



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

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

OCTOBER 8, 2014 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

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

HDRB Member Not Present: Ebony Simpson, Vice-Chair

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
Ellie Isaacs, Intern

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Order](#)

Mr. Howington called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. He welcomed everyone in attendance and outlined the role of the Historic District Board of Review. He apologized that the Regular Meeting is starting late, but the Special Called Meeting just ended.

Mr. Howington introduced Ms. Sara Farr, Historic Preservation Planner and Ms. Ellie

Isaacs, Intern.

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

2. [Petition of Katie S. Page | 14-003471-COA | 28 West Broughton Street | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a principal use sign and one (1) under-canopy sign face change at 28 West Broughton Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the sign standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

3. [Petition of Sign Mart Inc | 14-004079-COA | 110 E Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 110 East Broughton Street 14-004079-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 110 East Broughton Street 14-004079-COA.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the principal use fascia sign at 110 East Broughton Street, because the sign is visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

Vote Results

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

4. [Petition of Harley Krinsky | 14-004080-COA | 114-116 West Congress Street | Rehabilitation Amendments](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Project Description.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [DNR Comments \(Building\) - Later Revised \(See Amendment 2\).pdf](#)
Attachment: [DNR Comments \(Building\) - Amendment 2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [DNR Comments \(Sign\) - Amendment 2.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for amendments to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness [File No. 13-006343-COA] for the rehabilitation of the building located at 114-116 West Congress Street with the following condition:

- After the stucco is removed, the brick surface should be examined and evaluated for damaged. The original brick face may be damaged and soft. If it is, the brick facades should be sealed with an appropriate material to prevent further damage. Provide staff with a material specification of the proposed sealer prior to commencement of the work.

- PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry	
Second: Marjorie W Reed	
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye

Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye

5. [Petition of Golden Isles Signs, LLC | 14-004538-COA | 100 Bull Street | Building Identification Sign](#)

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

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the building identification sign at 100 Bull Street, because the sign meets the standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Marjorie W Reed

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

6. [Petition of Hansen Architects | 14-004584-COA | 101 West Broughton Street | Signs and New Storefront Window](#)

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

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for two (2) principal use signs and a new storefront window for the property located at 101 West Broughton Street - PASS as requested because the proposed work is visually

compatible, and meets the design and sign standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Marjorie W Reed

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

7. [Petition of Hansen Architects | 14-004588-COA | 25 East Broughton Street | Amended Alterations and Rehabilitation](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 25 East Broughton Street 14-004588-COA.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Historic Photographs.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Previously Approved Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition to amend a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations and rehabilitation of the building - PASS located at 25 East Broughton Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the design standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Marjorie W Reed

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

Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

8. [Petition of Signs of the South, Inc. | 14-004694-COA | 223 West Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 223 West Broughton Street 14-0046694-COA.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a principal use projecting sign on the building located at 223 West Broughton Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

9. [Petition of Signs of the South, Inc. | 14-004695-COA | 100 Bull Street | Principal Use Fascia Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 100 Bull Street 14-004695-COA.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a principal use fascia sign on the Bull Street façade of the building located at 100 Bull Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the sign standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Marjorie W Reed

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

10. [Petition of Treylor Park Savannah | 14-004699-COA | 115 East Bay Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a projecting principal use sign on the front façade of the building located at 115 East Bay Street with the following condition:

- PASS

1. Ensure that the lagbolts only penetrate the mortar joints on the brick façade and not the bricks themselves.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Marjorie W Reed

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

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

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

Board Action:

Approve the adoption of the October 8, 2014 agenda with the removal of the Vinyl Awnings Discussion from the agenda. - PASS

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. - Aye
Marjorie W Reed - Aye
Tess Scheer - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Not Present
Robin Williams - Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

12. [Approve Meeting Minutes of September 10, 2014](#)

Attachment: [09-10-2014 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of September 10, 2014 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

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

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

13. 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 Package- Drawings.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Package- Signage.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Masonry Percentage Calculation.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Variance Justification.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Aerial Map 000634.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Choctaw Ward.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [O'Neil Ward.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Walton Ward.pdf](#)

Mr. Forrest Lott 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 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.

Ms. Harris stated as the Board recalls this project is located outside of the Savannah National Historic Landmark District, but within the local Savannah Historic District.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends to continue the petition for New Construction, Part : Design Details in order to restudy the following:

- a. Choose an alternative door type to the proposed double sliding glass doors to be more visually compatible.
- b. Restudy the centerline alignment of the window and door openings on the Selma Street façade.
- c. Ensure the storefront glazing, window sashes and door frames are inset at least four inches.
- d. Incorporate a more substantial coping.
- e. Increase the use of modular masonry materials to meet the minimum 75% standard. Staff is asking the Board for guidance on how to calculate the percentage on non-parallel street-fronting surfaces.

Ms. Harris also reported that staff recommends approval of the proposed signs because they meet the sign ordinance and are visually compatible. She additionally reported that staff recommends denial of the variance from the 75% requirement of modular masonry materials to the Zoning Board of Appeals because the variance criteria have not been met.

Mr. Merriman asked that besides not being visually compatible, does the Board allow sliding glass doors?

Ms. Harris answered that there is nothing definite that says there cannot be sliding glass doors, but it is a visually compatible criteria.

Dr. Williams asked if the materials on the upper part are grey and white.

Ms. Harris answered yes.

Mr. Howington asked if the window colors are charcoal and bronze.

Ms. Harris stated that she believes the bronze is on the brick portion and the charcoal is on the stucco portion.

Mr. Howington said there will be two different colors on the building. But, the petitioner can clarify this during his comments.

Dr. Henry asked staff to explain the thinking regarding the standard pertaining to stucco versus modular material.

Ms. Harris explained that this is a part of the large scale development standard. It does not apply to buildings that do not fall within that category, the 75% modular masonry. She said the thinking behind this is the masonry is broken into smaller dimensions, creating a more human scale along these buildings.

Dr. Henry asked if the petitioner wishes to reduce this by one-third.

Ms. Harris stated that the petitioner will be able to answer this question.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lott stated that he would not spend any time on the things that the staff has recommended, but will cover the outstanding issues. He said in regard to the sliding glass door, he showed the Board a sliding glass door that is at a location on Bay Street. They believe that the style and rail elements are appropriate. He said the physical sample he brought today is out of proportion. He showed the Board some photographs and said the center shows side swing French doors which would swing into the residential unit. One photograph showed a view from the pedestrian sidewalk looking up. Mr. Lott said each of the door units recessed back into the wall. He explained that what the Board is seeing here are two panels of doors. The next image shown were sliding glass door. Mr. Lott said it is a dark frame and is recessed, the profiles are the same. The windows are above the third floor and, therefore, they are not in contact with the human scale occurring at the pedestrian level. They would prefer to use the sliding glass door as they are more efficient in terms of interior space and usage. However, they look forward to the Board's comments on the sliding glass doors.

Dr. Williams asked if the sliding glass door is slightly narrower as a unit than the French doors.

Mr. Lott answered that they both are the same. The fact that there are two styles that overlap, with the sliding glass door, the center profile could be different.

Mr. Lott said they walked around the neighborhood looking at different windows. A little brick building is in the area, but its windows do not align. The old Marine Hospital windows align vertically, but they are different sizes. A small townhouse is here and the entrance stoop does not align with the windows above. On the Old County Courthouse, the upper floors generally have an alignment, but the style of this building responds to the lower level differently and the windows do not align. He said the Old Mangle Hotel is a great example of how the lower floors have openings of one width and are recessed. This is similar to their building. The upper floors have a balcony and he believes sliding glass doors are here. Mr. Lott said the building that houses the Lady and Sons restaurant the center bay and the right bay have different alignments and different amounts of space on each side of the pilaster. But, all of these are successful buildings. The Old News Place building is composed of two buildings that have sliding glass doors. Because of the size of the doors, they look a little cartoonish to him. But they are beefy.

Mr. Lott stated that he was not saying that all of these buildings are the same as their building, but they were saying that in the district there are varieties, diversities, textures and so forth. He showed the Board a view of their windows. They made the lower windows on the second level align with the upper three floors. This narrows the amount of brick on the outside of the two windows that are within the recessed brick pattern. He showed the Board a view that brings the upper window in to alignment with the lower masonry.

Mr. Lott said that when they talk about the vertical column and the structural grid and change it with a stucco color, gray above. This will align with the width of the outermost brick expression. They are not trying to reinforce the alignment of one window over the other, but to keep the alignment of that structural grid expressed as the first order. On the brick level, they all are recessed beyond. The windows on the second floor are recessed behind the column. In their Part I discussion, they were trying to draw a distinction between the pedestrian masonry scale at the bottom. The windows on the upper floors have a plain expression. They do not have what you would typically see in a masonry window installation where.

Mr. Howington said that the model shows a sort of recess on the second floor.

Mr. Lott explained that there is a significant recess in the bay.

Mr. Howington asked him if there were recesses at the windows.

Mr. Lott said the window profile has a lot of recess to it with its jam. But the jam is not recessed. In other words, where you see the brick turn back and the brick mold begins, the stucco does not return.

Mr. Howington stated that just to be clear, he believes the standard says that the glass has to be recessed four inches.

Mr. Lott said regarding the coping, they looked around the district. They looked at a locomotive shop at the Central of Georgia. There is a heavy band at the top that is the same material as the coping. In their view, the heavier line across the top diminishes the weight of the parapet expression. They spent a lot of time in their first phase submission talking about it not being successful. He believes that Dr. Williams suggested that they

consider a more industrial aesthetic. They restudied this and came back with what they have now. They previously had more than more than 75% modular masonry. Therefore, this is really not their fault. He explained that they have brick going all the way up on the left end to the central tower and wraps around on all sides.

Mr. Lott said it was suggested that they restudy the butterfly roof. At that time some Board members liked the roof and some did not. They looked at a shed roof, and looked at a roof at a 90 degree angle. The only thing changed on the roof, and they still would like to do it, is it got six feet shorter in the front and back. They looked at hip and gable roofs too.

Ms. Reed said she noticed that the model has a curved roof on the end, but they do not see this in the images. She asked him if this exists.

Mr. Lott answered that it does not exist. He explained that what they have on the end and they can see in the middle panel to the left that it is one story shorter in order to step down, that top has a rail around it.

Dr. Henry for clarification asked the staff that on the Selma Street windows and doors, if they were talking about the entire façade or the upper façade.

Ms. Harris answered that the standards say the windows should align vertically all the way up. She explained that the three upper floor windows do not align with the lower floor.

Dr. Henry asked what is the square footage of this building.

Mr. Howington answered that the square footage is 42,000.

Mr. Lott said if the Board feels that making the windows align will make this a more successful project, they can align all the windows. He believes that the expression of the structural grid is more important. Mr. Lott said going back to the Mangle Hotel, which is the closest in scale to their building, it is taller than their building, having lower level windows different from upper level windows is not unusual in buildings in almost any scale. They were trying to have the second story windows reflect an appropriate detailing for a window set into a brick wall. The groupings of the windows are symmetrical vertically, each pair is symmetrical although each individual window does not align vertically. He said the Board can decide if this presents a problem.

Dr. Williams asked if these are single pane casement windows on the third through fifth floors.

Mr. Lott answered double-hung on two and casement above.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said looking at the sections she does not see structurally what are the pilaster. She sees the concrete blocks with the stucco or brick veneer. Are they true pilasters?

Mr. Lott answered that real columns are not behind the pilasters. They are expressing a grid.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she somewhat likes the finished coping.

Ms. Caldwell asked if the windows will be tinted.

Mr. Lott answered no.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with all of the staff's comments and recommendations, especially that the masonry materials need to be increased. She said that variances have already been given to allow a larger mass than usual. Therefore, they feel that it is important to enforce this standard. They like the articulation of the first two floors in the brick areas. However, they feel that the brick floor does not relate to the other floors in materiality. The colors of the stucco that are used are too stark and are competing with the colors of the proposed brick. The HSF feels that it would be more appropriate to use a lighter more natural earth tone color on the upper floors and explore the use of incorporating more modular masonry materials.

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

Mr. Lott stated that presently they have masonry on all facades from the second floor; when you go around the back it becomes the third floor. They will clad the entire base in brick. The sides that do not face a public street do not need to be brick. The question of having the right balance, if they made another floor brick in his view would put it out of balance. Conceptually, if you asked him if he believes that more brick is better than less brick. He would say yes he agrees. Typically, he would say that aligning windows vertically in the wall as a general rule makes sense. Mr. Lott said they cladded the entire left part, had one floor reduced, and the central tower in brick in order to provide a contrast and a response to what they had in their Part I review. This sort of three-over-two balance might not be 75%, but it is what looks right. If they reversed it, he believes it would not look appropriate. They prefer to do what they have presented as they think it is a more appropriate solution.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Lott if there is an opportunity to recess the upper floors windows a little more.

Mr. Lott said they asked their structural engineer this question. He said because of the wind loads that they are in and having to bring the structure load down and the upper floors are sitting on the bottom (the Board does not have to worry about the structure, but they do); if they move that upper story load pad inside of the outside wall it creates significant challenges. Mr. Lott said they recessed it as much as they could.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Lott why they selected the charcoal. Why not reverse the relationship so that something more preferably pickups the role of pilasters and the areas around the window becomes the lighter color.

Mr. Lott said what Dr. Williams is saying is not too dissimilar from Historic Savannah Foundation's comments. They will be happy to look at those colors. He said a lot of people have been looking at their color pallets trying to get the right colors and they may not be

there yet with the right colors.

Dr. Williams said to bring in the coping at the top and tie it all together. He asked if the coping is the same color as the brick down below.

Mr. Lott said the top coping is dark gray.

Dr. Williams said he thought it had a reddish color.

Mr. Howington asked if this would be tiered or a flat metal coping.

Mr. Lott said it will be a flat metal coping.

Dr. Williams asked if the colors can be put together so that it reads which parts go together although the petitioner is changing the expression about the second floor.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Lott to respond to Ms. Reed's question.

Mr. Lott said he would be happy to look at that. His question is if they make the top throw off the light in coloration with the bay, but then the building begins to appear more massive, then what does he do?

Dr. Williams stated that he believes the white in the windows could actually help this. There is a fair amount of light area. The windows will be reflecting a lot of white anyway.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry said he does not know how flush the windows are. He does not understand the stucco and brick.

Mr. Howington said this is the main thing that he wanted clarified. They have had the Board discussion before and were presented with more than 75% of masonry materials. He did not want the Board to back track on something that they have already discussed. He wanted to open this up for discussion again because this was a specific response to some of the comments of this Board.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she does not like this building as much as she liked the building that they rejected. She said the building reminds her of a building in Jacksonville. It looks generic. It looks like a hospital.

Mr. Howington said he likes some parts of this building better than the first building.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said it might be the color.

Dr. Williams said that it might help if everything that is vertical is white.

Mr. Howington said a portion of the east end is all brick. The 75% is critical to help break up the mass.

Dr. Williams asked what happens if they do not include the recesses in the percentage.

Mr. Lott said they calculated the public fronting and most of the other standards, the courtyard recess in his view would be looked at just as the side of any building. He said, however, they have some brick in here anyway.

Mr. Howington said he was curious as to what percentage they are.

Mr. Lott said they are at 55%. He said the staff acknowledged this in their comments, but there are buildings that are close to this context that are very large buildings; that are a greater percentage of stucco. He said a hotel on Oglethorpe Avenue, the student housing that SCAD has done, they are a larger percentage of non-masonry than 75%. Therefore, this is not a precedent. Mr. Lott said in seeking their Part I approval, they discussed specifically which areas were brick and which areas were non-brick because of the importance of the discussion that they were having at that time. He said that Dr. Williams was supportive of a brick veneer of that kind of grid would be difficult.

Mr. Howington said he believes that during those early discussion, the Board talked about the first and second floor being horizontal and that it be broken up industrially.

Dr. Henry said there is a rule about materials.

Ms. Harris explained in Part I the Board was looking at height and mass. The visual expression would have shown contrasting colors. While with this rendering that might not be stucco, but could be stone.

Mr. Howington said he knows the Board discussed stucco and metal paneling. But, he is not sure if the Board discussed masonry.

Mr. Merriman asked if the 55% counts towards the recessed parts.

Mr. Howington answered that the 55% does not count.

Dr. Williams asked how much would be added if it was counted.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Lott if he knew the answer to this question.

Mr. Lott said they could calculate it, but off hand he is unsure. The area where they have brick where the ordinance does not require it is in the recess. All the other sides of the buildings are two to three stories high with brick; where the church property is, the first street would have to have 75%. He recalls that they did talk about brick. They had brick that went up very tall in the previous iterations. There is precedent in this zone, on the west side of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, that have far less masonry than this building. They applied for the variance with ZBA and they really would like to have the Board's recommendation to move forward with this. Mr. Lott said they certainly felt they were moving forward with confidence after having talked about the stucco and metal paneling on the upper part and brick where they were showing a brick exterior.

Mr. Howington said he is aware that Selma Street is the issue. He asked, however, has the building as a whole been calculated. Or, is it 55% of the whole expression. There is

frontage on all sides.

Mr. Lott said all the elevations are more or less in their 50s. Some are 52 and some are 57. They calculated each elevation. If you took all the brick on this building and put it just on Selma Street, you should be at 110%. They tried to do what they felt was right for the architecture and not just adherence to that particular abstract standard.

Dr. Williams said he was less troubled by the percentage issue than the aesthetic. He would be willing to support the variance conditioned on the relationship of the colors and maybe if the upper portion could be looked into.

Mr. Merriman said according to the ordinance, the petitioner would have to put brick back.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Lott if this is something he would be willing to look at.

Mr. Lott, for clarity, asked if the Board was saying color, cornice, and window recess. He said they will change those. They will retain the sliding glass doors. No one has talked about the butterfly roof yet.

Mr. Howington stated that the petitioner is to retain the alignment of the windows as presented.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked if it is possible to make the vertical pilasters more proud.

Mr. Lott said they could look into this.

Mr. Howington said ensure that the four inch window recesses are achieved.

Mr. Lott said in the brick they have layer after layer with stucco. When you start having two or three steps back of your wood framing, it results in some difficulty. He explained that what they would rather do is recessed the window and leave the grid expression of the structure the light/dark relationship flush. Mr. Lott said they would be happy to bring the colors back to staff or if it is on the Consent Agenda that's okay, too.

Mr. Lott said they applied to ZBA for this. They feel there is a clear precedent that was a clear direction granted by this Board. They did discuss brick and in fact some of the Board members thanked him for showing them this. Standards as written do not always yield good architecture. When they looked at some of the previous versions, they clearly took the direction away from the previous meetings and it is important for the project to move forward. They have a meeting scheduled before the ZBA.

Mr. Howington said he recalls this conversation as well.

Mr. Lott asked for a continuance to continue the project to the next meeting. They really need the finding of fact.

Ms. Harris explained that staff recommended denial to the ZBA for the 75% modular masonry and since the Board will be voting to grant approval of a recommendation to ZBA a finding fact for the 75% modular masonry they will have to list their findings.

Mr. Lott stated that the first petition the Board heard before his petition had 13 variances that were approved without anyone having to list the fact findings. How is this?

Ms. Harris explained that normally the Board agrees with staff on the fact finding issues as outlined in the staff report, but in this case, she was unsure of what are their finding of facts. Therefore, the Board need to stipulate their fact findings in their recommendation to the ZBA.

Dr. Williams outlined the Board's finding facts are the special condition is the unique nature of the extremely long site along Selma Street. Other buildings in the area do not have 75% masonry materials; the literal interpretation would deprive the applicant of rights enjoyed by other properties; the variance is the minimum necessary; special privilege would not be granted that is denied to other buildings and the variance is consistent with the intent of the ordinance.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition for signage and Part 2 Design Details of new construction at 540 Selma Street at the request of the petitioner. The Board approved the signs because they meet sign ordinance and are visually compatible.

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review - PASS does hereby recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the 75% modular masonry materials requirement based on the variance criteria outlined above.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Tess Scheer

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

Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

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

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

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Stephens Ward.pdf](#)

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

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of revisions to Part I: Height and Mass and 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. She stated that the Historic District Board of Review approved Part I: Height and Mass with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II: Design Details:

1. Align the heights of the windows along the north, rear façade;
2. Add a fence along the Hall Street façade at the west property line;
3. Increase the foundation height;
4. Reduce the pitch of the main roof but not the turrets on the three corners;
5. Ensure the south elevation is parallel with Hall Street;
6. Recess the bays on Habersham so that the turrets read more prominently.

Ms. Harris said that additionally the Board approved the demolition of the non-contributing building at 615 Habersham Street because the building is not eligible for historic status. The petitioner has revised the design as follows:

1. The heights of the windows along the north façade align.
2. A fence has been added along the Hall Street façade.
3. The foundation height has increased from two feet, six inches, to three feet three and one-half inches.
4. The pitch of the main roof has been reduced from 11:12 to 4:12. The turrets have been reduced from 11:12 to 10:12.
5. The south elevation is now parallel with Hall Street.
6. The bays along Habersham Street are recessed at the second floor and the turrets read more prominently due to the roof shape alteration.

7. The former double stoop along Habersham has been expanded from one bay to five bays.
8. A pediment has been added above the porch and the window sizes above the porch have been reduced.

Ms. Harris stated that staff recommended, initially in their report, that the building be set a little further back with thinking that there was enough room in the site to set it further back, but with further conversation with the Traffic Engineering it was confirmed that this would not be possible. The parking spaces are shown too short in the site plan and would actually come out a little further making the width between the parking and the turning area to be too short.

Mr. Howington asked if one parking space was deleted, would that not alleviate the problem. Ms. Harris stated that five parking spaces are required and seven parking spaces are shown. She said, pointing to a section, that this cannot be shown as a parking space because it is too close to the bay element, therefore, it cannot be used according to Traffic Engineering. The other one has trash and other elements there, so this space cannot be considered a parking space. Therefore, there are only five parking spaces here.

Dr. Williams asked what happens with the parking spaces based on staff's recommendation.

Ms. Harris answered that the staff's recommendation becomes null and void.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends to continue the petition of New Construction: Part II, Design Details for five new townhomes at 615 Habersham Street to address the following:

1. Restudy the size and proportion of the two window openings in the center of the Habersham Street façade to meet the 5:3 ratio.
2. Restudy the materials of the window lintels, sills, and water table, foundation, and horizontal banding be made of a different material than the walls.
3. Change the turret and main roof to be constructed of standing seam metal.
4. Change the gate to be metal and painted black. Reduce the width of the gate opening to 12 feet.
5. Provide the depth of the porch on Habersham Street.
6. Reduce the length of the porch on the Habersham Street façade significantly to be more visually compatible with the modest more stoops along Habersham Street.

7. Ensure the window sashes are inset not less than three inches.

Mr. Howington said that he does not want to disagree with Traffic Engineering, but he does not know if a study was done. They can ask the petitioner this. But, coming in where the trash receptacles are, if you were to drive in right behind there that space cannot be used for a parking lot. Therefore, it seems as if you would gain a few feet. He said personally this bothers him with parking on the street. Mr. Howington said he does not believe that there is not another way to do this.

Ms. Harris said this is something that the petitioner can address. This was not discussed at the site plan review meeting and, therefore, she is unsure how this would have been received.

Dr. Henry asked when did the petitioner submit the revised plans.

Ms. Harris stated that the petitioner submitted the revised plans on time. But he has done some revisions since he received the staff report.

Dr. Henry said he is confused with the samples.

Ms. Harris explained that some of these are in response to the staff's recommendation. However, if the Board does not want to consider them, this would be the Board's decision. However, staff felt that the revisions were minor enough to be presented.

Mr. Merriman asked if the gate would be a part of the standard pertaining to garage doors.

Ms. Harris answered no. The gate goes with the solid and void visual compatibility and as much as they could be reduced at access points. They just need to be more pedestrian friendly. But it is not a specific standard.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cramer thanked the Board for what they do and for their review of this project. He said they have been responding to the various comments of the staff and the Review Board. As far as the parking lot, 43 feet is the magic number according to Traffic Engineering. There is no way to get it smaller than that because you have an 18 foot parking space and you must have a 25 foot right angle parking. This adds up to the 43. When he had the building situated the opposite way, he could go around the building on two sides and make the angle parking. But when you have that 90 degree parking angle, you have to have the 25 feet behind the parking place.

Mr. Cramer said Ms. Harris and he were discussing some elevations on Habersham Street and based on their discussion, he has with him now a couple of the elevations. It will only take him a minute to show them to the Board. He is only seeking to move the project further and/or get some advise from the Board.

Mr. Howington informed Mr. Cramer if he wanted to quickly respond to the elevation he could do so.

Mr. Cramer said he has two elevations that he would respond to in relation to the staff's report and regarding the Board's comments at the last meeting. He believed at the last meeting, they talked about making the Habersham Street side looking like the Hall Street

side. This is where the five bay porch came from and the tower end of each porch. He showed the Board an elevation and stated that it responds exactly to the staff's report and he turned it in, but it was too late to get the staff's report rewritten. Mr. Cramer explained that they restudied the size of the porch and the two windows over the entrance of the Habersham Street side and made them taller. The reason they have two roof samples is that the black is the right color, but gray only shows the shape of the roof. He only included this to show the profile as he always is asked about the profile every time he submits a project.

Mr. Cramer said regarding the material, they used the cast stone light stucco to accentuate sills and the horizontal band at the bottom of the building. They changed the material of the roof to standing seam. They made a 12 foot wide metal gate on the right side. The depth of the porch on Habersham Street is 6 feet. There are 17 feet from the building out to the curb. Therefore, it does not encroach too much. All the other buildings north of them have encroachments; and they have stoops and flowerbeds between the stoops. Consequently, it is like a continuous encroachment north of them.

Mr. Cramer stated that he reduced the length of the porch on Habersham Street and they will ensure that the window sashes are inset not less than three inches. The other elevation has a larger porch and the elevation is a little more pronounced and ornate.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Cramer to explain what is happening in the middle.

Mr. Cramer explained that he had to do something with the upper floor. He had to recess a part of it to make it work. He has the floor plan with him, but they ended up with recessing the bay window back into the top floor and then come out to give it that look. They had to put a little roof on each side of the porch.

Mr. Howington said this seems a little complicated. He does not know how the Board feels about this version, but he likes the other solution.

Mr. Cramer said he was trying to get the bay window to pop on this side of Habersham Street and when he looked at the other houses in the neighborhood, he noticed that the houses that had the tower form on them showed that the tower roof was just sat on the top of the main body of the roof and did not express the whole form of the octagon, onion dome or whatever it was in the actual roof. He likes the house across the street with the two onion domes. It is expressed on Habersham Street on the front, but does not go around the corner. The roof is on these, but the actual cornice line is continuous.

Mr. Howington stated that this particular iteration has the porch roof and the two little side wing roofs. What are they?

Mr. Cramer explained that these make the bay window work around the corner and are inset on top of the first floor level.

Mr. Howington asked if this is a porch.

Mr. Cramer answered no, it is not a porch; it is just a roof.

Mr. Howington asked if it is just a roof hanging there with nothing below.

Mr. Cramer answered that the first floor is below. The top floor is recessed back over the first floor on the elevation.

Ms. Caldwell asked if they had the model.

Mr. Howington said he would rather that they stayed away from this to be on the safe side. He did not want the Board to be confused.

Mr. Cramer stated that he is commenting on the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Howington asked what is happening at the roofline where the porch is horizontal. The stucco and blocks are scored, but there are some vertical lines that are going horizontally across at the second floor level.

Mr. Cramer explained that this is the block pattern. All the blocks are the same size and they are on course. The rustication is the same on the stucco.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked if the hatch pattern is arbitrary. It does not align with heads of the windows or anything.

Mr. Cramer said that it aligns with the bay windows and the main vertical elements. When it turns the corner, it is hard to keep everything lined up.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked Mr. Cramer to look at sheet A-3 versus sheet A-4. She said none of the scoring is on the same horizontal planes. She said what the Board has in front of them is not what is shown in their submittal package. They have not had a chance to look at that.

Mr. Howington said they have this same situation in the submittal package. They have the block pattern, but when they get to the floor line it is a different block pattern.

Ms. Weibe-Reed stated that if Mr. Cramer looks at the header it appears to be scored midway to the top header, but on Elevation 2 at Habersham Street it looks a little less. If they look at the ground level a band is shown at the bottom with one inch slivers, but on Hall Street the slivers are one and one-half inches. Therefore, there are great inconsistencies present in the way they are illustrated.

Dr. Williams said the last time Mr. Cramer was at the meeting, they talked about the Habersham Street elevation stepping back so that it would basically follow the geometry of the Hall Street elevation so that the towers would have the same return. Is it flush on Habersham Street?

Mr. Gunther said there appears to be a six inch return in the back.

Mr. Cramer said it has a six inch return. Bay windows are on the front.

Dr. Williams said he believes there is a house in the neighborhood on Huntingdon Street where they actually turn the corner. He thought the petitioner was going back

further with that. But the elevation remains flush. He is curious why these were not pushed back a little more.

Mr. Howington stated that it says six inches on the second floor, but is actually straight on the first floor.

Mr. Cramer said he put the porch at the intersection at the six inches offset at the pilaster on the porch. He thought this would take care of it on the first floor.

Mr. Gunther said the full bay expression needs to happen at the return.

Dr. Henry said he is familiar with the Huntingdon Street domes. They rise above the roofline. He would like to see the same thing done here.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Patrick Phelps resides at 308 East Hall Street. Mr. Phelps commended Mr. Cramer and the Board. They have come a long way and he believes that with a few tweaks, this will be a great neighbor that he looks forward to having. He wanted to make a point regarding the setback issue. He understands there are site constraints of parking, but there is also setback site restraints as well. It is outlined in the Preservation Ordinance and in the City Ordinance for acceptance next to adjacent neighbors along the block. If the parking cannot move, then the entire idea is that the building footprint needs to be reduced in length. Mr. Phelps said by looking at the living space, it appears that approximately eight or ten feet could be pulled out the spaces and make still efficient, useable and still abide by all of the site restraints.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that in the interest of time, most of their concerns have been brought up by the Board. They are looking at the colors, but understand that they might have been looking at the wrong colors. Ms. Meunier said by looking at the conditions of the changes that the petitioner has offered, they are leaning towards the first change they looked at, not the alternate, in terms of the porch in bringing it around the bay on the Habersham Street side.

Mr. Howington invited Mr. Cramer to respond to the public comments. Mr. Cramer declined.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry said that Mr. Phelps spoke of setbacks. This should have been done in Part I, Height and Mass. What are the rules?

Mr. Howington said while Ms. Harris is looking up the answer, last month there were some mistakes on the site plan that was presented to the Board. Some of the other buildings were set further to the street which in actuality made it seem that this building could be set back which presented a case. It was admitted that this was a mistake. However, this was a critical, significant error in the setback issue.

Ms. Harris said given the fact that the site plan was incorrect at the last meeting and considering that revisions are being made to Part I, if the Board wanted to revisit this, she

believes it would be fair. She read that the setback standards state "for front yard there shall be no front yard setback except as follows: on tithing lots where there is a historic setback along a particular block, front setback shall be provided; on a trust lot fronting a square, proposed buildings may establish a front yard setback not to exceed 20 feet." Ms. Harris said this is just outside the Oglethorpe Plan Area, she does not know if there is a strict adherence to those provisions here.

Mr. Howington said that the setback bothered him the last time and it concerns him now because he feels strongly that this street has a very strong presence of yards and setbacks.

Mr. Merriman said the last time the building was situated this way because the lot is not square. The Board has already approved the request for Part I Height and Mass.

Dr. Williams said Part I Height and Mass was approved on a site plan that was incorrect. Theoretically, the Board can rescind that approval.

Mr. Merriman asked for clarification pertaining to what was brought incorrectly to the Board.

Mr. Cramer stated he would like to respond to this question. He said at the last meeting, Mr. Phelps stated that his house was shown closer to the curb. Mr. Cramer explained that Mr. Phelps's steps come all the way to the curb. He has two steps to the sidewalk and then he has about a five foot landing and more steps going up. Mr. Cramer said his CAD person made it look like one object is closer to the curb. Mr. Phelps has large massive steps and they all somewhat blended together. It did not delineate the steps from the building. Mr. Cramer said he remembers that he acknowledged that it was further back.

Mr. Cramer stated that he wanted to bring to the Board's attention that there are a lot of nice big lots here with a lane to Hall Street that he would love to design something here. Most of these buildings have steps that go to the sidewalk and up to the main level of the house. Therefore, just by architecture, you would have a lot of room to setback. He said, however, he does not have this luxury. Secondly, other than multi-family dwellings here, the steps usually sit right on the sidewalk. This happens at the Russian Hotel and the townhouses across Habersham Street. At least more than 30% of the buildings here do this also. Therefore, it is not like this has not been done in the ward before. Mr. Cramer said that diagonally across Hall Street, the steps are on the sidewalk.

Mr. Cramer asked for a continuance.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition for Part II, Design Details for five new townhomes at 615⁵ - PASS Habersham Street at the request of the petitioner.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams
Second: Justin Gunther

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

15. [Petition of Hansen Architects | 14-003378-COA | 230 West Broughton Street | New Construction: Part II Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 14-003378-COA.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Ortho-Zoning-Imagery.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Decker Ward.pdf](#)

Mr. Patrick Phelps was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction, Part 2: Design Details for a four story tall building with basement at 230-240 West Broughton Street. The building features three, 30 foot wide bays, and central storefront. The Board approved Part I: Height and Mass on September 10, 2014 with no conditions.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends to continue Part II, Design Details for new construction at 230-240 West Broughton Street to address the following:

1. Eliminate the use of Azek trim an panels because it is not visually compatible and does not meet the design standards;
2. Eliminate the cast stone base along the lane as it is not a typical treatment on a lane;
3. Select an alternative material for front façade detailing;
4. Consider adding an additional decorative element on either side of the main entrance, to break up the seven feet of stucco;
5. Select a more contrasting color for the cast stone or stucco;
6. Redesign the fenestration on the fourth floor to met the window standards; and
7. Provide screening for the mechanical equipment on the roof.

Dr. Henry asked what is Azek.

Ms. Harris explained that Azek has been approved by the Board for new construction, rear porch decking.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Phelps said he would go through and review the staff recommendations. The Azek

trim would be on the recessed panels on the first floor. It will be a smooth surface panel. Azek has been used in the district before. It looks very similar to wood. Due to its low maintenance and easiness to use it, they are asking the Board's consideration to use the azek. He said pertaining to the cast stone, staff has said that it is a 5/8" recess. They will select another material for the front detailing. Pertaining to the decorative element on either side of the main entrance to break up the seven feet of stucco, they would like to pull the central bay out and have it protrude out two inches so they will have a shadow line. Most of Broughton Street is flat and he really does not believe they will need more than two inches. A stronger shadow line would make the entrance more prominent. They will select a more contrasting color for the cast stone or stucco and provide it to the staff. Mr. Phelps said regarding the fenestration on the fourth floor to meet the window standards, they will go to a four bay punch opening. They will provide screening for the mechanical equipment on the roof to staff.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with all of staff's comments.

Mr. Howington invited Mr. Phelps to respond to the public comments. Mr. Phelps declined.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Howington said that Azek is a modern material and it looks like wood when painted. It is a durable material and he does not have any issues with Azek on a modern new building.

Dr. Williams said on the third floor, there are five windows. By reducing the floor, the windows somehow seem meager.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for Part 2 Design Details at 230-240 West Broughton Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Eliminate the use of Azek trim and panels because it is not visually compatible and does not meet the design standards;
2. Eliminate the cast stone base along the lane as it is not a typical treatment on a lane;
3. Select an alternative material for front façade detailing;
4. Consider adding an additional decorative element on either side of the main entrance, to break up the seven feet of stucco; ^{- PASS}
5. Select a more contrasting color for the cast

stone or stucco;

6. Redesign the fenestration on the fourth floor to meet the window standards; and
7. Provide screening for the mechanical equipment on the roof (if visible from the public right-of-way);

Because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Tess Scheer

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

16. [Petition of Shedrick Coleman for SHEDDarchitecture | 14-003482-COA | 407 and 409 East McDonough Street | New Construction: Part 1 Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Crawford Ward.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [10-7-14 Public Comments.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of Part I Height and Mass for new construction on a vacant lot at 407 and 409 East McDonough Street. The new construction consists of a four story duplex with parking on the ground floor, accessed from East Perry Street. The petitioner also includes a variance request from the 30 foot structured parking standard. A similar petition was reviewed by the Board on September 10, 2014 and was continued at the request of the petitioner. The Board discussion focused on the orientation of the building toward Perry Street, the lack of walls of continuity, the tall floor to floor heights (particularly the raised basement and stoop height), and reducing the height and width of the fire wall on the rear fourth floor balconies between the two units. A similar petition was reviewed by the Board on August 13, 2014

and was continued at the request of the petitioner. Much Board discussion focused on the orientation of the building, height and the front entrance.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II, Design Details because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards:

- a. Either enclose the underside of the stoops or add doors at the ground level.
- b. Retain only one vehicular access point along the street to the west of the project with a human door along the opposite street (subject to approval from Traffic Engineering).
- c. Add a stringcourse to the parapet wall.
- d. Reduce the width of the fire wall and continue the coping across its face.
- e. Dimension the height of all balustrade and railing: also dimension all baluster spacing.
- f. Ensure that the apron to the garage is not located on the public right-of-way.
- g. Review the site plan to indicate that the sidewalk will continue across the driveway in material, configuration, and budget.

Ms. Michalak said staff also recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the 30 foot structured parking setback requirement because the project meets the variance criteria.

Ms. Michalak said that yesterday staff received some public comments from the neighbor regarding some issues with the access easement.

Mr. Howington clarified that any public comments relating to the legal boundaries is not the purview of the Review Board. Any legal disputes are between the petitioner and individual(s).

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Coleman stated that they have no issues with any of the staff's recommendations. All the recommendations can be addressed. They have already addressed some of the comments. The driveway and the apron will be inside the garage. It is 25 feet deep and will address having that transition there and the sidewalk is an oversight.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Coleman to address item a regarding the enclosure of the underside of the stoops.

Mr. Coleman stated that he took the door out because of the issue with the height. They will probably enclose it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Robert Rosenwald resides at 504 East McDonough Street. He stated that he wanted to be present at the other meetings, but was unable to be here. He said he sent his written comments to Ms. Harris. Mr. Rosenwald said he is still concerned. There is a tall building next to his house; he is not saying the buildings under discussion today equate to that, but he is concerned about height issues and the stair tower. Factually, he does not understand

why there is a stair tower. He realizes that the height of the building has been reduced, but it will still stick out and be seen by everyone. He is also concerned that if the stair tower remains approved he is concerned about triple windows. Mr. Rosenwald said he does not see triple windows or a stair tower anywhere in his neighborhood.

Mr. Tom Sharpe, Manager of the Condo Homeowners Association, said they have two issues. They have retained an attorney to look at the lot line and the easement that the condo association has to their parking area and that the submittal to the Review Board is inaccurate. The property that was purchased is 61 feet by 60 feet not 69 feet as shown in their proposal. This would change the square foot and the coverage ratio. The Condo Association has an easement over the westernmost 18 feet on the 61 feet side. They have sent a letter to the petitioner, but they have not gotten a response.

Mr. Howington told Mr. Sharpe that the Board appreciates his concerns and they are valid; however, the Board has no jurisdiction with legal matters. But, they do have jurisdiction over height and mass. The Board has to adhere to what was presented to them. If there are legal issues that were not presented correctly, then the petitioner will have to come back to the Board with those adjustments.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with staff's comments. Mr. Coleman has said that they will address staff comments. The HSF believes this is much improved with reducing the overall height and the floor to floor heights. They believe that enclosing the underside of the stoops with brick is the best option.

Mr. Howington invited Mr. Coleman to respond to the public comments, but Mr. Coleman declined.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Merriman said he was pleased to hear that the underside of the stoops would be enclosed.

Dr. Williams asked if the underside would be brick just under the stoop or all the way under the stairs. He believes they need to be precise with what is expected.

Ms. Michalak said the Board will see this in the Part II Design Details.

Mr. Howington said he believes at the last review, a comment was made that the columns were too slender which somewhat replicate some of the other buildings farther down Perry Street or on the back side of Perry Street. He believes the comment was to make the columns stronger in detail.

Mr. Coleman said this comment was made in the meeting before and they will take care of this.

Mr. Howington stated Mr. Coleman has agreed to look at this in accordance with the enclosing of the under stairs. He said he knew there was a concern over the stair tower, but they have reviewed the stair tower several times.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

1. Approve the petition for Part I, Height and Mass at 407 and 409 East McDonough Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II, Design Details because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards:
 - a. Increase the width of the lintels.
 - b. Revise the two stoops to be one adjoined stoop and enclose the underside of the stoops at ground level.
 - c. Retain only one vehicular access point along the street to the west of the project with a human door along the opposite street (subject to approval from Traffic Engineering).
 - d. Add a stringcourse to the parapet wall.
 - e. Reduce the width of the fire wall and continue the coping across its face. - PASS
 - f. Dimension the height of all balustrades and railing; also dimension all baluster spacing.
 - g. Ensure that the apron to the garage is not located on the public right-of-way.
 - h. Revise the site plan to indicate that the sidewalk will continue across all driveways in materials, configuration, and height.
2. Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the 30 foot structured parking setback requirement because the project meets the variance criteria.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

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

Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

17. [Petition of Christina H. Swenson | 14-004539-COA | 12 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Rehabilitation and Partial Demolition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Historic and MPC Archive Photographs.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Research Documents.pdf](#)

Ms. Christina Swenson was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for rehabilitation of the main building, demolition of the eastern addition, and side porch reconstruction for the property located at 12 West Oglethorpe Avenue. Ms. Michalak stated that this building suffered a fire in 2009 and since that time, the structure's roof has collapsed. Basically, only walls are here.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for rehabilitation of the main building, demolition of the eastern addition, and the porch reconstruction for the property located at 12 West Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Revise the angle of the propped porch addition roof. The historic photos indicate that the roof pitch intersected the main building in the first leg of the bay window on the east façade.
2. Revise the balustrade and foundation design for the proposed porch addition to match the historic photographs which indicate a wood lap siding balustrade with a brick foundation below. Add a tall wood apron between the siding and the brick as shown in the photos.
3. Ensure that c. 1950 addition is thoroughly documented through both drawings and photographs prior to its demolition. Submit the documentation to staff for review and approval prior to commencement of the demolition.

Mr. Howington asked Ms. Michalak that when she discussed the siding on the porch, she was thinking historically that they still have a brick face with a concrete porch. She was looking at the wood that is in the photograph, but it is just a railing.

Ms. Michalak answered correct. She is calling it a balustrade as it is not really a railing.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Swenson said they have no issues with the staff's recommendations. The original design shows wood siding. They are still doing some research on the building. The owner has hired someone to look into getting tax credits. She is trying to get in touch with The Elks to see if they have any information on this building. They have been in touch with the Georgia Historical Society.

Mr. Mike DeCaire stated that he is the project manager for this site.

Mr. Howington said this is a nice project and he is happy to see that the building will be restored.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they, too, are happy to see this building being rehabilitated. They want the building to be restored as to the photo evidence. Ms. Meunier the petitioner may know this, but the angle of the porch roof was not actually hitting the first leg of the bay. When she looked at it, she thought it was hitting the correct place, but she thinks this should be determined and treated however it was.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Caldwell asked what kind of material was on the roof.

Mr. Howington said they can ask the petitioner this question and he directed this question to Ms. Swenson.

Ms. Swenson said they found some burnt metal. It appears to be metal.

Mr. Howington said maybe through further research and documentation; they may find the information about the roof material.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for rehabilitation of the main building, demolition of the eastern addition, and side porch reconstruction for the property located at 12 West Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Revise the angle of the proposed porch addition roof. The historic photos indicate that the roof pitch intersected the main building in the first leg of the bay window on the east façade.
2. Revise the balustrade and foundation design for the proposed porch addition to match the historic photographs which indicate a wood lap siding balustrade with a brick foundation below. Add a tall wood apron - PASS between the siding and the brick as shown in the photos.
3. Ensure that c. 1950 addition is thoroughly documented through both drawings and photographs prior to its demolition. Submit the documentation to staff for review and approval prior to commencement of the

demolition.

4. Restudy the historic documentation available of the original porch to ensure that the proposed standing seam metal roof is the appropriate material and design.

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Tess Scheer

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

18. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 14-004581-COA | 412 Williamson Street | New Construction: Part 1 Height and Mass Amendment](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 14-004581-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 412 Williamson Street 14-004581-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 412 Williamson Street 14-004581-COA.pdf](#)

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

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of an amendment to Part I Height and Mass of a previously approved new construction hotel located at 412 Williamson Street to increase the height one story above the earned bonus story at the northeast corner of the building in order to accommodate a restaurant/café and outdoor terrace. The additional story adds approximately 6,780 square feet to the building, 4,016 square feet of which is heated space. The petitioner has stated that the additional height was necessitated by the recent amendment to the Height Map by City Council to the property to the north of the project site.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the amendment to Part 1: Height and Mass because the project is visually compatible and meets the design standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay said accompanying him is Mr. Dave Moore, senior lead project architect for their project. He said they concur with the staff report. They are really excited about the opportunity to move forward with this project. They are looking forward to moving to the next phase. The parapet height will not be more than 42 inches.

Mr. Howington said the condition of approval as recommended by staff is no longer there.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for an amendment- PASS to Part 1 Height and Mass of a new hotel at 412 Williamson Street because the building is visually compatible and meets the design standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

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

19. [Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 14-004592-COA | 10 Whitaker Street | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations to the windows and entrance door for the property located at 10 Whitaker Street.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for the new entrance door system on Whitaker Street and East Bay Lane facades with the following condition to be submitted

to staff for final review and approval:

Ensure that both new doors are inset not less than three inches from the exterior surface of the building façade.

Ms. Michalak additionally reported that staff recommends denial to replace two double-hung, single-paned, true-divided lite windows along Whitaker Street with frameless picture windows because the proposed work does not meet the preservation and design standards.

Mr. Gunther asked if a door is currently on Bay Lane.

Ms. Michalak answered that it is currently a window.

Mr. Gunther asked if staff is okay with this.

Ms. Michalak answered that it is a lane. She is aware that they are not supposed to include interior arrangements, but they would have to enclose the stair and it is a fire stair. She said [pointing to an area] that this was changed from a window to a door not long ago.

Mr. Howington asked Ms. Michalak if she said the front façade was on the lane.

Ms. Michalak answered no. The front façade was on Bryan Street.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lynch stated they do not have any issues with the staff's concern. He said the owner would like for the Board to consider their second item regarding the windows. They have looked at the windows several times and the sashes do not appear historic. They are probably the historic configuration, but the glass in the frames is just clear glass. The frame construction does not appear to be original. There is not much paint on the exterior. They do not believe that they are original.

Mr. Lynch said the owner will keep all the sashes on site. Therefore, if needed, it would be easily reversible.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with staff in their recommendation of denial to replace the double-hung windows because they are not deteriorated and are not proposed to be replaced in-kind. They do not agree with replacement of the main entrance door system on Whitaker Street with a frameless glass door entrance as they feel that the door system is also a character defining feature and is not deteriorated. Therefore, it should not be lost. Ms. Meunier said particularly on this façade because it is such a small façade and the door is arguably a large part of that and how it is read. Therefore, they believe that it could be considered a character defining feature and should not be lost.

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

Mr. Lynch stated that he would reiterate the staff's comments; the door is a late 1980 addition that is not historic.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams asked if they know what the 1980 door looked like.

Ms. Michalak stated exactly where the door is a window was there.

Mr. Howington said it was not an original opening.

Mr. Gunther said his concern is the lost of the historic fabric.

Ms. Caldwell said if the door is going to be replaced on the front it should go back to being a window as it was originally.

Mr. Howington stated that the Board has to remain with what is presented to them by the petitioner. The Board can either approve or deny the petition.

Ms. Caldwell asked that to approve the petition, would it not need to go back to what it was historically.

Mr. Howington explained that the opening is presently there; therefore, they would not be modifying the opening. They, so to speak, would not be doing any harm, but just replacing the door.

Mr. Lynch explained that the back lane door is currently used by the first floor tenant as a service door and also as a second egress door. The reason they need the other stair is for the assembly use on the second floor. Presently, the building only has a single means of egress from the second floor. This is to bring it into code compliance. The tenants want separate entrances and exits and this is the only code compliant alternative that they were able to come up with.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

1. Approve the new entrance door systems on the Whitaker and East Bay Lane facades with the following condition to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:
 - Ensure that both new doors are inset not less than three (3) inches from the exterior surface - PASS of the building façade.
2. Deny the replacement of the two (2) double-hung, single-paned, true-divided lite windows along Whitaker Street with frameless picture windows because the proposed work does not meet the preservation and design standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Nicholas Henry

Debra Caldwell

- Nay

Justin Gunther

- Aye

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

20. [Petition of Andy Lynch | 14-004593-COA | 570 Indian Street | Signs and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Submittal City Storage REVISED.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Floor Plan.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 570 Indian Street 14-004593-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [letter-with-stud-mount.pdf](#)
Attachment: [studWSpacer.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Reccomendation.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Sara Farr gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting alterations at 570 Indian Street.

Ms. Farr reported that staff recommends to continue the petition in order to address the following concerns:

1. The historic character of the property will be damaged by the removal of historic fabric to install two new doors, one on the north façade and one on the south façade. Further study of the necessity of these new openings and the utilization of existing openings needs to be completed.
2. The hollow metal door set within a corrugated metal panel proposed for the north façade is not visually compatible and needs to be restudied.
3. The internal lighting integrated into the metal awning on the south facade should be removed.
4. The service yard fence faces a public street and must be constructed of mason or iron.

Ms. Farr additionally reported that staff recommends approval of the three signs with the following conditions:

1. Color samples are provided and approved.
2. The signs are mounted into the mortar and do not damage the brick.

Mr. Lynch stated that this is the second phase of the project. They met with staff yesterday and believe they worked through most of the issues. Therefore, if possible, they would like to avoid a continuance and make most of the adjustments now as they are not that problematic.

Mr. Lynch explained that the service yard enclosure is a secondary screen wall. It is the exact the same detail that they had approved and got constructed on the site of the Service Brewery. They talked with staff about the possibility of some masonry piers to help break

up the wood enclosure. Probably, on the corners they could use some kind of masonry pier and that would help to tie the brick in, but also try to keep the vocabulary that they previously got approved on the first phase of the project. He said regarding the ATM after further clarification with staff, it is not really an ATM. It is more of a transactional kiosk to get access to the building.

Mr. Lynch said they agreed to remove the internal canopy lighting. He believes it was a misunderstanding of what the standards were asking for. He explained that it really was just a couple of down lights in the awning system, but they can remove the lights. Mr. Lynch said regarding the hollow metal door, they will keep the door configuration, but just extend it over and do some kind of aluminum storefront system; maybe a spandrel pattern to help carry the horizontal height across.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Lynch if the previous approval had a storefront.

Mr. Lynch answered yes; it was a hollow metal door.

Mr. Howington said he was speaking of the previous phase.

Mr. Lynch said the previous phase looked almost identical to this and explained that it was a coiling rollup door that had an egress door in the coiling door. This is how they came up with this system as it looks very similar to what they got approved. He said regarding the two new doors, is more a code compliance issue where they need an exit from the fire stair. Mr. Lynch said he believes they can figure out a new configuration that could possibly share this entrance. On the back they do not have as many openings to work with. An existing loading dock is here that they want to maintain as a future loading area. Mr. Lynch showed the Board the egress stair and pointed out the doorway that goes into the storage area. They want to separate the two. Therefore, their only opportunity is to add another entry. Mr. Lynch said, pointing to an area, that unfortunately City Traffic Engineer has dictated that the loading dock be put on this side of the building so the trucks could come in and then back onto the property. He said they believed this was the best location to put the opening because the most inconspicuous place is behind the 30 feet setback from the property line. An existing aluminum decorative fence runs along the property that was approved in the first phase of the project. The fence will remain in place.

Mr. Gunther asked Mr. Lynch to explain what he said about the openings for the hollow metal door.

Mr. Lynch explained that they probably would leave the corrugated material from the door head to the existing opening. Then from here across, they would brick and use about two glass panels with the spandrel system and then an aluminum storefront door. This would match the material that they will use for opening. Mr. Lynch agreed to work with staff to amend his petition to incorporate all of the staff's conditions and ensure that all the conditions are met.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Howington said it appears that Mr. Lynch has met with staff and has met most of the conditions. The staff is agreeable that the conditions have been met.

Mr. Merriman said what Mr. Lynch explained takes care of Mr. Gunther's question about the hollow metal door. He wanted clarification regarding Mr. Lynch's explanation regarding the staff's recommendation for item #1.

Mr. Howington said he believes he understood Mr. Lynch's explanation. But, he will ask Mr. Lynch to answer Mr. Merriman's question.

Mr. Lynch explained that he said they can work out a solution to eliminate this door. This will be a "drive-in" entrance where the cars can actually pull in and unload. Traffic Engineering asked them not to put it there. Therefore, he believes they can use the pedestrian entrance and probably eliminate that door. The door on the back is more problematic. They do not have enough existing openings in the back to make it viable. So, they took the location that was the least visible from the right-of-way to make these changes. Mr. Lynch showed the Board a picture of the back area and pointed out that the door they are proposing would be behind the tree; it's a CMU shed structure. They will remove all the existing corrugated material and rework the opening and masonry.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Lynch if they have talked with Park & Tree about this.

Mr. Lynch answered no. They have not talked with Park and Tree yet; but he did not believe that Park and Tree would have a problem with it.

Mr. Howington said he believes that Mr. Lynch has addressed all of staff's conditions.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for signs and alterations to 570 Indian Street with the following conditions:

1. The hollow metal door proposed for the south façade is removed. The proposed storefront door on the north façade will remain.
2. The hollow metal door set within a corrugated metal panel proposed for the north façade will be removed and replaced with a storefront door with a metal panel. - PASS
3. The internal lighting integrated into the metal awning on the south façade will be removed.
4. The service yard fence will be visually compatible with the fence used in the service yard at the brewery located at 574 Indian Street.
5. Color samples are provided and approved for all signs.
6. The signs are mounted into the mortar and do not damage the brick.

Vote Results

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

21. [Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 14-004596-COA | 7 Drayton Street | Window Replacement](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to replace the windows for the property located at 7 Drayton Street (also known as 25-27 Bay Street). The second through fifth floor double hung, wood windows – on the east, north, and south facades – are proposed to be replaced. The west façade has existing steel windows that will not be replaced. On the entire south (lane) façade and third through fifth floors on the east (Drayton) and north (East Bay) facades, all windows are proposed to be replaced with Marvin, aluminum clad, double-hung, double-paned, one-over-one lite windows. On the second floor of the east and north facades, the windows are proposed to be replaced with Marvin, wood, double-hung, double-paned, one-over-one lite windows.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends denial to replace the windows for the property located at 7 Drayton Street because the proposed work is not visually compatible and does not meet the preservation or design standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lynch said they understand the staff’s concern about the windows. They brought the petition forward skeptically, but this has become a life-safety concern for the owner. During the last year, three windows fell out of the fourth and fifth floors. The ongoing maintenance of the property has become a burden to them. The property is a little different. They are sitting on two major roads downtown. The only way to access the upper floor windows on three of the facades is by scaffolding the building which essentially is a \$3,000 cost, plus the maintenance cost. Consequently, they would be looking at about a \$7,500 investment over five to ten years or how often the windows need to be maintained.

Mr. Lynch explained that on the westside of the property all of the windows are already steel windows. What they are proposing is to simply replace the windows on the upper three floors with aluminum clad windows that would match wood windows being installed

on the first floor. He clarified that the wood windows they are installing are single-paned, true-divided lite that would match the exact configuration. The windows on the upper floor would be a clad window. Unfortunately, a single-paned clad type window doesn't exist, but the profiles would match exactly. He realizes that this is not something that they would typically propose, but the owner is adamant in trying to at least switch out at least the upper three stories where access is such a big problem. Most of the second floor windows could be served by a lift, but the third to the fifth floors become a costly endeavor. However, the windows must be maintained. Mr. Lynch asked the Board to please consider this.

Ms. Scheer asked why are the windows falling out. What's the reason?

Mr. Lynch answered that the sashes have come apart in many places; not all are original sashes, but several are so old. They get a lot of sun exposure and maintenance is difficult to do for five stories up. Therefore, they have not been maintained as well as they probably should have been because from a financial standpoint the owner has to do it every ten years.

Ms. Scheer asked Mr. Lynch that to replace the windows, he was speaking about scaffolding.

Mr. Lynch answered correct. The owner would have to scaffold the building to replace them, but the windows that they are looking at are 30 year windows which make it financially viable.

Mr. Howington asked would it be feasible to repair the windows from the interior of the building.

Mr. Lynch answered maybe from the inside to be repaired, but not to be replaced.

Mr. Merriman stated that the entire sash could be removed from the inside.

Mr. Lynch said all the sashes have been taken out already and have stored them on site. During construction, they had one fall out; and before construction two fell out onto the sidewalk. Therefore, as a safety precaution, they took all of the sashes out. The majority of them on this facade are in very poor condition. It would require almost a wholesale replacement of most of the sashes. There are some on the north side of the property that does not get the sun exposure and they are in a little better shape.

Mr. Howington asked if this is the wholesale replacement of sashes or sashes and frames.

Mr. Lynch answered sashes and frames.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with staff. They always believe that the sashes should be repaired as long as they can be as opposed to replacing the windows for as long as they can be. She said the HSF understands that the windows may not have been maintained, but they also choose repair and not full scale replacement of all the windows.

Mr. Howington invited Mr. Lynch to respond to the public comments, if he desired. Mr. Lynch declined.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Scheer said the Board has told other property owners that the cost of owning them is to maintain them and repair them as they are and not replace them with modern material.

Mr. Merriman said a great majority of his business comes from building new sashes. He said that they can easily be replaced and maintained. Mr. Merriman said with such a rated structure as this, he did not see how the Board could approve this request.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the petition to replace the windows for the property located at 7 Drayton Street because the proposed work is not visually compatible and does not meet the preservation or- PASS design standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Tess Scheer

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

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

22. [Petition of Robert W. Bristol | 13-003855-COA | 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Request for Extension](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Request for Extension.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Savannah Historic District Board of Review hereby approve the 12 month extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) issued on October 9, 2013 for the construction of a garage at the rear of the property located at 502 East - PASS

Oglethorpe Avenue [File No. 13-003855-COA].

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

23. [Petition of Loretta Hoover for Georgia Historical Society | 14-004322-COA | 104 West Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 104 West Gaston Street 14-004322-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 104 West Gaston Street 14-004322-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of S. Bart Redmond | 14-004464-COA | 208 East Jones Street | Staff Approved - Partial Stucco Replacement](#)

Attachment: [COA - 208 East Jones Street 14-004464-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 208 East Jones Street 14-004464-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of Michael Cannon | 14-004469-COA | 100 West Liberty Lane | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 100 West Liberty Lane 14-004469-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 100 West Liberty Lane 14-004469-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Josh Beckler for Coastal Canvas Products | 14-004470-COA | 300 Drayton Street | Staff Approved - Awnings](#)

Attachment: [COA - 300 Drayton Street 14-004470-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 300 Drayton Street 14-004470-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Gretchen O. Callejas | 14-004489-COA | 207 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Selective Demolition](#)

Attachment: [COA - 207 West Broughton Street 14-004489-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 207 West Broughton Street 14-004489-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Amended Petition of Gretchen O. Callejas | 14-004490-COA | 21 Houston Street | Staff Approved - Rear Addition](#)

Attachment: [COA - 21 Houston Street 14-004490-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 21 Houston Street 14-004490-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Tom Wolcott | 14-004500-COA | 120 West Bryan Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 120 West Bryan Street 14-004500-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 120 West Bryan Street 14-004500-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Marija Bumgarner for City of Savannah Tourism | 14-004516-COA | 2 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Replace Existing DOT Signs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 2 East Bay Street 14-004516-COA Various Locations.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 2 East Bay Street 14-004516-COA Various Locations.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Marija Bumgarner for City of Savannah Tourism | 14-004517-COA | 301 MLK Jr. Boulevard | Awning Replacement](#)

Attachment: [COA - 301 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard 14-004517-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Replacement Awning Visitors Center - 301 MLK Jr. Blvd 14-004517-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Tiffany Miller | 14-004574-COA | 230-232 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Color Changes](#)

Attachment: [COA - 230 - 232 Bull Street 14-004574-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 230 - 232 Bull Street 14-004574-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Jennifer Deacon for Dawson Architects | 14-004577-COA | 319 & 321 West Congress Street | Staff Approved - Awnings](#)

Attachment: [COA - 319 & 321 West Congress Street 14-004577-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 319 & 321 West Congress Street 14-004577-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Amended Petition of Jennifer Deacon for Dawson Architects | 14-004578-COA | 535 East Liberty Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 535 East Liberty Street 14-004578-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 535 East Liberty Street 14-004578-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Doug Bean for Doug Bean Signs, Inc. | 14-004579-COA | 320 Montgomery Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Changes](#)

Attachment: [COA - 320 Montgomery Street 14-004579-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 320 Montgomery Street 14-004579-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Matthew Frankel for Hansen Architects, PC | 14-004589-COA | 24 Drayton Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [1446 24 Drayton Street Ameris Bank HBR Packet 9-10-14.pdf](#)

Attachment: [COA - 24 Drayton Street 14-004589-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects, PC | 14-004603-COA | 10 Whitaker Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Change and Awnings](#)

Attachment: [COA - 10 Whitaker Street 14-004603-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Glass Door and window frame.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Amended Petition of Gerald D. Cowart | 14-004626-COA | 322 - 324 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Rehabilitation](#)

Attachment: [COA - 322 - 324 East Broughton Street 14-004626-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 322 - 324 East Broughton Street 14-004626-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of Leigh McMahon for Carlstedts, LLC | 14-004627-COA | 515 Barnard Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 515 Barnard Street 14-004627-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 515 Barnard Street 14-004627-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Amended Petition of Robert W and Mary Kay Bristol | 14-004729-COA | 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Garage](#)

Attachment: [COA - 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue 14-004729-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue 14-004729-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. [Petition of Benjamin Baxter for Metal Crafts, Inc. | 14-004757-COA | 421 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 421 Habersham Street 14-004757-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 421 Habersham Street 14-004757-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. [Petition of Sally and Archie Davis | 14-004800-COA | 244 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Brick Repointing](#)

Attachment: [COA - 244 East Oglethorpe Avenue 14-004800-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 244 East Oglethorpe Avenue 14-004800-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. [Petition of Brian Robin for Robin Restoration, LLC | 14-004815-COA | 218 East Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [Decision - 218 East Gaston Street 14-004815-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 218 East Gaston Street 14-004815-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. [Petition of Marija Bumgarner for City of Savannah Tourism | 14-004820-COA | 2 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Signage](#)

Attachment: [COA - 2 East Bay Street 14-004820-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 2 East Bay Street 14-004820-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

45. [Petition of Eric Meyerhoff | 14-004851-COA | 425 East President Street | Staff Approved - Color](#)

Change

Attachment: [COA - 425 East President Street 14-004851-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 425 East President Street 14-004851-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

46. [Petition of Lora McGrath | 14-004852-COA | 116 West Harris Street | Staff Approved - Siding Repair and Paint](#)

Attachment: [COA - 116 West Harris Street 14-004852-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 116 West Harris Street 14-004852-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

47. [Petition of Stratton Leopold | 14-004855-COA | 720 - 722 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Sign](#)

Attachment: [COA - 720 -722 Habersham Street 14-004855-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 720-722 Habersham Street 14-004855-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

48. [Petition of Michael Beard for Superior Building, Inc. | 14-004872-COA | 116 East Jones Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 116 East Jones Street 14-004872-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [GAF Product approval paperwork \(2\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [GAF Timberline- Slate.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 10-08-14.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 10-08-14.pdf](#)

Mr. Howington said 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, October 16, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

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

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

53. [Review Position Guest Editorial Letter](#)

Attachment: [Does history matter_HDBR editorial_7x14.pdf](#)

Mr. Howington stated that at the last meeting, they discussed the letter and felt that it needed to be condensed. A committee was formed to rewrite the letter. The committee members were: Dr. Henry; Dr. Williams, Mr. Gunther, Ms. Scheer and Mr. Howington. He said that the committee has written a draft letter.

Ms. Harris said the draft letter was forwarded to the Board members and was attached to the agenda as a matter of public record. Therefore, she did not believe that the letter needed to be read into the minutes. However, if the letter would be sent as a Board, she recommends that the Board take a vote on the letter.

The Board unanimously approved the position letter with deletion of the phrase "**rather against us,**" and added "**and other community partners.**"

Mr. Merriman said as the Board members are aware, Mr. Reed Engle has resigned from the Historic District Board of Review. He said in the past when a member resigned or their term expired, a plaque, resolution, or some form of gratification was given to the individual for their service. He said that when he initially became a member of the Review Board, Mr. Engle helped him tremendously. Mr. Merriman asked the Board if they plan to give recognition to Mr. Engle for the services he rendered as a member of the Review Board.

Mr. Howington said the Board will recognize Mr. Engle for his services.

Board Action:

Approve position letter with deletion of phrase "rather against us." Add "and other community partners." - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

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

New Business

54. [Request for Comments on Bike Rack Proposal at SCAD Library](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Harris reported that City Council has requested a recommendation from the Historic District Board of Review regarding the visual compatibility of new bike racks proposed to be installed by SCAD at the Jen Library located at 201 West Broughton Street.

Ms. Harris stated that the proposed new bike racks will replace the existing bike racks along the west façade, on the public right-of-way, of the Jen Library. The proposed 22 new bike racks accommodate the same quantity of bikes as the existing racks but within a smaller footprint and with greater clearances around the bike parking zone. They are the *Landscapeforms, Key Bike Rack*, which have a circular design and proposed to be red in color. Per the applicant, "they convey a contemporary and playful tone."

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval to City Council for the proposed bike racks because they are visually compatible with the Moderne and International Style elements of the Jen Library building.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Adel Parker, on behalf of SCAD, thanked the staff for the introduction to the bike rack project. They are excited to see an ongoing conversation of what the bike racks mean to the City of Savannah. They thank the staff and Board for their recommendation.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Parker if SCAD would be acceptable to changing the color.

Mr. Parker said that there are certain specifications for the racks. He believes the colors are black, red and yellow.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey came forward as a resident and as a prolific biker. He loves the new design, but he would choose a different color; probably black or silver. He said believes the racks are needed and that they are trying to get bikes off of public signage. There are only a few bike racks here.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Wiebe-Reed stated that she believes that pertaining to the color, that the Board recommend that the bike racks do not be a mixture of red, black or yellow. But, that they be just one color.

Dr. Williams stated that the Board could recommend approval of the bike racks with black being their preferential color.

Mr. Parker stated that this is the first time that they are doing this and using this vendor. When SCAD did the renovations to the Jen Library, they did one color that was specified by Ms. Harris.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review recommends approval to City Council for the bike racks, in either black or red, with the condition that all of the bike racks be the same color (whether they be black or red, either is acceptable) because the bike racks are otherwise visually compatible with the Moderne and International Style elements of the Jen Library building. - 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. - Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

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

XV. ADJOURNMENT

55. [Adjourned.](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, Chair Howington adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ms. Ellen I. Harris
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem