the street where the window facings are not exactly two windows wide; yet, you do not perceive it.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

1. Approve the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 6-story hotel on the vacant

property located at 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board for review with the Part II, Design Details application:

- a. Break up the mass on the blank east façade at the corner stair of the hotel.
 - b. Locate and label electrical devices and refuse storage areas on the site plan.
2. Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the following standard:
- *Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18 to 24 inch tall base of contrasting material, to the lintel.* - PASS
To allow the storefront glazing to extend to the ground.
 - *The distance between windows shall be not less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows. Paired or grouped windows are permitted, provided the individual sashes have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3.*
To allow for a greater distance between windows for two bays on the front façade, one bay on the west façade, and one bay on the east façade.

Because the variance criteria are met.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Tess Scheer

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

19. [Petition of Neil Dawson, Dawson Architects | 14-005113-COA | 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue | New Construction Parking Garage: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

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

NOTE: Ms. Weibe-Reed recused herself from participation in this petition. She works as an architectural consultant for Dawson Architects.

Ms. Caldwell left the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Ms. Jennifer Deacon was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for 5-story parking garage (7 levels of parking) for the vacant property located at 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue (135 MLK Jr. Blvd.). The garage fronts Ann Street and Alton Street, and is oriented to face Ann Street. The petitioner as large-scale development. An attached 6-story hotel is also requested; the hotel is reviewed separately under File No. 14-005106-COA.

The applicant is also requesting variances from the following standards:

- *Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18 to 24 inch tall base of contrasting material, to the lintel.*
To allow the storefront glazing to extend to the ground.
- *Access to parking shall be from lanes or north-south service streets. When a property does not front a lane or north-south service street, parking may be accessed from east-west connecting streets or trust streets.*
To allow for one-way exiting from the parking garage along Alton Street which is an east-west street. (The one-way entrance to the parking garage is along Ann Street which is a north-south street.)
- *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).*
To allow for a 0 foot structured parking setback along Alton Street and a 24 foot-8 inch structured parking setback along Ann Street. The physical parking spaces along Ann Street are setback 46 feet from the Ann Street façade.

The applicant (Dawson Architects and Maupin Engineering) attended an SPR meeting on Thursday, October 23, 2014.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 5-story parking garage (7 levels of parking) for the vacant property located at 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to the board for review with the Part II, Design Details application:

- a. Clarify how the base (ground floor) will be differentiated from the middle and top; i.e. through the use of materials.
- b. Revise the Alton Street façade to have primary entrances as required OR apply for a variance from this standard on this façade only.
- c. Revise the entrance and exit drives to serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

- d. Revise the width of the following architectural bays to be between 15 and 20 feet to meet the standard: 4 foot wide bays are proposed between 13 foot-6 inch wide and 20 foot wide bays OR apply for a variance from the standard for these bays only.

Ms. Michalak reported also that staff recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the following standards:

- a. *Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18 to 24 inch tall base of contrasting material, to the lintel.*
To allow the storefront glazing to extend to the ground.
- b. *Access to parking shall be from lanes or north-south service streets. When a property does not front a lane or north-south service street, parking may be accessed from east-west connecting streets or trust streets.*
To allow for one-way exiting from the parking garage to be along Alton Street which is an east-west street. (The one-way entrance to the parking garage is along Ann Street which is a north-south street.)
- c. *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).*
To allow for a 0 foot structured parking setback along Alton Street and a 24 foot-8 inch structured parking setback along Ann Street. The physical parking spaces along Ann Street are setback 46 feet from the Ann Street façade.

Because the variance criteria are met.

Mr. Howington asked staff if Alton Street is a private street.

Ms. Michalak showed the Board the property line where Alton Street is designated private. She explained that where the garage is located, Alton Street is a public street. Alton is designated as a street and not as a lane.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Deacon said she would address the staff's comments. She said a similar comment that came up on the hotel clarifying how the ground floor would be differentiated from the middle and top. They want to specifically address, but since the aesthetic of the aloft is one that is modern, they did not want to create a parking garage that looks like a historic building with punched openings. They wanted to be honest about the functioning of a parking garage. Therefore, they are showing on this elevation the actual level for the parking garage with guardrails in front of them, but they are also using the screening element which makes reference to the prescribed floor heights that are complied by the ordinance. Even though they have seven stories of parking, they are making reference to what the historic guidelines are for heights.

Ms. Deacon explained that in doing this, they believe that the element they used on all three exposed elevations shows the separation between the base middle and top. These elements differentiate from the rest of the building. They used it on the Alton Street elevation and they are using it in this location to hid the vehicular ramps that are going up. Consequently, they are keeping a solid linear form to the building and she believes that they are consistent with the aesthetic that they established for the hotel; however, as she has said, they are using the screen element to break up the façade in a different way. She feels, therefore, that this

how they have responded to the base ground middle variation.

Ms. Deacon said they discussed at length with the staff was the function of Alton Street. She said in terms of their site plan, several of their variances on this building have to do with the function of Alton Street. She pointed out that as Ms. Michalak reported a portion of Alton Street is actually a private drive and it will be functioning basically as the valet drop off for the Fairfield Hotel that is presently under construction. She showed the Board the portion of Alton Street that is public, but it really functions as a serve area for Johnson Supplies and the rear kind of lane entrances for Carlitos, City Coffee and the restaurant buildings that are located on MLK Jr. Blvd. Ms. Deacon said when they discussed this with staff, they talked about this part of Alton Street really functions more as a lane than a street. Their reason for applying for a variance for not having primary entrances along this elevation is due to the fact that they are regarding this side of the building as a lane. They will be requesting a variance for this.

Ms. Deacon said they made reference to providing continuous vehicular entrances at their driveway entrances. This is something that they will address in Part II; and they will provide details for this at a later time. She explained that one of the reasons that they were providing two entrances is so that they have a separate entrance and exit. Therefore, they do not have one 30 foot wide entrance/exit opening that they have to deal with. This works better for their site functionally to have two different entrances, but it also kept the openings smaller.

Ms. Deacon said in reference to the comment about the bay spacing, they feel this has actually been addressed. It is just a different interpretation of the bay. The bays were read as four feet and 13'-6" average. But, really they were reading the bays from center line to pilaster which would put it at 17' - 6" as a typical base spacing. Therefore, they do not feel that they need to ask the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance for this. Ms. Deacon entertained questions from the Board.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Deacon that on Montgomery Street and at the beginning of the hotel's canopy if these will be leased stores.

Ms. Deacon said they were trying to meet the requirements of the ordinance for the setback. She believes that there is a 30 foot parking setback. They were not allowed to start parking until they were 30 feet back from the building. She does not really know if they would be required to have a variance for this because their parking does not start until 46 feet back from the property line. However, this is a matter of interpretation. Ms. Deacon explained that what they did was to create spaces that could either be used as office or retail and the average depth on these are 24' - 8". They wanted to ensure that they had enough space for a vehicular lane to get out of the building.

Dr. Williams asked that with the spaces being potential retail or office, if they considered awnings over the doors.

Ms. Deacon said this is something that they can definitely consider. If this is a comment of staff or Board, they would include this in their Part II - Design Details.

Mr. Howington stated that even if it was not a continuous canopy, but broken up, it would help define some of those entrances.

Ms. Deacon agreed and said that it might bring the pedestrian scale of that part of the building down. This is something that they can explore in Part II.

Dr. Williams said this might be an opportunity to distinguish the vertical piers with one color materiality and what would effectively been spandrels below the windows with some other kind of color materiality. This would actually reinforce the verticality from the hotel.

Ms. Deacon said this was something that they talked about; but they will address this more fully in Part II.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Howington said he believes that Alton Street is definitely a street. He would not want to see a pedestrian entrance here. The petitioner would need to apply for a variance.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

1. Approve the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 5-story parking garage (7 levels of parking) for the vacant property located at 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board for review with the Part II, Design Details application:
 - a. Apply for a variance from the “primary entrances” standard to allow the Alton Street façade to act as a lane, with no primary/pedestrian entrances.
 - b. Revise the entrance and exit drives to serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.
2. Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the following standards:
 - a. *Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18 to 24 inch tall base of contrasting material, to the lintel.* - PASS
To allow the storefront glazing to extend to the ground.

- b. *Access to parking shall be from lanes or north-south service streets. When a property does not front a lane or north-south service street, parking may be accessed from east-west connecting streets or trust streets.*

To allow for one-way exiting from the parking garage to be along Alton Street which is an east-west street. (The one-way entrance to the parking garage is along Ann Street which is a north-south street.)

- c. *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).*

To allow for a 0 foot structured parking setback along Alton Street and a 24 foot-8 inch structured parking setback along Ann Street. The physical parking spaces along Ann Street are setback 46 feet from the Ann Street façade.

Because the variance criteria are met.

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Robin Williams

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

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

[20. Petition of Joshua Beckler for Coastal Canvas | 14-003616-COA | 59 Barnard Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 59 Barnard Street 14-003616-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 59 Barnard Street 14-003616-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

21. [Petition of Natalie Aiken for Hansen Architects, PC | 14-004586-COA | 118 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Windows](#)

Attachment: [COA - 118 East Broughton Street 14-004586-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 118 East Broughton Street 14-004586-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of Charles H. Chewning | 14-004894-COA | 327 Tattnell Street | Staff Approved - Color Change/Shutters](#)

Attachment: [COA - 327 Tattnell Street 004894-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 327 Tattnell Street 14-004894-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Lee Smith for Smith Properties | 14-004919-COA | 150-152 Price Street | Staff Approved - Repointing and Iron Gate](#)

Attachment: [COA - 150-152 Price Street 14-004919-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 150 - 152 Price Street 14-004919-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Amended Petition of Christina Swenson | 14-004977-COA | 537, 539 and 539B East Liberty Street | Staff Approved - Awnings](#)

Attachment: [COA - 537, 539 and 539B East Liberty Street 14-004977-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 537, 539 and 539B East Liberty Street 14-004977-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Amended Petition of John Clegg for Barnard Architects | 14-004987-COA | 421 Abercorn Street | Staff Approved - Entrance Door and Window](#)

Attachment: [COA - 421 Abercorn Street 14-004987-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of James Beasley, Sr. | 14-005019-COA | 10 Barnard Street | Staff Approved - Sign Refacing](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Luis Burgos for Hansen Architects, PC | 14-005020-COA | 309 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Install Mechanical Grill](#)

Attachment: [309 W Broughton St- 10-8-14 COA Application and Dwgs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [COA - 309 West Broughton Street 14-005020-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Robin Grenchik | 14-005078-COA | 405 Whitaker Street | Staff Approved - Security Cameras](#)

Attachment: [COA - 405 Whitaker Street 14-005078-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [axis security camera image 405 Whitaker Street.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Anne Smith for Lominack Kolman Smith Architects | 14-005084-COA | 105 West Congress Street | Staff Approved - Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 105 West Congress Street 14-005084-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [HDBR Application 10-15-2014.pub.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of S. Bart Redmond for Redmond Construction, Inc. | 14-005115-COA | 101-103 West Gordon Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 101-103 West Gordon Street 14-005115-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 101 -103 West Gordon Street 14-005115-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Matthew Hallett for Ellsworth Hallett, LLC | 14-005119-COA | 206 East Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 206 East Gaston Street 14-005119-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 206 East Gaston Street 14-005119-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of John Pulcini | 14-005123-COA | 503 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Windows](#)

Attachment: [COA - 206 East Gaston Street 14-005119-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 206 East Gaston Street 14-005119-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Danny Johnson | 14-005167-COA | 414 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard | Staff Approved - Shingles](#)

Attachment: [COA - 414 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard 14-005167-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Application - 414 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard 14-005167-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Caitlin Moultroup for City of Savannah | 14-005246-COA | 132 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Remove Granite Panels](#)

Attachment: [COA - 132 East Broughton Street 14-005246-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Luis Burgos for Hansen Architects, PC | 14-005272-COA | 32 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Restore/Repair Facades](#)

Attachment: [COA - 32 East Broughton Street 14-005272-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 32 East Broughton Street 14-005272-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Luis Burgos for Hansen Architects, PC | 14-005340-COA | 301 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Downspouts](#)

Attachment: [COA - 301 West Broughton Street 14-005340-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 301 West Broughton Street 14-005340-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Luis Burgos for Hansen Architects, PC | 14-005341-COA | 20 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Downspouts](#)

Attachment: [COA - 20 East Broughton Street 14-005341-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 20 East Broughton Street 14-005341-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Luis Burgos for Hansen Architects, PC | 14-005342-COA | 226 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Downspout](#)

Attachment: [COA - 226 West Broughton Street 14-005342-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 226 West Broughton Street 14-005342-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of Luis Burgos for Hansen Architects, PC | 14-005343-COA | 109 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Downspouts](#)

Attachment: [COA - 109 West Broughton Street 14-005343-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 109 West Broughton Street 14-005343-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Petition of Luis Burgos for Hansen Architects, PC | 14-005347-COA | 113-115 West Broughton](#)

Street | Staff Approved - Downspouts

Attachment: [COA - 113-115 West Broughton Street 14-005347-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 113-115 West Broughton Street 14-005347-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. Petition of Luis Burgos for Hansen Architects, PC | 14-005349-COA | 216-218 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Downspouts

Attachment: [COA - 216-218 West Broughton Street 14-005349-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 216-218 West Broughton Street 14-005349-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. Petition of Luis Burgos for Hansen Architects, PC | 14-005352-COA | 220 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Downspout

Attachment: [COA - 220 West Broughton Street 14-005352-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 220 West Broughton Street 14-005352-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. Petition of Luis Burgos for Hansen Architects, PC | 14-005361-COA | 108 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Downspouts

Attachment: [COA - 108 West Broughton Street 14-005361-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 108 West Broughton Street 14-005361-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. Petition of Luis Burgos for Hansen Architects, PC | 14-005362-COA | 18 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Downspouts

Attachment: [COA - 18 East Broughton Street 14-005362-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 18 East Broughton Street 14-005362-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

45. Petition of Luis Burgos for Hansen Architects, PC | 14-005363-COA | 125 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Downspout

Attachment: [COA - 125 East Broughton Street 14-005363-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 125 East Broughton Street 14-005363-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

46. Petition of Kevin McCarthy | 14-005367-COA | 20 West Jones Street | Staff Approved - Color Change

Attachment: [COA - 20 West Jones Street 14-005367-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 20 West Jones Street 14-005367-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

47. [Petition of Curtis Faircloth | 14-005408-COA | 117 Whitaker Street | Staff Approved - Sign Reface](#)

Attachment: [COA - 117 Whitaker Street 14-005408-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 117 Whitaker Street 14-005408-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

48. [Petition of John Larroude | 14-005426-COA | 220 West Gwinnett Street | Staff Approved - Roof](#)

Attachment: [COA - 220 West Gwinnett Street 14-005426-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Application - 220 West Gwinnett Street 14-005426-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 11-12-14.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

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Items Deferred to Staff 11-12-14.pdf](#)

Mr. Howington stated that the staff has given the Board a report on the items deferred to staff.

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

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

Mr. Howington said the Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting has been moved to Monday, November 17, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. in the West Conference Room.

52. [HDBR Annual Retreat | December 5, 2014, 9:00 AM | Tybee Island Lighthouse](#)

Ms. Harris said that Mr. Malik Watkins will be one of the speakers at the Retreat and Ms. Jennifer Herman, Assistant City Attorney, will be a speaker also. Mr. Robert Civceovich will talk about applying the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Ms. Sarah Jones will talk about the new Tybee Island Historic Preservation Commission that has been established. At 2: 00 p.m. there will be a tour of some of the tax credit projects.

Ms. Harris reported that presently, she does not know which building the Retreat will be held in, but as soon as she gets the address she will forward it to the Board members.

53. [Next Meeting - Wednesday, December 10, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

54. [Vinyl Awnings Discussion](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Harris Vinyl Awnings 081314.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Preservation Brief 44 - The Use of Awnings on Historic Buildings Repair, Replacement, and New Design.pdf](#)

Attachment: [List of Awnings in Historic District.pdf](#)

Attachment: [HSF Comments_HDBR 11 12 14.pdf](#)

Mr. Howington thanked Mr. Wood of Coastal Canvas for waiting patiently to continue the discussion of the vinyl awnings that was initially held at the Review Board meeting of August 13, 2014. He also thanked Mr. Woods for providing the Board with an elaborate extensive example sheet.

Ms. Harris recapped that this discussion is being held for the Board to decide whether or not they wish to allow vinyl awnings in the Historic District. She reported that there are three sections of the ordinance that address awning material: 1) Secretary of the Interior's Standards 9 - talks about New Additions to not Damage and new materials being compatible with historic; 2) Visual compatibility factors - which talks about materials being visual compatible; and 3) Design Standards - which is the most specific which says that residential awnings shall be constructed of canvas, cloth or equivalent. Non-residential awnings shall be constructed of canvas, other equivalent cloth, metal, or glass.

Ms. Harris stated that vinyl awnings have been approved within the Historic District in the past, however, recently staff has determined that they are not visually compatible. Mr. Woods has provided a list of addresses that show the more traditional canvas type fabrics, woven acrylic as well as vinyl awning samples for the Board to look at. Staff feels that the vinyl awnings tend to

mimic the cloth-like quality, but it does not have the same texture and they have concerns about the reflective quality.

Ms. Harris reported that there is a Historic Preservation Brief published by the National Park Service #44 which talks about awning material and notes that "for various reasons particularly its reflectivity and texture-vinyl is generally an unsuitable material for awnings on historic buildings. Many historic review commissions note that the inappropriateness of vinyl in their guidelines and call for the use of canvas, canvas blends, or acrylics that resemble canvas." Ms. Harris stated that staff feels the vinyl awnings are visually incompatible and should not be considered as an equivalent cloth. However, the staff is seeking the Board's guidance in this matter. She, too, thanked Mr. Glen Wood of Coastal Canvas for being present.

Ms. Harris stated that the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) written comments states that "HSF agrees with staff's recommendation that vinyl awnings are not visually compatible for buildings that predate the invention of the material. Specifically because vinyl does not have the same texture as cloth as well as the reflective quality of vinyl, which we feel is not appropriate."

Ms. Harris said that there are some options for the Board to consider. The HSF seems to suggest that maybe for non-contributing buildings it maybe fine or maybe not.

Mr. Howington, for clarity, asked staff that maybe it could be allowed in the Historic District, but perhaps not on a contributing building.

Ms. Harris answered, potentially, yes.

Dr. Williams said following up on the HSF's comment, when did the material make its appearance.

Ms. Harris said the material was developed after World War II, and by the 1960s, vinyl resins, acrylic fibers and polyester materials were all being used to provide a longer-lasting awning cover. Therefore, vinyl awnings were here by 1945, but were used regularly after the 1960s.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Harris if he understood her to say that vinyl would be appropriate on a modern building in the district.

Ms. Harris answered potentially; this is an option for the Board to consider. Staff feels that it is not an appropriate building material. She said that the Historic Savannah Foundation seems to suggest that perhaps with more contemporary or newer buildings that it might be okay. Staff is looking for guidance from the Board on this issue.

Dr. Williams asked if it has been prompted by a qualitative basically cheap versions appearing where they were better quality in the past.

Ms. Harris answered not to her knowledge.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, it is not that there was a change in the product.

Dr. Henry asked approximately how many building in the Historic Districts have vinyl awnings.

Mr. Howington stated that there are quite a lot on the list that was given to the Board. They have three pages shown where the vinyl awnings are located in the district. He invited Mr. Wood to come forth and make his presentation.

Mr. Wood said that vinyl is a big word. It encompasses a huge amount of things. It also encompasses a huge amount of awning fabrics. He showed the Board one they would see the most downtown. It would be thought of as a vinyl awning fabric.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Wood if he would use this one or would not use it.

Mr. Wood said that they would not use this one. It is a back-lit fabric or a vinyl-laminated polyester. But, it is still vinyl. However, he does not see how they can say vinyl and throw out every thing in there. He said he disagrees with the visual compatibility and glossiness part of it. He ask argued with people over the years about it. A lady told him specifically that she did not care what he said about vinyl awnings, she wants an acrylic awning just like that one there. He told the lady let's walk over there and look at it; they did; and it was a vinyl awning.

Mr. Wood said again that he disagrees with the visual compatibility because you would think of visual compatibility matching brick, mortar, marble, aluminum, galvanized steel, glossy materials, matte finish and all the different color paints and textures.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Wood if all three of sample charts that were shown to the Board are vinyl.

Mr. Wood answered yes.

Dr. Williams said that the last set that was given to the Board does not have the shine that the other two have. Is there a terminology that would distinguishes the third sample them from the other two?

Mr. Wood answered the brand names.

Dr. Henry said that the Board cannot get into brand names.

Dr. Williams said what Mr. Wood is demonstrating is that some vinyl has a matte finish.

Mr. Howington asked why could they not get into brand names. They do so on windows; they have an approved list of window manufacturers.

Dr. Henry said there is a difference between a list of approved brands than one

brand.

Mr. Howington said there may be more than just this one brand or there may be equal brands.

Ms. McClain said one sample is described as laminated polyester and the other says woven cloth. Is it laminated?

Mr. Wood said it might be coated or it might be laminated, but it is a vinyl material.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Wood if he brought any other fabrics with him.

Mr. Wood answered no.

Mr. Wood said what he recommended that it is important for the Board to look at the awnings up in the air and make a suggestion then regarding the visual compatibility. Many people will say I like this fabric, but it is not designed to be held in the hand and wrinkled up, but it is designed to be put up in the air; it is designed to withstand weather; it designed to withstand wind and provide function.

Mr. Howington said most of the Board members visited the locations and saw the vinyl awnings.

Mr. Wood wanted the Board to remember that when he was here before, he told them that acrylic has a down side, too. It is an unstable fabric and when it gets cold or wet it stretches. Therefore, the first part of the day acrylic awnings are not attractive. They sag.

Dr. Henry asked if all the samples the Board is viewing now are acrylic.

Mr. Wood answered no.

Mr. Howington explained that there are different types of wood and there are different types vinyl. What Mr. Wood has said is that the middle sample is something that he would not use. The other two he has used; especially the last sample which looks more like cloth in appearance than the other two.

Mr. Thomson stated that it seems that the samples would have some sort of manufacturers or industry specifications that differentiate one from the other. He would be curious to know the STM testing results.

Dr. Williams said he believes it is fair to say that a big distinguishing factor is that as soon as you start handling the samples, you will see that this one has a shine; to him this seems to be the trigger. The red flag is if has shiny, it is obvious vinyl; whereas Mr. Wood has given an example that something could be vinyl but it does not have the look of vinyl; and in the same way fiberglass imitates stone on some buildings components.

Ms. McClain asked how long will the awnings last.

Mr. Wood said they all have a five year warranty. Basically, they generally last ten years.

Mr. Howington said looking at acrylic versus the other awning, they look almost the same. Mr. Howington asked Mr. Wood if he would have any objections to using this only.

Mr. Wood answered not at all; but only yes. However, the reason why he gave the Board the list was for them to judge the fabric up in the air and not in their hands.

Dr. Williams stated that when Mr. Wood's list says vinyl, the Board does not know which sample vinyl they are looking at.

Mr. Thomson said the problem with what was suggested is that the samples that were submitted said we accept vinyl. If we say we accept vinyl, then we have to accept it. Any sample of vinyl could be submitted and if it is a cheap vinyl or shiny one if they do not express which vinyl, they will have to accept it. He said what they need to say is we will accept this, but not these. This would be a way of defining the vinyl, if this is the will of the Board.

Mr. Wood said he can argue that point, because they said do not accept vinyl. He is saying don't write a law that says they will not use vinyl.

Mr. Thomson said they would write a law that would say we may only accept this kind of vinyl.

Mr. Howington said he believes what Mr. Thomson is saying is that may be the Board can come to an agreement on is possibly they will have some specifications that would limit certain vinyl awnings per those specifications and brands. This could be done just like the list of acceptable window manufacturers. They could have a list of accepted vinyl awning manufacturers and/or specifications for historic buildings. Then they have the idea that could the other specification be used on a modern or contemporary building. Consequently, it would not necessarily rule this one out totally on a new building, but on a contributing building perhaps only this acrylic awning could be used.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Wood if they do the vinyl and the acrylic.

Mr. Wood answered that they do everything. The cost of the acrylic may be 10% to 20% more. It becomes expensive with you put graphic on as you have to use a special machine.

Mr. Howington said he believes the issue is more complicated than just saying that "we will accept vinyl or not." He believes they can say that they will accept certain specifications of vinyl. This is what the Board needs to clarify.

Mr. Wood said again, his request is that the Board judge it by how it looks up in the air and not how it feels in their hands. Since he has been in this business, he has had boards that would not allow them to put up black awnings; some boards did not allow red awnings; boards that would not allow them to put up blue awnings; but now things have changed. He has been in business 40 years and has used that fabric 40 years.

Dr. Williams asked if the Board needs to make a decision today.

Mr. Howington stated that Mr. Wood has been patient. He has been on the agenda several times. He does not want this to be prolonged, but he believes they could let a subcommittee handle this. However, it seems to him that the consensus is they will accept vinyl under certain specifications and stipulations of certain vinyl awnings would only be allowed on contributing buildings and certain vinyl awnings could be allowed on contributing and non-contributing buildings. Mr. Howington said they may need to define this, but may not be able to define it today.

Mr. Wood said he could leave the sample cards here. He said that according to relationship of materials, texture and color it says, "The relationship of materials, texture and color of the façade of a structure shall be visually compatible with the predominate materials, textures and colors used on contributing structures to which the structure is visually related." The point here is you are talking about whether that fabric looks good up against a glass wall or brick wall. You are saying visually compatible up against a marble wall; an aluminum façade; galvanized metal façade; painted facades; and stucco. Now, how can you say that it is not visually compatible with any of these. He said, therefore, his statement is that unless they are going to start restricting visual compatibility of every single material that you deal with, how can you do so on this one?

Mr. Howington told Mr. Wood that they do look at each individual project as visual compatibility. Therefore, he believes they could look at each individual project and awning whether that specific fabric is visual compatible to that project whether it be on glass, aluminum, brick and so forth. Mr. Howington said he believes, therefore, that it is a fair question and a fair answer to say that they can look at these individually per the specifications they can probably set this up by the next meeting and vote on which ones could be allowed on contributing buildings and noncontributing buildings with the samples that Mr. Wood has provided. Mr. Howington said he did not know whether these are the only vinyl awnings that Mr. Wood use in the Historic District. He asked him if he uses other specifications that they could define in a standard a list of specifications that would be allowed per those individual instances.

Mr. Howington told Mr. Wood if he had other samples that he would like for the Board to put on a list of standards, they will look at it and by next meeting would probably be able to vote on it and put it in as an allowable standard. He said he saw Mr. Wood's point that each one should be looked at individually.

Dr. Williams said if any technical data could be provided that distinguishes the

fabrication standards of the nature; for example, if they could look at a set of specifications without even looking at the samples would be able to tell whether it is acceptable.

Mr. Wood said they have not done anything like this, but what they have done is a huge study on ultra violent resistant. This does not have any to with shine.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked Mr. Wood how many awnings manufacturers are there available to the Board.

Mr. Wood answered one. He said awnings may be bought from people out of town, but there is only one in Savannah.

Ms. Weibe-Reed explained that she was not talking about retailers, but manufacturers.

Mr. Wood said actually that is an interesting story. They buy rolls of fabric and make the awnings themselves. They make everything they sell.

Mr. Howington said he believes what Ms. Weibe-Reed is asking is what will the list look like; would it be 15 manufacturers acceptable or five.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Wood if he could provide the staff with more sample cards.

Mr. Wood said he has a list on his desk and a list of every fabric that is available to them. He has as much pride about Savannah as anybody and he has lived here a long time. He knows what he would like to see downtown. Sometimes they have to submit things because the customer demands it.

Mr. Howington said this will help Mr. Woods; therefore, if there is a list, he would be able to tell the customer what would not be an acceptable fabric.

Mr. Wood said he felt it was important for him to come before the Board not because of a vendor or a supplier that he is advocating, but as a customer.

Mr. Howington thanked Mr. Wood for coming and sharing the information.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

55. [Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, Chair Howington adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen Harris
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EH:mem