



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
December 10, 2014 1:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

DECEMBER 10, 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
Marjorie Weibe-Reed
Tess Scheer
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Members Not Present: Ebony Simpson, Vice-Chair
Stephen Merriman, Jr.

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

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

1. [Petition of Luis Burgos for Hansen Architects | 14-005520-COA | 24 Drayton Street | Signs and Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet-24Drayton St.-14-005520-COA.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for vinyl window signs, a new projecting principal use sign, an awning over the ATM and ATM signage with the condition that a material sample for the awning is provided for approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

- Tess Scheer - Aye
- Robin Williams - Aye
- Debra Caldwell - Aye
- Justin Gunther - Aye
- Nicholas Henry - Aye
- Keith Howington - Abstain
- Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
- Marjorie W Reed - Aye

2. [Petition of Brian Norris, Lammons Construction Co. | 14-005537-COA | 535 West Charlton Street | Addition](#)

- Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Renderings and Specifications.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a rear screened porch addition for the property located at 535 West Charlton Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Add a lower rail and balusters to the porch railing. Ensure that the baluster spacing does not exceed 4 inches. - PASS
2. Change the proposed fiberglass screening material to fine wire mesh.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

- Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

3. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs Inc. for Savannah Slow Ride | 14-005538-COA | 420 West Bryan Street](#)
[| Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
Attachment: [sav slow ride HRB attach.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- 420 W. Bryan St. -14-005538-COA.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a projecting principal use sign at 420 West Bryan Street sized 4.5 feet by 6.5 feet and constructed of metal and - PASS painted matte black, Dover matte white and Glidden Celery Leaf with the condition that the sign is mounted only into the mortar and not the brick.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

4. [Petition of Robert J. Portman for Barnard Architects | 14-005540-COA | 133 Montgomery Street](#)
[Alterations](#)

Attachment: [County Parking Deck Rain Screen HRB Submittal.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 133 Montgomery St - 14-005540-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the installation of rain screens and projecting vertical - PASS

“fins” at 133 Montgomery Street, because they are visually compatible.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

5. [Petition of Dawson Architects | 14-005567-COA | 135 Martin Luther King Jr., Blvd. | Amendment to New Construction](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition to amend the previously approved design as requested because- PASS the standards are met and the project is visually compatible.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

6. [Petition of Kathy Ledvina | 14-005608-COA | 143 Houston Street | Roof Repair and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [COA - 143 Houston St. 12-002202-COA.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a COA for 143 Houston Street (14-005608-COA) to replace the existing roof and for alterations to the East (front) and North (lane) façades of the commercial building at 143 Houston Street because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the intent of the design standards, with the - PASS following conditions:

- a. All signage be submitted to the Board for review and approval prior to installation.
- b. The electric meter location, be submitted to staff for final review and approval prior to installation.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

7. [Adopt December 10, 2014 Agenda](#)

Board Action:

Approve December 10, 2014 Agenda. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

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

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

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

8. [Approval of Minutes November 12, 2014](#)

Attachment: [11-12-2014 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of Minutes of November 12, 2014. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

9. [December 5, 2014 Board Retreat Summary](#)

Attachment: [Board Retreat Summary.pdf](#)

Attachment: [City Attorney Handout.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve December 5, 2014 Board Retreat Summary. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

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

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition at petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition at petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition at petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

13. [Petition of Neil Dawson, Dawson Architects | 14-005106-COA | 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue |
New Construction Hotel: Part II, Design Details](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition at petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

14. [Petition of Neil Dawson, Dawson Architects | 14-005113-COA | 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue |
New Construction Parking Garage: Part II, Design Details](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition at petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

15. [Petition of Hawg Scooters of Savannah | 14-005280-COA | 409 East Bay Street | Signs](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition at petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

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

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Stephens Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Color scheme.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of Part II: Design Details to construct five new townhomes, four of which face Hall Street and two face Habersham (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 provide at the rear, with the entrance to the parking area provided off Habersham Street. The Historic Review Board approved Part I: Height and Mass with some conditions which have been met. Additionally, the board approved the demolition of a non-contributing building at 615 Habersham Street because the building is not eligible for historic status.

Ms. Harris said that on October 8, 2014, the Board reviewed Part II: Design Details and continued the petition. The Board's discussion focused primarily on the setback, materials, scoring patterning, configuration of the turrets, and porch width and roof along Habersham Street. On November 12, 2014, the Board reviewed a revised submittal. It was continued at the request of the petitioner with Board discussion that focused primarily on the Habersham Street façade and the appropriate articulation of the turrets.

Ms. Harris explained that the petitioner has revised the Habersham Street façade to have the façade set back approximately six inches from the turrets in order for them to have greater articulation. Additionally, the petitioner has provided a series of studies of the façade and is presenting the preferred concept to the Board.

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

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cramer thanked the Board for their time and hard work; he entertained questions from the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said the issue the Board had with this petition was the turrets' articulation. The petitioner has reconciled this.

Dr. Henry said he believes this solution is the best they will get. If the turrets are emphasized more, the façade will be negatively affected.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for New Construction: Part II, Design Details for five new townhomes at 615 Habersham Street with the- PASS condition that the window sashes are inset not less than three inches, because the project is visually compatible and meets the design standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Material Board.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

Attachment: [14-003988-COA Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of Part II: Design Details for new construction of a three story building at the southeast corner of West Congress and Jefferson Streets. The proposed building will have a corner primary entrance, one secondary entrance along Jefferson Street, and two secondary entrances along West Congress Street. The Board approved Part I: Height and Mass at the September 10, 2014 meeting with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II Design Details (the design response is below):

1. Reduce the height of the awning structure on the third floor;
 - * The awning structure has been replaced with a structured roof;
2. Increase the ground floor height to 14 feet six inches to meet the standard;
 - * The ground floor height has been raised 14'8";

3. Incorporate windows on the second floor rather than storefront which is more typical on second floor along Congress Street;
 - * The storefront on the second floor has been replaced with windows;
4. Ensure that the horizontal banding continues on the street facades of the building beneath the awnings. Consider lowering the height of the storefronts and the awning installation to further emphasize the differentiation between the first story and upper stories;
 - * The horizontal banding continues beneath the awnings;
5. Restudy the disposition and massing of the third floor;
 - * The third floor has been redesigned to consist of a series of sloped shed roofs in a regular rhythm that relates to the bay spacing below.
 - * The structural supports are proposed to have a stucco finish with vines, while the roofs consist of solar PVC panels.
 - * The structure is setback seven feet nine inches from the Congress and Jefferson facades. There is a vegetative roof at the perimeter;
6. Restudy the awning structure to be more integrated into the overall design;
 - * See comments above.
7. Add additional glass to the recessed entrance on Congress Street;
 - * Additional glass has been added to the Congress Street entrance;
8. Restudy the spacing on the second floor windows.
 - * The spacing of the second floor windows are restudied and the lane elevation modified but the spacing on the other elevations are retained.

Ms. Harris explained that the materials and colors include a light colored brick with buff mortar and an accent brick in a darker brown. The proposed storefront sill is Elberton granite while the storefront frames are black. The stucco elements on the third floor are also a brown color. The awning color and signage will be submitted in a separate application.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends to continue Part II: Design Details for a new three story building at the southeast corner of Jefferson and West Congress Streets to address the following:

1. Reduce the height of the third floor;
2. Restudy the roof shape of the third floor;
3. Relocate the walk-up window to a less prominent location such as the blank bay to the south so as to not disrupt the storefront pattern;
4. Provide the awning material; and
5. Locate the awnings between each pilaster rather than overlapping.

Dr. Williams asked if the unfinished galvanized awning is the light base.

Ms. Harris explained that they are the light fixtures above the awnings. Specifications are provided in the packages that were sent to the Board.

Dr. Henry said they look like tool sheds.

Ms. Harris explained that the design was primarily responding to the use of incorporating solar panels. She believes the petitioner has actually brought forward some alternative schemes that do not necessarily include the solar panels, but, may be more visually compatible. The petitioner is better able to address this.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay came forward and stated that he will address the staff's comments. He stated that the purpose of the third floor is primarily for an outdoor dining space so that people would have the opportunity to eat in the restaurant on the ground floor level; and also be able to go to the third floor level and have an outdoor dining experience. For this reason, the elevator comes up to this level, the stair tower and the need for outdoor covered space. Mr. Shay explained that what they presented at the Height and Mass level had a hard roof enclosing habitable space; an awning that had a deliberately unusual shape. Based on one of the comments from a Board member, they felt that this was probably not the right way to go. They also had feedback that this should relate more directly to the architecture of what was below it. Therefore, they restudied this and decided to take the rhythm of the bay spacing on the façade. Also at that time, his client was desirous of participating in a program to be able to use solar power for the roof. Therefore, they left this to be a form generator as well to have a slightly sloping roof with southern exposure so that the roof could be covered with solar panels. The solar consultant determined that even using high efficiency panels that they needed to have a certain amount of variant in order to make it worthwhile. So, they added a little bit of roof over the area in the back that is underneath the mechanical equipment that is screened. By doing this, it ended up driving the form of the building. Mr. Shay said that upon getting the staff's report and this was not favorable, he spoke with his client and asked him how committed he was to the solar panels. He explained to the client that this was driving the design of the roof in ways that may not be the best design. His client told him that they were willing to forgo the solar roof if they could maintain the tenants' requirements for the walk-up window.

Mr. Shay said he believes that one Board member stated that it would be helpful to have some perspective views. Therefore, they had these generated and as the Board can see, because of that shape and the total height of the roof ends up being more than just the 9 feet to have good head clearance, it presents rhythm, although it is not enough for them to see it maybe from Broughton Street, but the most obtrusive view is the part along Congress Street. This is what they proposed originally. They went back to the drawing board and decided to come back more closely with what they presented the first time, which was to have a minimal height roof on the enclosed portions with flat roof that evolved out of the vertical circulation elements where it turned out that they need to have a service area for an upstairs restroom and some mechanical. Consequently, they pulled the eye level down and looked at going back to relatively simple awning that would be over the space. This is a fairly gentle awning. As the Board can see, it is much less obtrusive and follows the rhythm of the base. However, instead of presenting that sort of saw tooth profile, it has a simpler fashion that is approximately a little over nine feet above the covered deck area. Mr. Shay said they believe this is a good compromise solution. The people who go up here will still be able to have a good outdoor dining experience that will be less visible and less

obtrusive from the street. As he has stated, his client is willing to forgo the solar element.

Mr. Shay stated that they also studied another look which was to do a simpler gable rather than the barrel end. However, they were not completely satisfied with it. However, it is here as another potential solution. He explained that what they would like for the Board to do to today is to approve the opportunity for them to have the third floor. He reminded the Board that this area is permitted to have four stories. He said they are asking for what intentionally reads as a two story building with a little bit of roof awning on the third floor. Therefore, they feel that this is relatively low impact. If the Board looks at the packet and how it looks in relationship to the other buildings that are in the ward, they will see that it is compatible. Mr. Shay said he believes the original model shows this as well.

Mr. Shay said he believes the other main concern was the issue of the walkup window. They are presenting the shell of this building. There is a tenant that intends to occupy the ground floor. It will be a sit down restaurant, not a fast food operation. After a lot of study and debate, it does need to be in this location. This is why they chose to use a window system that is very compatible with the storefront and is made by the same manufacturer. All it does is add a sash on the inside of the same exact rhythm of the storefront in this same area and a little bit of a personal edge is there. The personal edge does not protrude beyond the pilaster. Therefore, it does not protrude on the passer-by and they think it is, therefore, a relatively low impact solution. The people who, therefore, do not want to come into the restaurant and sit down will have the opportunity to place their order at the sliding window and have some place to sit their wallet while they are trying to make change and so forth. They feel that this is a compatible solution; and much more compatible than an independent freestanding window. It is much more keeping with the intent of the ordinance to drive storefront for a relatively large percentage of the façade than what is nearby at McDonalds. Therefore, they feel that they need to hold the line on this window, the interior design of the entire restaurant really relies on this; although he is not the architect for that particular tenant, he can tell the Board that they have coordinated with them carefully to ensure that everything will work out and maintain the rules in the Historic District.

Mr. Shay stated that they showed the awning slightly encroaching on the pilasters that are between the awnings and staff recommended that they be pulled back a little. He said they have done so. He said the materials for the awning and the proposed gabled awning, on the roof is a vinyl coated canvas. If Board wants to review the awning up close, he would be happy to pass it to them now. They will return to the Board within a couple of meetings to present to them the awning color package, the graphics for the ground floor tenant and the signage.

Mr. Shay said a question was raised about the light fixtures. He explained that they carefully selected the light fixtures. They have tried to use the finish that is compatible with the other finishes and colors that have been selected for the exterior of the building. He entertained questions from the Board.

Dr. Williams said based on the color point of view, he agrees that it seems to be compatible with the other materials. But, there is a finished pallet of materials – the brick; the stone; and he is not sure where the rosette goes. Where will the rosette be placed?

Mr. Shay answered that the rosette does not go anywhere. It was only given to the Board

to show that all the metal would be painted black and sort of shiny.

Mr. Gunther asked if this would be on the third floor.

Mr. Shay answered that it will be everywhere.

Dr. Williams asked if the galvanized would be left unfinished.

Mr. Shay stated that maybe the galvanized is leading them to believe that it is more rustic than what it is. He explained that it is basically a silvery metal. However, the idea is not that it is unfinished, but that it is an exposed silvery metal.

Dr. Henry said he did not intend to get into designing the project, but he approves of the solar aspects if they are kept slanted and disguise them with some sort of banding.

Mr. Shay said he believes the staff recommended that they pull down the apparent height of the roof. However, in doing this, it would raise the height of the roof. He said that they also want it to appear to be very light. Mr. Shay said he believes that once they put a parapet on it, it would need solid walls below it and more visual girth.

Mr. Gunther said, he too, likes the solar aspect. He asked Mr. Shay if there is an opportunity for revisions where the roof is flat.

Mr. Shay said there is not enough area. It turned out that they need to have approximately 75 percent of the entire roof area had to be covered with solar panels in order for it to begin to reach the point where it made any economic sense. He said there is not enough roof area here to make it work out.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she believes three roof options were presented. She asked Mr. Shay if he was asking the Board to choose the roof or whether he was presenting a specific roof.

Mr. Shay said that option one is the one that is shown in the model and in the original petition. His preferred option is option two. He said option 2 and option 3 are very close. They have a light canvas roof over it. What he was saying is that if the barrel vault was for some reason objectionable, it would be possible to do a gable roof.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked Mr. Shay if he was saying that he would like the Board to approve the barrel.

Mr. Shay answered yes.

Ms. Weibe-Reed told Mr. Shay that she did not see a sight line drawing. She asked how visible this is from the street.

Mr. Shay [pointing to an area] said this is the most obtrusive view. He believes they submitted this in Part I. They were asked to revisit the shape of the roof and they have done so.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she believes that from this perspective, she likes the fact that the decorative truss is there. She believes this decorates the edge at the roof line so that it does not look so utilitarian.

Mr. Gunther asked Mr. Shay if there was an inspiration he was drawing from for the awning brackets or barrel vault truss decorations.

Mr. Shay said it was not drawn from any particular historical resource. The roof will be a green area, not because it will be painted green, but it will have a border that is a vegetative roof and will have some features on the building where they are deliberately introducing a vegetative wall. They will have vegetation on the columns, for example. They wanted to do something vaguely gothic.

Dr. Williams stated that at the last meeting, they invited Mr. Shay to integrate the design of the canopy into the body of the building. Therefore, when Mr. Shay mentioned gothic, it puzzled him as it is a classical building below. He said that he applauds Mr. Shay's placement and spacing of the piers to match the body of the building. But, in some ways the more pediment triangular shape would be in keeping with the pediments in the area. What is the material that is being proposed? Is it opaque such as a solid roof or translucent? Will light filter through it?

Mr. Shay said that light will filter through it, but it will be opaque. Therefore, if someone was up there on a rainy day, you would not be sitting in the rain. The idea is that the material would allow sunlight through in the daytime.

Dr. Williams asked if the color would be white or some light color.

Mr. Shay answered that he could not presently say what the color would be, but it will be something that transmits light. He will come back to the Board with this later.

Mr. Shay recognized Ms. Minnie Poole of their firm for the hard work she has devoted to this project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that they agree with all of staff's comments. They also share the staff's concern about the shape of the third floor roof. With regards to Mr. Gunther's question to the petitioner about the barrel vault, they do not see the reference that this is being pulled from. The more rectilinear in nature seems to be more in keeping with the rest of the design of the building. Therefore, they believe the gable option is more successful. Also, the gable option uses a more simplified truss design. They believe the gable option is best with the simplified truss design. Ms. Meunier said they believe that the decorative design is not pulling from anything and appears to be unnecessary.

Ms. Meunier said in terms of the walk-up window, because this is new construction and it is not a historic building that needs to be punched into for a window, they are okay with it. They heard the petitioner's comments about the walk-up window, but they would love to see it moved to a less prominent location as the staff has recommended.

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

Mr. Shay said he does not have a problem with the gable roof, but has a problem with the trusses being more mathematically driven than organically driven. If this is the pleasure of the Review Board, they will agree with that. The floor plan of the tenants has been studied and the window needs to be here. Moving the window to the back completely disrupts the entire kitchen operation.

Dr. Williams asked if the takeout window could be moved within the same bay.

Mr. Shay answered no.

Dr. Williams asked if the takeout window could be moved one window to the right.

Mr. Shay answered no. He could see where this would be more satisfying, but he does not have that flexibility. He has no control over this.

Ms. McClain asked if there is a ledge here.

Mr. Shay answered that there is a ledge that comes out three feet.

Ms. McClain asked if this could be removal.

Mr. Shay answered that its intent is to be permanent.

Ms. McClain asked if there is a way for it to be designed to be removable when serving so that it would not be as permanent as it is now.

Mr. Shay said that the purse ledge on the outside is about five inches. It is not prominent at all. Most of the ledge is on the inside of the window. He would not want to design something that was removable as it would take about 48 hours for it to be removed by somebody who was not authorized to do so. It needs to be something that is permanent.

Mr. Howington said he believes the rendering is a little misleading. As Mr. Shay commented it does not stick out passed the pilaster.

Ms. Caldwell asked if it was being said that there is no ledge on the inside; the entire ledge is on the outside.

Mr. Shay answered no. He explained that most of the ledge is actually on the inside. What he said is that they cannot shift it anymore in that direction because the counter space behind it would no longer be fully useable.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Gunther said he knew that McDonald's takeout window was fairly controversial. He asked if there is any language in the ordinance regarding takeout windows.

Ms. Harris stated that there aren't specific standards. She explained that a takeout counter would be a visual compatibility issue.

Mr. Gunther said, therefore, there is nothing in the ordinance that prohibits or allows that activity to occur.

Dr. Williams said there are more parapets in this block that this gable takes up a scale feature that is already here. He believes this seems to have almost the same angle. He believes this is one issue that speaks to the compatibility.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Shay that if he moved the structure on the roof the other way, would that solve the problem.

Mr. Shay answered no. One side would face south; but the truth is that they need to go in the direction of what they originally presented in order to get to the point where the solar aspect is feasible.

Ms. Caldwell said she believes the simple gable is the best solution.

Dr. Williams said he does not know if this comes under their purview, but the design in the gable with the sunburst motif reminds him of an art deco detailing that you find in panels. He does not know if there is a way that the motif could actually be incorporated as a design detail into the panels. Maybe there could be just one panel that would be the same proportions in the gable. This might be an opportunity to integrate the design in the canopy into the body of the building and then pick up by the awning. Are the awning brackets being considered now or are they in the future submission?

Ms. Harris answered that the brackets are now, but the fabric will be in a future submission.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, as presented the awning brackets were organic. He, therefore, wanted to ask Mr. Shay a question.

Mr. Shay stated that he believes what Dr. Williams is referring to are the awning brackets that are at the street level. These are presented as being the organic inspiration. If it is the desire of the Board that they go in the direction of the gable, then he asks that the Board condition the approval on them bringing back the details of the brackets to staff to ensure that they have something that is consistent with the architecture of the awning and the building.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Shay if he would also consider what he suggested about taking the detail that is in the gable and seeing if it could be echoed somehow in the body of the building.

Mr. Shay answered that this is something that he could discuss with them. However, he does not believe that it would be something that would be appropriate for every panel. He is somewhat fascinated about the idea of doing something just over the corner entrance. Mr. Shay said, therefore, he believes there is merit to the suggestion, but he would like to have the opportunity to study this and get with the staff.

Mr. Gunther suggested that Board and staff look at whether this sets a precedent in the Historic District for walk-up windows.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for design details of a new three story building at the southeast corner of Jefferson and West Congress Streets with the following conditions to be reviewed and approved by staff:

1. Third floor structure to be Option 3 with gable and simple sunburst metalwork;
2. Restudy the awning brackets on the ground floor; - PASS
3. Restudy the recessed panels in parapet to potentially include a reference to the

- sunburst motif;
4. Provide the awning material; and
 5. Locate the awnings between each pilaster rather than overlapping.

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

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [COA - 412 Williamson Street - H-11-4569-2 PT 2 11-14-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Sample Panel Guidelines 120309.pdf](#)

Attachment: [November 2012 Approved Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

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

Ms. Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of an amendment to Part I Height and Mass and Part 2 Design Details of a previously approved new construction hotel at 412 Williamson Street. The changes include:

- The fire stair tower located at the southeast corner of the building has been moved to the west of the building, further from the façade, and has reduced massing;
- The elevator shafts have shifted and the enclosed floor on the rooftop increased slightly;
- Some walls on the rooftop enclosure have changed from opaque to glazed;
- Windows added to the south elevation;
- More consistent window configuration;
- On the recessed portion of the fifth floor along River Street the paired windows have changed to an aluminum storefront doors with sidelights and metal awnings added;
- Windows added to the southwest façade, ground level;
- The depth of the entrance recess has been reduced on the Williamson Street entrance

and a door added to the adjacent window;

- An elevator to River Street has been added to the east façade of the building (this elevator was previously shown conceptually but was not reviewed as part of this project because it is a City-project as part of the Montgomery Street Ramp Staircase which is now moving forward).
- The predominant proposed materials include Cherokee brick with putty mortar, cast stone in “buffstone,” and charcoal standing seam metal roof. Previously two colors of brick were approved, including the one proposed;
- Awnings, signs, and lighting will be provided in a later submittal.

Ms. Harris gave the following background information on the project: the Board approved the request to demolish the existing structure on the property on January 11, 2012. On April 11, 2012 the Board approved an additional “bonus story” above the height map based on the provision that, “Multiple ground floor active uses permitted in the base zoning district (including but not limited to retail, office, lobby, restaurant) span the length of the façade on all street fronting elevations (not including lanes) and maintain individual primary exterior entrances.” Part I, Height and Mass, amended, was approved on September 12, 2012. Part II, Design Details was approved November 14, 2012. A one year extension was granted in October, 2013. The November 14, 2012 approval included the following conditions:

“...provided that final colors, materials, and dimensions and be resubmitted to the Board for review and with the following conditions:

1. Construct a sample panel on-site to be reviewed and approved by staff prior to construction and installation in accordance with the HDBR Sample Panel Guidelines (attached). Revise the mortar colors to have less contrast with the associated brick and eliminate the gray color indicative of a cement composition.
2. Remove the screen track from the Peerless, Model 9350 window, to provide greater visibility for the variation in sash depth.
3. Recess the ventilation panels a minimum of three inches from the face of the brick to reinforce the shape of the opening and to provide greater depth within the façade.
4. Submit awning/canopy details to staff for final review.
5. Within the wall along Williamson Street, the cast stone coping overhang the brick and more ornament within the metal grills. Vertical piers, introduced between bays (three window groupings) are recommended to provide a rhythm more consistent with the bays established in the building exterior.
6. Provide greater similarity in the color of cast stone, mortar and aluminum finish. Reconsider the two-tone brick to provide less contrast or a single brick.”

The project has been revised in response to utilize a buff colored mortar, single brick tone, the cast stone coping overhangs, the metal grills are more ornate and the colors are more similar.

On July 9, 2014 the HDBR approved amendments to the overall height and mass of the building and recommended denial to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the Height Map for an additional story (14-002857-COA). The Zoning Board of Appeals granted a one story height variance on August 28, 2014 (14-003662-ZBA).

The HDBR approved amendments to the revised height and mass on October 8, 2014.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the amendment to Part 2: Design Details with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval, because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards.

1. Restudy the ground floor window and door configuration on the south, Williamson Street, elevation to provide greater symmetry at the entrance where a door has been added to a prior window opening.
2. Provide additional clarification/details regarding the trellis materials and configuration and revise so as to not overhang the building face.
3. Construct a sample panel on-site to be reviewed and approved by staff prior to construction and installation in accordance with the HDBR Sample Panel Guidelines (attached).

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Harris how many railings are here.

Ms. Harris [pointing to a section] said her understanding is a railing is here along the side, one railing along this wall and two railings off each wall to provide the idea that pedestrians walking in a hurry or need access could utilize the corridors on either side; folks having lunch or meeting here for meetings would have the center area.

Dr. Williams said the only thing he could think of that is similar to this is the grand stair at the SCAD museum. There are no railings on the grand stair. He asked the staff if there is a code requirement that would necessitate those two inner railings.

Ms. Harris answered that to her understanding, there is no code requirement for this. However, this could be confirmed by the petitioner.

Mr. Gunther asked staff if the Board has seen this before.

Ms. Harris answered that the Board has seen concepts of it. This has been an evolving project. It has been included in site plans, but only conceptually.

Mr. Gunther asked if the glass elevator is an accessibility issue.

Ms. Harris answered yes. It is on City property; it is in the public-right-of-way, but it is there to provide accessibility to the folks who cannot use the stairs. Therefore, it will be attached to the building and will be built at the same time. But, technically, it is city-owned property.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay stated that Mr. David Moore, the senior project architect, was accompanying him today. He stated that he wanted to start with the stairway which is a project of the City of Savannah. They are showing the Board how the stairway and the hotel fit together. The city's desire is that the 10 to 12 million people who walk on River Street every year will finally have a way to safely walk to City Market. The requirement for the ADA elevator is that the City is under federal law, just like everybody else, which is to comply with the Americans With Disabilities Act. The nearest public elevator to this location is the elevator that is between City Hall and the Hyatt Hotel. Mr. Shay explained that they cannot use the existing slope on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard which is immediate west of

their project because it is too steep. He said a slope with certain steepness is not permitted in the City of Savannah. Therefore, this is why the elevator is there. A part of why the elevator is glass is because of security reasons as it is a public elevator. It will be operational 24 hours a day. Both the glass enclosure and the elevator will be glazed so that people who are tempted to do something bad will rethink themselves as being in public. He said the other reason is, they have deliberately chosen to stay with a kind of industrial romantic theme for everything, although this one is more transparent than something that was from the 1870s, the idea is that the steel frame, which is the superstructure is actually exposed steel with flanges, etc. The in-between is the storefront glazing. If they look at the detailing there is some variation in the glazing.

Mr. Shay stated that with regards to Dr. William's question, he loves the SCAD museum but he thinks that the clientele is different. He could not guess how many of those 10 to 12 million people are going to walk those stairs every year that will be slightly intoxicated, but they have decided that they would like to have railings on both sides and some place where if somebody started to slip and fall, they would be able to grab a railing. The design that they have proposed to the City and they accepted as in the handrail, itself, an integrated LED continuous light. This is what is also providing light down the stairway to the left and the right. This is a best practice issue. Mr. Shay stated that he will end up being the architect of record for this project. If someone brings a suit against the City for slipping and falling, he wants to be able to say that there was a handrail and a path five feet away that you might have chosen. This is his concern for this area. If the Board notices, they will see that the railing is set off from the wall and is continuous. This is because as they will see in the elevation that with this wall the City intends to have clad in granite. As a matter of fact, they want the steps to be granite as well. Then it would be uplite so that the wall will get the lighting on it. He said for the area that is open to the roof which was approved during height and mass, they have proposed a cornice. This will allow daylight and moonlight through it. It projects about five feet from where the column is and about three feet from the façade. They believe that it is consistent with a lot of the famous buildings/landmark buildings that have cornices. Mr. Shay said he understood that the Board may say that it is a part of the trellis which it is, but the architectural effect is that they think it will function more like a cornice than a trellis in this area. He said they are really very keen on this and believe it is something that will add a lot of visual interest. One of the refinements that they have made is that the stairwell that was on this corner in the earlier approved design has been shifted further to the west. Therefore, somebody that is up there would be able to get the full range of the Savannah prospect. He explained that in essence what they did was to flip the otherwise symmetrical façade. He said their approved façade design actually had the façade of the stairwell pushed up flush with the face in the corner. What they have chosen to do to have a more consistent expression is step the stairway back so that only the first flight of stairs down is fully enclosed and use glazing on the outside that uses the same frame that is on the other corner so that they can have a glazed panel there. This is something that they will tell the Board about when they come back at a later meeting for graphics, signage and so forth.

Mr. Shay said in regards to the staff request for the refinement of the façade that faces south, when they flip the stair tower, they thought they would need to have an exit door where they really wanted a window, he believes it can just be a window. Therefore, they will not have to propose a change there at all.

Mr. Howington said the staff reported that Mr. Shay has already restudied the ground floor window and door configuration on the south.

Mr. Shay confirmed that they are willing to forgo the door and stick with the window fenestration that sort of makes the lower section of the façade to be symmetrical.

Dr. Williams said that he finds it interesting that visually everyone is using the central section of the stairs, the place of what he calls the express lane is on the outer edges.

Mr. Shay said they are sort of blurry or almost invisible.

Dr. Williams said this isn't like anything else the Board evaluates, it is a peculiar thing for them. But, this is an improvement over the last versions that had planter boxes. He wonders, however, if there is an opportunity to vary the tread shape somehow, be it in the central section or the outer section that would perhaps slow down the middle section to be more inviting rather than just a series of straight steps, maybe the central section bows forward or recedes back. Has the City put constraints on what you can do with the design of the staircase?

Mr. Shay answered that this would be an understatement. The City had the final call on everything that they are presenting to the Board today. However, he will say that if they looked at something that was more bowed or so forth, it would also doom granite as a material because unlike the Renaissance there is not people left who can carve granite in these kinds of ways. He would rather have straight granite stairs then to end up with a situation where they have a bowed or more imaginative design out of concrete.

Dr. Williams asked what if the granite remained straight but the outer sections were such as Mr. Shay introduced a kind of bowed. What if the other sections were angled? He said he was only trying to think out loud. He is only trying to probe points. Mr. Shay is raising good responses and he is only throwing questions at him so that the Board's discussion will be more meaningful.

Mr. Shay thanked Dr. Williams and said that the discussions that they have had with the City over the past two years and more recently with the Kessler group, Christian Sottile and Andrew have been robust and really the consensus of the entire group is that this is a design that everybody is the most satisfied with. He does not want the Board to believe that all of those things have not been talked about; many of them have been studied and some have been crossed out. The City's desire is this is something that they can afford. All of these options have been thoroughly studied. He said he is not at liberty to tell the Board today that he can change the design. What they really wanted the Board to see is that the design of the stairway is compatible and integrated with the design of the hotel.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. David Moore said on the design of the stairs, there is, in the center section, is a wider area for the landing, which is somewhat a pause moment for the entire row of stairs. Therefore, it is not a consistent flight going down. Mr. Moore said this was one of the things that they picked up in their discussion with Christian Sottile. They took a look at what their concept was and tried to evolve that into something that they felt was a solution that everybody could say was a win-win for the design solution. Therefore, they tried to incorporate many of the points they had as an interest and in fact some of the things that they addressed actually gave them a little more flexibility to make some design solutions that offered what they are presenting as a solution that they did not have when they were originally saying that they had to have planters and so forth.

Mr. Moore said this solution actually is a more successful, dynamic, and a very elegant solution to the stairs than what they had before and it relates to incorporating all of those comments that both design teams were interested in.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said the trellis projecting out over the wall plane has a precedent. He said the old YMCA building where you can see going down the south elevation the awning projects out over the upper story wall plane. He said reading it from there it reads as a cornice. However, he believes the absence of the cornice works well given the nature of this area.

Mr. Howington said he likes the projecting cornice. It sort of strengthens that trellis; it is heavy and puts some weight on that corner. Therefore, he is actually in favor of the projecting cornice in this particular, specific, isolated interest.

Dr. Williams asked how far the trellis extends.

Mr. Howington answered that it wraps around and then goes to the panel walls that Mr. Shay referred to. He said, however, he wonders how far the panel is from the façade on the south side where the panel is in from the façade.

Mr. Shay stated that essentially the "open feeling" wraps the three sides the same way. It surrounds all of the open area; the roof has been previously approved in the Height and Mass stage. It looks opaque, but it is not. In fact, it is glazed. The parapet is right here and a glazed panel is also fastened to the outside of the steel structure that provides some additional safety on the roof.

Mr. Howington asked if this sits back a foot or so.

Mr. Shay explained that the columns are set so that they are freestanding just to the inside of the parapet wall and the glazing is attached to the front of the columns. The glass is setback about one foot from the face of the brick in this plane and the columns are right behind that. In this way, it is really transparent.

Mr. Howington asked if glass is to the left.

Mr. Shay explained that larger glass panels are behind this about three and one-half feet further back is the enclosure for the first downward flight of the stairs. He said before they had a masonry mass that was on the corner in a way that was not satisfying, but now what they have is the ability to express that cornice and the open feeling all the way around all three sides of the building mass.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Shay if he said it is reading solid now, but it is actually clear glass.

Mr. Shay answered that it is clear glass.

Mr. Howington asked if the trellis structure would be seen.

Mr. Shay answered yes. If you were looking up, you would be able to see it. However, above it the projection is consistent. Therefore, it is back in the plain of the columns which is about one foot behind the plane of the masonry.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Caldwell asked how the Board feels about the Grecian perforated panels.

Mr. Howington stated that he believes the Board has seen this before. But, since this is a direct question, Mr. Shay will comment on this as he has a specific response to this.

Mr. Shay explained that the relatively tight grid sample that the Board sees is used in places where they do not have glass on balconies. But, there are other places where the perforated metal is used. At the courtyard wall, which is on the Williamson Street level, the masonry openings in the garden wall are there. It is the same pattern, but it is magnified greatly in scale. Consequently, they are using the Grecian pattern. The places where the fine grid pattern are being employed it will be almost impossible to read those from the exterior of the building at ground level; but, you will be able from a guest experience if you were inside the hotel.

Mr. Gunther asked if the motif is common to the other parts of the rhythm.

Mr. Shay answered yes.

Ms. Caldwell asked what percentage would be used on the building.

Mr. Shay answered that he believes it is less than 50% when it is small and more than 50% when it is over scaled.

Ms. Caldwell asked what is the percentage on the overall building.

Mr. Shay answered less than 5%.

Dr. Williams stated that as he understands #42 is glass panels in the south facing the elevation. There are shorter railings, glass-like panels, in the opening behind this and in the background there is fade greys recessed further to the north. He said that given that this is facing the south, the expansions of the glass will be above the dark red brick. This will be highly reflective. Dr. Williams said depending on the sun, this could be like a big bright reflecting hot spot.

Mr. Howington guessed the other option would be to make it solid brick. He believes that the petitioner was trying to keep it as open as possible.

Dr. Williams stated that he does not know if non-reflective glass would be an option.

Mr. Howington said it is clear glass.

Dr. Williams said his concern is the really intense reflections on it.

Mr. Howington explained that the Board could state in its motion that the glass be non-reflective.

Mr. Shay said it is not intended to be reflective glass. They will have something that will look great for back-lighting.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Shay if he has specified the glass on the elevator.

Mr. Shay answered that they have; he said the intention here is that it be clear and non-reflective because they want people to be able to see inside.

Dr. Williams asked if this is specified in the drawings.

Mr. Shay answered yes.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the amendment to Part 2: Design Details with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval, because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards:

1. Restudy the ground floor window and door configuration on the south, Williamson Street, elevation to provide greater symmetry at the entrance where a door has been added - PASS to a prior window opening.
2. Construct a sample panel on-site to be reviewed and approved by staff prior to construction and installation in accordance with the HDBR Sample Panel Guidelines.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

19. [Petition of Pete Callejas, Homestead Architecture | 14-005065-COA | 312 / 314 Lorch Street | New Construction Residential: Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Gaston Ward.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details for a three-story duplex on the vacant parcels located at 312 and 314 Lorch Street. The site is landlocked by new construction to the east, a commercial business to the west, and historic buildings to the north, with no lane access. Each parcel is 26.5 feet wide. The western parcel (314) is 42.01 feet deep and the eastern parcel (312) is 46.4 feet deep.

Ms. Michalak gave the following background information on the petition. At the November 12, 2014 HDBR meeting, the Board approved Part I, Height and Mass with the following conditions:

- a. Increase the voids on the west façade and add voids to the east façade.
- b. Align the fences with the front façade to create a wall of continuity along Lorch Street.
- c. Add base molding to all second and third floor columns on the front porches.
- d. Provide baluster spacing (maximum 4 inches) and height of the balustrades (maximum 36 inches).
- e. Indicate the proposed locations for the electrical meters on secondary or rear facades.

Ms. Michalak stated that the petitioner has met the conditions. She said the Board also recommended approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the “structured parking” standard to allow garage parking on the first floor of the building with access to the garages off of Lorch Street.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details for a three-story duplex on the vacant parcels located at 312 and 314 Lorch Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Ensure that all proposed Hardi materials have a smooth finish.
2. Provide specifications for the “French” style doors and garage doors.
3. Revise the 3rd floor windows on the east and west facades to be true, operable, casement windows.
4. Ensure that the window sashes within the stucco ground floor are inset not less than 3 inches from the face of the building.
5. Ensure that the shutters are constructed of durable wood.
6. Paint or stain the wood fences.

Dr. Williams asked what was the Board's wording in their decision the last time this petition was before them regarding the design of the porticos on the front of the building.

Ms. Michalak explained that the Board discussed the portico at length, but nothing was included in their motion to change it.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Peter Callejas said the last time they were before the Board, they discussed to restudy the front and side elevations. They looked at making it look more like a typical duplex with the continuous railing going across a continuous porch. They also looked at several different variations that when this became almost as one mass, they became less important. Mr. Callejas said they took these out. They went another step further and took out the center column as this was one of the questions/comments that came from the Board.

Mr. Callejas said he believes that visually they want to see a structure below each of the columns. Originally, they took out one obviously for the purpose of being able to put a car between here, which is somewhat an anomaly. In this case the span is much wider than anything that could be contextually compatible with anything in the Historic District. It could be done, but they probably would have to make it a steel beam. But, visually they feel that having one remain is fine. In fact, if they look at the original, when these two buildings stand together, they create a rhythm. Nevertheless, they further studied some other alternative elevations. They looked at ways to create some individuality between each of the buildings to make them look less like one mass, but more like two separate buildings which was their original intent. Mr. Callejas said they looked at a lot of different things to see what they could potentially do, all were rejected by the client. Therefore, they did not study them any further.

Mr. Callejas said when they reviewed the ordinance, it talked about consistency in rhythm, repetition, mass and voids, and solids and voids. They looked at what was on the south side of the street with all the historic homes that are here. [He showed the Board photographs of the buildings]. Mr. Callejas said when they look at the rhythm of the solids and voids and the directional expression of each of these, it is somewhat unscientific, but you can get a feel for what the proportions of these buildings are. Then when you look at the new buildings that are adjacent to their project, the front façade is cutback and the roof is cut down, it emphasizes that rhythm and repetition of solids and voids when you get to a duplex it reads as one structure. However, if you look at the one they originally had which by the nature of dividing or separating the porches slightly, you are also continuing the repetition of void and mass visually that are consistent with every other part of the street.

Mr. Callejas said, therefore, if they look at a duplex it reads as one building. The proportion is outside the compatibility range where all the other buildings are in this proportional directional expression range is not within that range. If they look at what they are proposing, it looks like two separate individual, yet twin buildings that fit inside the compatibility range. Therefore, they felt this was the best approach. They studied the other elevations extensively, but they decided that what they are presenting is more consistent with what the ordinance says. It also feels more appropriate with everything else that is on the street in rhythm, repetition and scale.

Mr. Callejas said on the side elevations they have added one shuttered false window and have created an operable awning window. He said that when you look at their design which is a 23 foot wide building and a certain amount of that width is taken up by the vertical circulation and a little bit of the width is taken up by a hallway that brings you from the front to the back of the building, all are functional rooms and the spaces are on the outside wall. If you look at what is already here, there really isn't much of an opportunity to add more windows and to adorn the side elevation in a modest duplex in a central lot and a third

tier connector street with this many false windows for no reason, they felt is a little impractical. They feel that what they have added is enough to emphasize the repetition and rhythm that is needed. Ultimately, at some point, someone will build something on this corner lot; imaginably, it will be a three-story building and probably a zero lot line and will cover up the elevation.

Mr. Callejas said they agree with all the other comments. They are in agreement to work through everything at the staff level to get every thing coordinated. He believes the owner is willing to provide the specifications or the necessary information on the selections. Mr. Callejas said they are pleased with their design and believe this will be an asset to the community and the neighborhood. They have looked at several alternatives, but they have come back to what is being presented today. He entertained questions from the Board.

Dr. Williams told Mr. Callejas that using the compelling case he has made and the way he has designed the house, especially the roof level, is as a duplex. No effort was made to draw the line as it was between the buildings. It is shown that the neighbors on the right have recesses and so forth to reinforce the void. He said taking this approach to a logic conclusion, would suggest that something reinforces the division at roof level because presently it reads as a duplex.

Mr. Callejas said if you look at it literally, you could say what Dr. Williams has said. But, they do not have a lot of opportunity to do anything at the roof level and most of the roof will not be seen from the street. They feel that gabled center elements which not only serve as a rainwater diverter, but also creates a rhythm that makes this feel as one central element or building. These are two twin buildings and they have a piece of molding centered. They are separate buildings, and there is not a lot of opportunity to bring anything back on the front façade to do that. They are only coming in a foot on each side. There is no way in the roof to carve anything out and they do not feel that this is necessary. They believe that their design is strong enough to be interpreted as being two separate twin structures.

Mr. Gunther asked if there is any rationale behind the six-over-six and six-over-nine windows.

Mr. Callejas stated that a lot of historic buildings have this pattern.

Mr. Gunther asked Mr. Callejas if he found this pattern in this neighborhood.

Mr. Callejas said most of the windows have been changed over time. He does not believe that any of the units across the street have anything original on them. There are some two-over-two windows and a variety of anomalies. There are no other six-over-six or six-over-nine on that street.

Mr. Howington said that he believes the majority of things on this street are new construction.

Mr. Callejas said if it was adamant by the Board that the windows be changed, they are willing to look at this, but they felt strongly that the six-over-nine windows and six-over-six windows were appropriate for this style.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Callejas how would he classify the style of the house.

Mr. Callejas asked Dr. Williams if he wanted him to put a label on the house.

Dr. Williams stated that Mr. Callejas stated that it is appropriate for the style of the house.

Mr. Callejas explained that as a designer, you study all different things and try different windows, all kinds of different elements and get a feel for what works and what does not work. Whether he puts a label on it or whether he says that there is exactly the same house in the same neighborhood is not always to him what constitutes a successful design. However, they are willing to restudy some other alternatives if this is something that the Board feels strongly about. But, he does not feel that there is anything inappropriate about the design of the windows on the building.

Ms. Scheer said that after seeing the alternatives for one solid porch across, she likes the vertical expression of the two separate versus the horizontal. She said she appreciates the thoroughness of Mr. Callejas different explorations, but he also has some columns at the bottom. Now, it is back in there and she is bothered by the two middle columns. She asked Mr. Callejas if he has explored removing them completely.

Mr. Callejas answered yes.

Ms. Scheer said they are interior and dark. She was wondering if this would help open it up and make it less awkward.

Mr. Callejas said the shadow on the rendering makes it look darker than it really is. It sits back five and one-half feet. Therefore, it would never be that dark when everything else is this light. He believes it is an interpretation of how it shows up on the computer screen. He said it probably would be a better example if the shadow lines were not there. This type of span on the porch looks very awkward. As he has said earlier, this one is an anomaly. They feel that this and with the expression and the twin buildings next to it takes away a little, but taking the other column out makes it look very odd. As a designer, he felt that it did not work. For no other reason than just not having it there; a column underneath each of these columns aligns it. Consequently, you would really want to see a column there in order to align them. The reason why a column is not there is just to allow the car to go through there. But, in his opinion, taking the other columns out does not make it any better.

Dr. Williams said the color sample that was passed to the Board, the renderings show that the ground level is sort of medium gray.

Mr. Callejas said he would not read too much in that elevation. He said he did not match the color exactly, but he believes the proposed color is much darker.

Dr. Williams said this is exactly his point. It is almost black at the bottom and has a very dark ground floor.

Mr. Callejas said that he was not involved in the color selection for this project.

Therefore, he could not speak exactly to that, but he tends to agree that they can lighten this up a bit and make it more of a medium gray, a shade or two lighter than what is proposed would probably go a long way to increase the compatibility with the other buildings on the street. He does not have problems with the other colors, but as he said, the color has not been a part of his purview. Mr. Callejas stated that he is hopeful that if there is any change or any alterations that his client and the staff could work together to iron those things out.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey came forward and stated that this is a challenging petition as he observes from the questions, variety of designs and the renderings that they have seen. He said he does not know if he has an answer or fall in any one most successful design. Mr. Carey said he believes that the preferred plan is good. They see a color rendition, one with shadowing and certainly would appear to be the petitioner's favorite as it looks the best. He was having a tough time comparing one color shadowed rendition with all the others and making a distinction and discerning which is better among all of these.

Mr. Carey said he sees the argument about whether they should appear as two or one, but he was of a mixed opinion on this. He believes each could be successful. He said he does not want to delay things, but if the Board is able to make the distinction, then that's great as the Board would be able to make a decision on this, but he could not as he needs to see more "likes with likes" or honest comparison.

Mr. Carey said he understand what Dr. Williams was talking about in terms of the lower levels, the doors, the colors and so forth. He heard the petitioner's responses to these things, but he believes they want this to be as invisible as possible and not to be so starkly contrasted. Therefore, anything that can be done to make the ground level disappear, he believes will be recommended.

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

Mr. Callejas stated that they selected this one over the others because he was trying to illustrate that they did a lot of studying on a variety of different elevations and elevation type; none of which were desired by the client. The design they presented is the one they wanted to push forward as it is the one they feel strongly about. This is why they have shaded this one and is why they rendered this one.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she wished the Board would have seen an option with an arched three base with a six bay second floor that has classical references. She believes that visually, the petitioner could have gotten both of those entrance doors and both of the garage doors into an equal bay. It seems to have a more terminate base feel to it.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Weibe-Reed that when she says "arched," does she means segmental arch or fully round arch.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said segmental arch.

Dr. Williams asked her if she was saying remove the piers that are between the doors.

Ms. Weibe-Reed answered yes; she would move it to the center and make it a three bay base, but she is not designing it.

Mr. Gunther said he wanted to reiterate again that he does not believe that in this section of town that

six-over-six and six-over-nine are not compatible with the context of the neighborhood. He said he would suggest a firewall to pierce the roof.

Dr. Williams said something is needed with a leading edge that would be legible from the street. It could even die back into the frontage of the roof after a certain point. Something is needed that will give it some type of separation. At least the leading edge of the cornice is going to read as a continuous line break. Why did they break the cornice, but then he does not know what happened to the wall.

There was one perspective view that showed the neighboring building hypothetically and put back in. He asked that this view be shown again. He understands that the petitioner is saying that roofs are not going to be noticeable.

Ms. Caldwell asked the petitioner if they would have to have an interior firewall.

Mr. Howington said a firewall is needed, but it does not need to go above the roofline. He said it appears the Board is hung up on the two separates versus the one building. He asked if it would help them if they reviewed the iterations of the porches.

Ms. McClain answered no; she does not believe that would help. She agrees that the windows are not visually compatible.

Mr. Howington said he believes that the petitioner agreed that if this was a point, he is in agreement with a two-over-two window or something more compatible. He said he believes the windows as Mr. Gunther mentioned could be a condition.

Dr. Williams said he believes the side elevation was fine with the one window. This was one of staff's concerns in the past. However, he believes that the petitioner's proposed solution is acceptable.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said if the petitioner would like to go to two-over-two windows, how does that affect the historic building.

Mr. Howington said the Board is in its discussion, but he believes the petitioner said that he is acceptable to all of staff's recommendations. However, he wants him to return so that they can restate the staff's recommendation again for the records and get Mr. Callejas's response.

1. Ensure that all proposed Hardi materials will have a smooth finish
Mr. Callejas answered that they agree with this recommendation.
2. Provide specifications for French style doors and garage doors
Mr. Callejas answered that they are in agreement with this recommendation.
3. Revise third floor windows on the east and west facades to be true and operable casement windows.
Mr. Callejas answered they are in agreement with this recommendation.
4. Ensure that the window sashes and stucco ground floor inset not less than three inches.
Mr. Callejas stated that this actually shows up on the head jams and in the details.
5. Ensure that the shutters are constructed of durable wood.
Mr. Callejas answered yes.
6. Paint or stain the wood.

Mr. Callejas answered yes.

Mr. Howington said that Mr. Callejas is agreeable to all the conditions and is also in agreement to change the window pattern to at least a two-over-two or a one-over-one whichever is more compatible with the neighborhood. It appears that the biggest concern is the front porch façade.

Dr. Williams said requiring steel would be overkill here. Therefore, where do they start? Everything else is basically the same.

Mr. Howington said, too, that everything else is basically the same. They will end up with a continuous porch.

Dr. Williams said he would rather have the one with the gable and the piers as it is essentially a variation of what they have done. It brings the two things together with a shared pier on them. Therefore, if they could get the one with the gable and piers on either side of the doors. The reality is it is a duplex and it is following that long Savannah tradition of mirrored construction of the pair and with the doors both on the inside towards the party wall. He believes that the piers help to reinforce the rhythm with raised the stoops down the block.

Mr. Howington asked the Board if they feel the double columns on the outside is correct.

Dr. Williams said there are two pairs of houses on Waldburg Street that have this solution. They are located between Barnard and Jefferson Streets.

Mr. Howington asked the Board to review the renderings again. He said that Dr. Williams was looking at an example of a similar compatible double building.

Dr. Williams pointed out that this is what he had in mind.

Mr. Howington said they are missing the double column on the right-hand side. He believes, however, that this is an oversight.

Dr. Williams said on Waldburg Street they have little columnets that are paired; they are two inch diameter or three inch diameter. He wonders about having two feet of dead space between two central piers on the ground floor.

Mr. Howington said a railing could be between the two.

Dr. Williams said a solid wall could be between the two.

Ms. Caldwell said she believes a larger gable would look nice.

Mr. Howington said he does not want the Board to redesign the buildings.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked the Board to look at number 9. She believes the larger gables look nice.

Mr. Howington said since the petitioner presented all these options, they do have the right to review them.

Mr. Gunther said if the Board cannot agree on a design, the petitioner has presented a preferred design.

Mr. Howington said he does not know how the Board feels about what Dr. Williams has proposed with the double columns on the outside and the double columns on the inside keeping in mind that this would be the solution with adding back the column between the door, garage door, and the piers and

two-over-two windows. He does not know how the petitioner would feel with this being an acceptable solution to move the Board or if he would rather continue this.

Ms. McClain said she would like to see the rendering with the two-over-two windows. This will change the design drastically.

Mr. Howington informed the Board that Ms. McClain wants to see the rendering with the two-over-two windows. But, the petitioner has not commented if he is agreeable to looking at the solution or if he wants the Board to vote on the solution that he has presented or if he would like to do a continuance and comeback with another solution.

Mr. Callejas said his client is not clear regarding what he feels would be preferable. The original design is very similar to this. Obviously, he neglected to put the second column over here. This does not create the degree of separation that they wanted and this was one of the ones as were all the ones that were originally rejected by the client to go back to the original design which does create the separation. They felt that it is more visually compatible with everything else on the rest of the street. Mr. Callejas said that he does believe that anything is needed here; he believes it is overkill and is a little over-intellectualizing this. He believes this reads as one unit and this reads as one unit. Original it was asked of them to get rid of them and maybe have one continuous roof. But, of course, this was not the one that they were not talking about having two individual units. The other obviously is a better solution than not having any solution or any type of approval. But, this does not have the same degree of separation. Personally, he believes they can develop this and make it something that would work architecturally, but it is not what they presented as their reason. They felt strongly about this and felt comfortable with it. Therefore, with the changing of two-over-two windows and figuring out how to get the doors to work and probably changing them to a taller two-over-two window is perfectly acceptable. But, they still feel strongly whether this is a stronger design and creating two twin structures that are appearing to be twin structures. Mr. Callejas said obviously to some there is a lot of discord among the Board and some are concerned about some things while other Board members are concerned about other things. There is not a consensus; therefore, he does not know how to approach this. Obviously, they would like to walk away from the meeting with an approval for the design. For whatever reason, there seems to be a problem. They rejected all the others. The client felt strongly about having this design.

Mr. Howington told Mr. Callejas that if the client felt strongly about the design, he could call for a vote on the design without the other options. Or he can ask for a continuance depending upon how they feel. If the project comes back with changes, it is reviewed as a new project. Therefore, it will not be denied unless it comes back as the same.

Dr. Williams said that the petitioner has been very emphatic about the preferred solution with viewing it as compatible. He asked the petitioner if it is purely aesthetics or if there is some functional reason for having the physical gap between the two porches.

Mr. Callejas said the client feels strongly about having these appear as two separate units rather than them being more of a duplex. As he has said before, they believe that all the others felt like one unit, even with the double columns. In doing so, obviously the proportion was not compatible with the rest of the buildings on the street. Therefore, when he talks about compatibility, he is talking mostly about the proportions of the building. This one reads as two separate buildings with two separate porches more so than the others.

Mr. Howington explained to Mr. Callejas that he believes what Dr. Williams was saying is there is a functional reason. He assumes the functional reason is the duplex and that he wants some separation of privacy there.

Mr. Howington informed the Board that if it meets the standards, they cannot redesign the project. The petitioner has presented other options, but from what he sees it does meet the ordinance and standards. This is what the petitioner has proposed and this is what they prefer. The petitioner would like for the Board to vote on what is presented.

Ms. McClain said the petitioner did agree to change the windows to two-over-two. Will this come back to the Board so they can see whether the windows are two-over-two or one-over-one.

Mr. Howington said the windows could be done at the staff level. Mr. Callejas has agreed to all of staff's recommendations.

Dr. Henry said the project may be meeting the standards, but the Review Board also looks at the appropriateness (visual compatibility).

Mr. Howington explained that this is true. However, a finding of fact would have to be made by the Board as to why this is not visually compatible.

Ms. Caldwell said the windows are a finding of fact.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she does not have a problem with the porches, but her problem is the little gable at the top; it is missing scale. This is why she was leaning towards option 9. The scale of that gable really made it read as two separate buildings.

Mr. Howington said throw out all the others as this what the petitioner wants the Board to vote on. Does it meet visual compatibility? Does it meet the ordinance?

Mr. Callejas asked Mr. Howington to explain again that if the motion fails, they come back next month with a revised version and not start back at the height and mass level.

Ms. Harris said that Mr. Callejas has already gotten the height and mass approval. Therefore, what the Board would be denying is the design details.

Mr. Howington explained that if Mr. Callejas calls for a vote today and it fails, if he changes the design details and it comes back differently, then it is reviewed as a new project. He said Mr. Callejas could ask for a continuance.

Mr. Callejas asked the Board to vote on the project as presented.

Dr. Williams said the other issue the Board has not discussed is the color of the ground floor. In his opinion, it is far too dark. It should be significantly lighter.

Ms. Caldwell said the color could be done at the staff level.

Dr. Williams said he believes that there should be some parameters set. Do they want the ground floor to be darker than the building? Do they want it to match? What is the compatible pattern in this area?

Dr. Henry felt the color should be reviewed by the staff.

Mr. Howington said he personally feels it is a little too dark, but they can let the staff handle this. He clarified that the petitioner has agreed with all the staff's recommendations and has agreed to restudy the window pattern. He will take this back to staff either as a two-over-two window or a one-over-one window whichever feels mostly compatible to this building and in the neighborhood. He believes that staff is agreeable with looking at a different face color as well. The petitioner has requested that

they call for a vote.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a three-story duplex on the vacant parcels located at 312 and 314 Lorch Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Ensure that all proposed Hardi materials have a smooth finish.
2. Provide specifications for the “French” style doors and garage doors.
3. Revise the 3rd floor windows on the east and west facades to be true, operable, casement windows.
4. Ensure that the window sashes within the stucco ground floor are inset not less than 3 inches from the face of the building. - PASS
5. Ensure that the shutters are constructed of durable wood.
6. Paint or stain the wood fences.
7. Restudy the window lite configuration to be more compatible with visually related contributing building; a 2-over-2 or 1-over-1 lite pattern is preferred.
8. Restudy the dark gray paint color proposed for the ground floor stucco.

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Nay
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Nay
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

20. [Petition of Matthew Allen, J. Leander LLC | 14-005100-COA | 427 East President Street | New Construction Residential: Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Columbia Ward.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Panoramic Site Photograph.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Site and Context Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Mass Model.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Color Selections and Specifications.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details for a two-story, single-family residential building on the vacant parcel located at 427 East President Street. The Board approved Part I on November 12, 2014 with the following conditions:

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

Ms. Michalak said the conditions are met. Staff recommends approval of the conditions.

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

1. Restudy the firebox's shape and size to be more visually compatible with chimneys on historic buildings, and that the firebox material be sand finish stucco to match the building's foundation.
2. Submit a final stoop design and details, including stucco base walls, wood landing, stairs, posts, and railings. Ensure that a section through the stoop and railing are provided and that the railings height does not exceed 36 inches and baluster spacing does not exceed 4 inches.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Michalak if she said a wall is in front of the firebox. How tall is the fireboxes?

Ms. Michalak answered yes. There is not a dimension on the firebox but, as the drawings show, the firebox and the wall are close in height.

Dr. Williams asked if the pilasters on the corners are new.

Ms. Michalak answered no, they are not new.

Dr. Williams asked if the west elevation is within their purview.

Ms. Michalak answered that technically anything above the fence is within the Board's purview. She said that an eight foot stucco wall is here.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Michalak what are her feelings regarding the lack of a chimney.

Ms. Michalak answered that mostly every new construction that the staff reviews now no longer have chimneys. It is because most people now no longer build fireplaces as most of them are gas. This is why only a firebox is here because it is a gas chimney.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Allan said regarding staff's recommendation to restudy the firebox, you really cannot see this. You would have to be on top of a double-decker bus to see this. An eight foot wall is here.

Mr. Howington asked him if he was acceptable to lowering this or leaving it as is.

Mr. Allan said his preference is that maybe no motion needs to be made on this. But, as always, he is amenable.

Mr. Howington asked him if he was agreeable with the staff's second recommendation.

Mr. Allan said he has no problems with this recommendation. They are already in the process of doing this.

Dr. Williams said that Mr. Allan is clearly going in the direction of a Greek revival. Lintels are on the ground floor and corner pilasters are here. He asked Mr. Allan if he would be amenable to making the pilasters a little wider so that they are more proportionate in keeping with the Greek revival. He said that when he sees columns that are overly thin or they are expressed as pilasters on East Victory Drive where a portico is there with pencil thin columns and it looks laughable. He does not want the petitioner's buildings to look this way. A good point of reference would be the Beach Institute building which has pilasters, but double the width. They come right up to the shutters. Therefore, they could be more compatible if they were wider. If the pilasters were wide enough so that the one on the right would touch the shutter, as this is a actually what happens at the Beach Institute, the pilasters would probably be about 50% wider.

Dr. Williams stated that based on the lintels, doorway and especially the ground floor, the first floor lintels with their gable profile, the petitioner is clearly making an effort to nod to history in an authentic way, but it falls apart when it gets to the pilasters. Dr. Williams told Mr. Allan that he might want to take a look at the Beach Institute which is approximately the same height as his building; it is a two-story building with corner pilasters and actually has them articulated down the façade, and is anchored at the corners.

Mr. Howington said he believes the petitioner is agreeable with that.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she agrees with what is being said about the proportions for the pilasters. She asked Mr. Allan if he is missing a pilaster in the back.

Dr. Williams also pointed out that a pilaster should be on both faces of the corner.

Mr. Allan said obviously they missed this pilaster. What is the inside corner that they are talking about?

Dr. Williams explained that it is at the elbow. It would have half the width on each of the faces.

Mr. Howington said the Board is requesting consistency with the pilasters on the inside and outside corners.

Dr. Williams said the door, the stairs, and railings below do not appear to line up well. He realizes it is probably outside their purview, but it seems odd. It appears that the porch could slide over a little; the stairs and railings are okay.

Mr. Allan explained [pointing to an area] that this door does not line up between these two.

Dr. Williams said it appears that the entire porch could slide over a little. He believes the stairs and railings are okay.

Mr. Allan stated that this is coming in from the parking area. Maybe there needs to be sufficient space to get there. But he is not sure.

Dr. Williams said it is outside the purview of the Review Board, but he was just curious about it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry said that the pilasters have been the Board's concern.

Mr. Howington said the pilasters have been the main concern and Mr. Allan has agreed to staff recommendations with the understanding that the firebox is not really visible from the street and this could be worked out with staff.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for New Construction: Part II, Design Details for a two-story, single-family residential building on the vacant parcel located at 427 East President Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Submit a final stoop design and details, including stucco base walls, wood landing, stairs, posts, and railings. Ensure that a section through the stoop and railing are provided and that the railings height does not exceed 36 inches and baluster spacing does not exceed 4 inches. - PASS

2. Lower the height of the firebox or raise the height of the stucco wall so that the firebox will not be visible from the public right-of-way.
3. Increase the width of all pilasters.
4. Add pilasters to the inside and outside corners of the building (at the southwest).

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

21. [Petition of Andy Lynch, Lynch Associates Architects, PC | 14-005105-COA | 515 Montgomery Street | New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass and Part 2: Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Elevations and Rendering.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Plans.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Specifications.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Material Board Photo.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff report 14-005105-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Masonry calculation.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Masonry calculation alternative.pdf](#)

Mr. Andrew Lynch and Mr. Tripp Beacham were present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of Part I: Height and Mass and Part II: Design Details for new construction of a 59 unit, four story multifamily building. The building fronts primarily onto Montgomery Street, with a small façade facing West Gaston Street. Parking is surface and partially under the building and is accessed from West Huntingdon Street. The petitioner is also requesting a variance from the 75% modular masonry material requirement.

Ms. Harris explained that on November 12, 2014 the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approved the request to demolish two existing non-contributing buildings at 515

Montgomery and 408 West Huntingdon Streets because they do not meet the criteria for historic designation. The HDBR continued the petition for Part 1 Height and Mass at the request of the petitioner, but determined that Parts 1 and 2 could be heard jointly at the next meeting. The Board discussion primarily focused on the building setback and the treatment of the building at the intersection of Montgomery and West Huntingdon Streets.

Ms. Harris said the project has been revised to bring the buildings closer to the street so that the low stoop walls and stairs encroach, additional voids added to the west and south facades, reduced curb cut width, and the height of portions of the building has increased. She said that the petitioner has also addressed some of the other topics of discussion including adding additional voids on the west and south facades; reducing the curb cut width and changing the height on portions of the building so that there is a varied height for different sections of the building.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of Part 1 Height and Mass for new construction at 515 Montgomery Street with the condition that the following be addressed with Part II: Design Details:

1. Revise the windows added to the rear, west elevation and the Huntingdon, east elevation which are square to be rectangular.
2. Restudy the low walls in front of the entrances to be either eliminated or restudied to be more visually compatible.

Continue Part II: Design Details to meet the following conditions:

1. Provide the current proposed lot coverage.
2. Restudy or eliminate the low walls in front of the entrances to be more visually compatible;
3. Submit mortar colors, gate colors, metal accent on fence colors;
4. Change the hardi siding to have a smooth finish and be eliminated as an accent feature within the brick and stucco facades;
5. Ensure that the proposed doors are inset at least three inches;
6. Replace the fiber cement panels be replaced with a different material;
7. Ensure the square windows are double hung, awning or casement;
8. Ensure the square windows on the west and south facades meet the 5:3 ratio.
9. Ensure the storefronts extend from a sill along the Montgomery and Gaston Streets.
10. Ensure that the storefront glazing is inset at least four inches from the façade.
11. Ensure that all sections of the building have a stringcourse;
12. Change the stair material from concrete to an approved material to meet the standard;
13. Redesign the porch elements to ensure that the columns have a cap and base molding and the column capital does extends outward of the porch architrave.
14. Change the brick wall color to match that of the main structure.
15. Ensure that the sidewalk continues to serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration and height.
16. A "security fence" is noted along the western parcel boundary but specific

information was not provided. Provide additional information regarding the security fence.

17. The Montgomery Street façade incorporates 49% masonry materials. Staff recommends that the quantity of types of materials be reduced and the masonry be increased to meet the standard.
18. Ensure that all window and door insets meet the four inch standard.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends denial of the variance request from the 75% modular masonry material requirement to allow 49% masonry because the variance criteria are not met.

Dr. Williams said he was curious about staff's recommendation #4. He asked Ms. Harris why it is recommended that the wood finish elements be eliminated.

Ms. Harris said this could be replaced by another masonry material or metal. She said that typically on historic masonry buildings you don't find wood being used as an accent feature in that way.

Dr. Williams said he was looking at Frogtown which has concrete masonry panels. He does not know whether it is hardi plank or wood.

Ms. Harris said it would be noncontributing of course, but she is sure that an example could be found to contradict this, but as a typical rule, you don't find wood be used on masonry buildings. This is a new product that they have not seen before. Therefore, she would love for the Board to talk about this issue as it is an unusual situation. Hardi board is intended to mimic wood. If it is doing that effectively, then is it visually compatible with the historic materials or is it intended to look like a new material.

Ms. Weibe-Reed stated she really likes the little walls. She asked if there is a standard in the ordinance that says they should or should not exist.

Ms. Harris explained that there is not a particular standard regarding this. It all goes back to visual compatibility. When you look at the other multi-story structures in the area, they tend to have stoops; she is not suggesting that they be covered. One of the things that she mentioned to the petitioner that he might want to consider is certainly have the bricks be the same color as the main building. This is a specific standard, but having the solid mass in front of the building creates a physical barrier. A less typical suggestion that the petitioner might want to consider something like incorporating cable railings to provide a little lighter texture to it. Ms. Harris said she believes that the brick's contrast makes it a separate feature where it should be more incorporated.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked Ms. Harris if she is suggesting that the brick wall become more transparent.

Ms. Harris said she has no problems with stoops being on the building.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Harris if she said that the buildings are at the zero lot line. Therefore, this has been revised since the Board saw this initially.

Ms. Harris answered yes. After the Board's discussion, the petitioner moved the building forward. Therefore, the stops actually encroach into the sidewalk. Therefore, the petitioner would need an encroachment permit.

Dr. Henry said he was looking at the staff's recommendations. There are seventeen recommendations. He has counted nine of the recommendations as being serious.

Mr. Howington asked the Board to keep the questions specific as they can and they will cover this more in the Board discussion.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lynch said that Mr. Tripp Beacham, the architect from Charlotte, NC, is accompanying him today. Mr. Beacham will address most of the Part II items. Mr. Lynch said he did not know if the Board wanted to go through Part I first and vote on that or do both parts simultaneously.

Mr. Howington said he would like to get the responses to Part I and Part II. Then the Board will separate them.

Mr. Lynch stated that as staff said, they have addressed all of the Part I concerns. He said regarding the comment about the windows on the rear, they were treating them more as accent windows. This is a secondary vehicular access point. Huntingdon Street is more of a lane at this point. Mr. Lynch said [pointing to an area] that the windows fall here and here. The windows are actually rectangular, but they are still not meeting the 3:5 standard. They felt that by adding the panel below, it still gave that vertical proportion that should meet the standard. It is a little more of a contemporary aesthetic than a traditional window.

Mr. Lynch said that regarding staff's recommendation #2, they have moved the building forward considerably on both Gaston Street and Montgomery Street. They moved it more on Montgomery Street side because they had more sidewalk to work with. They would like to keep the walls. He believes that for a large scale development being here, it is appropriate. He is working on the Candler Hospital building and have a series of property line walls that surround the building. But, here it is a little more contemporary as a way to negotiate the grade change they need from the street to the first floor. Mr. Lynch said they talked with staff about the possibility of going to a cable rail and maybe doing a corner pilaster or column and then do cable rail between. He said that the only issue they see with this is that they will have to raise the height a little to make it code compliant. Presently, they are about a foot at street grade up to the finished floor grade. From finish floor grade up to the top of the walls is only about two feet. Therefore, the total height of the walls is only 30 inches.

Mr. Lynch said they are agreeable to changing the color of the brick material to something more compatible with the building base. They felt that mixing up the colors helped to breakdown the mass of what is a somewhat large building. He said that Mr. Beacham will talk about Part II issues with the brick, but the general idea is they thought that the whole block of brick is going to be that much more monumental. The scheme that they have proposed helps to breakdown the massing. It is not a financial issue, but a massing issue. Mr. Lynch entertained questions from the Board on Part I.

Dr. Henry said the walls are 30 inches high. Will this function?

Mr. Lynch explained that the grade change is about 12 inches from the sidewalk to the finished first floor. They made the stoops about 18 inches; just tall and wide enough so that someone could not fall off. By code they can go up to 36 inches. But, they did not feel that it was necessary to bring them up that much more.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Lynch if he was saying that if they form a wall that they do not have to meet code requirements for railings.

Mr. Lynch answered correct. He said technically they do not need them, but they think that it is prudent to have some kind of barrier there so that a person would not be able to step off the back of the stoops.

Dr. Williams asked that if they did not have them, the stoops would come down to the grade about one foot.

Mr. Lynch said it would be a one foot step up. Therefore, they would need some kind of railing, but he believes doing an 18 inch or 24 inch railing will probably not look appropriate so he imagines they will go up about 36 inches.

Mr. Howington said they could go up to the line of separation to break it up.

Mr. Lynch explained that in some of the other large scale development historic projects downtown they found evidence of street walls. He does not know whether they were used as stoops, but this is a more contemporary, modern interpretation of that.

Dr. Williams stated that he heard Mr. Lynch mentioned Candler Hospital, the Savannah Law School. He asked if cast iron fences are on top of them.

Mr. Lynch answered that it is an 18 inch low wall. It is reverse reading where it is a light well in lieu of a raised stoop. But the height issue is about the same. He said that Mr. Beacham will come and address the items for Part II, Design Details.

Mr. Beacham said with regard to the stoops, there is a practical layer to them. They found that for residential units that are at grade it is important to raise them up a little so that there is a difference between public space and private space. The separation brings one thing, but the secondary part to this is the low wall provides a little privacy. Therefore, he believes that practically speaking the function will be a comfortable space for the residents.

Mr. Beacham said they used an accent color for the base walls. They are trying to be contemporary with the building and not mimic any traditional styles, but from a traditional perspective, often you find a dark granite base to a central business district building. He said they thought that this mimicked that to some degree, a little more abstract. They will be amenable if there is any mention to make it the same color. But, they believe that it helps to break up the mass of the building.

Mr. Beacham said regarding the question about the Hardi siding material, the wood grain, unfortunately it is not available in a smooth finish. He fully understands and respects the spirit of that, the aspect of the ordinance that wood grain Hardi that is painted certainly does not look as nice as Hardi that is smooth. Mr. Beacham said the sample that was

passed to the Board, their drawings shows the Maple color which is actually slightly darker than the one the Board sees, even though Maple is usually lighter. But, they can supplement the darker color. The intent with the wood panels is to give a fresh modern look. A lot of things done to the building were to break up the mass and make it more interesting. They think the wood panels give it a clean and residential feel. He feels that if the materials were changed to either brick or stucco, the building would have a commercial feeling. They want to keep the materials. It is a relatively new product that they believe is not only a hardy product for longevity, but it is aesthetically pleasing. They try to keep that material up in the building so that it is not something that you can get right on top of with your hands. It is a little more authentic maybe 20 feet away. He said he believes that the Board can see from the samples that it is fairly convincing even up close. Mr. Beacham said regarding the 75% brick requirement, the overall concept of the building is to try to break up the fairly long facades. The plan to put the courtyard in the middle was never to break the building up; the architecture to the left and right is similar, but they wanted them to feel as if they were potentially a different building. The light stucco was to try to lighten the building up with the surrounding context. He said he feels that if this was masonry, the scale of the building would suffer dramatically. Therefore, while this is considered one large scale building, their intent was to break it into smaller buildings. Therefore, he hopes that, in spirit, that this be viewed under a small building scale. They believe it is a better solution to stay with the stucco material than to go with brick. He believes that they have submitted an alternative that meets the 75% standard. This has nothing to do with cost, but is purely aesthetic and massing.

Mr. Beacham said there was a question about the architrave detail on the base and capital detailing of the bay window porches. They will be adding these. This is not an issue.

Mr. Howington said he believes that Mr. Beacham spoke on most of the staff's recommendations except for the storefront, bringing the sill up.

Mr. Beacham said they addressed this in their revision.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Beacham to respond to Item #9.

Mr. Beacham explained that the accent window question is a similar issue that the Board reviewed earlier today. He said practically speaking on residential units, things are happening behind the wall that makes it impractical to make it a larger window. Their effort is to make it more in keeping with the 5:3 rectangular shape, but meeting this standard in a double-hung window would be difficult.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they support the staff's recommendations for Part I, especially with restudying the low stoop walls. She stated that she just mentioned this to the petitioner, but it does not give him much time to consider this, but in terms of them restudying the low stoop walls, they thought about the consideration of eliminating them entirely instead extending the balconies down to the ground level to create porches similar to the picture they see on Drayton Street. The HSF believes this would change the aesthetic that the petitioners have spoken about. However, this is a traditional building and they are using it as an example and are going with a contemporary feel; but this may be something that they could look at in the district to interpret in a contemporary way.

Ms. Meunier said regarding the design details for Part II, they believe that the alternative that the petitioners have provided for the modular masonry submission where brick is used in place of the stucco in the northernmost block, they feel this is appropriate, but they suggest adding a stronger cornice or stringcourse at the top and maybe look into using a different color brick so that the massing will be broken up a little more.

Ms. Meunier for the southernmost section, they like the differentiation of the Hardi siding on the top levels and the strong cornices that are here; however, they question the material as it is a new material. She said obviously it is more of a stain over the wood grain and it looks more like wood. Consequently, it is an interesting intention and they believe that it could be successful, but they question how this would weather and maybe maintenance issues with the stain on that material. Hardi-plank requires less maintenance and, therefore, this may not be an issue, but being a new material they wonder about it. Therefore, if this material is replaced, it would be interesting to put stucco on the top levels keeping the brick on the lower levels with doing a color differentiation for the contrast. Ms. Meunier said they believe that the contrast that the petitioners are trying to create is successful in terms of trying to break up the mass.

Ms. Meunier said she believes that the petitioner mentioned that they are going with a darker color for Hardi-plank if they use that and the HSF agrees with that, it looks better in the renderings, having a stronger contrast than the sample that was provided.

Mr. Howington asked the petitioners if they wanted to respond to the public comments.

Mr. Beacham explained that the question regarding stain on the Hardi siding is it is not a stain but a permanent embedded color to the Hardi-plank just like a prefinished Hardi material that is meant to be there forever. He said he believes that if you are going to use a stained wood product in a more commercial application this is a guarantee that it is going to look good 5, 10 or 15 years from now.

Mr. Howington told Mr. Beacham that he believes he touched on the variance request and that he prefers not to have the 75% masonry materials. He asked him to elaborate more on his accessibility of his alternative in the same color brick. Mr. Howington asked him to respond on this preference and so forth.

Mr. Beacham said they have provided evidence of what this would entail basically as a revision for that option. He said he believes it is an inferior look; it is counter to the concept that they are trying to pull off at this site. He explained that the entire goal for them is to respect the historic context of Savannah, but do it in an interpretive way. Where the massing and materials of the building respects the shade and shadow repetition porches and stoops extension that you would see in traditional architecture, but more in a contemporary way. Mr. Beacham said he thinks that many large buildings, particularly large multi-family buildings, suffer because the tension and massing are not sensitively done. The repetition is not authentic. They believe in this instance, it has nothing to do with cost. He said that hard coat stucco is not an expensive product. Mr. Beacham said, therefore, they believe this is putting their best foot forward. They prefer that this be the manner in which they precede.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Howington informed the Board that specifically, he would like for them to address the Part I, Height and Mass issues first and the staff's recommendations.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she likes the smaller windows; she reads them as accent windows. The variety is somewhat interesting.

Mr. Howington stated that he reads the windows as accent as well. They are on secondary facades. Therefore, he believes that with the linear panels underneath, it implies the intent of the ordinance and it does not upset him against the ordinance. He does not know how the other Board members feel about this, but it is in keeping with the size of the adjacent windows and panes. Therefore, he believes to make them rectangular will probably not be a better solution. He feels that the solution presented is probably a better solution.

Dr. Williams asked if it was mentioned that the windows are rectangular now. What the Board sees in the lower drawing is that they are square and match the upper panes and sash. He agrees that it looks correct and works well as an accent window. If they were rectangular and no longer the same size as the upper half of the window, it would actually look weird. Dr. Williams said he would like some clarification if it is still this or has it been modified. The petitioner made a comment that they are now rectangular.

Mr. Beacham explained that he totally agrees. They refer to leave the square to be more an accent window. He believes the renderings were modified to make the windows rectangular which he believes is odd. They prefer to leave the windows square with the panel detailed to make them sort of marry those windows together.

Dr. Williams asked if the windows match the size of the upper half of the adjacent windows.

Mr. Beacham answered that he does not believe they do. His worry is that they would look less like an accent window if they match this.

Dr. Williams stated that the way the windows are presented, they look successful.

Mr. Beacham said he agrees 100% that the square will much more manifest an accent window intent.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said he likes the low walls. She believes they act like a porch to engage the street, but it also acts like a low seat.

Mr. Howington stated that he likes them as well. He believes they create, to some degree, a line of continuity, but he is not sure he likes the little precast wall on the top. He believes there needs to be some separation there, both public and private.

Mr. Gunther said if they are viewing these as walls of continuity, in his opinion they are a wall of continuity.

Mr. Howington corrected that what he should have said is that the building is the wall of continuity.

Mr. Gunther said the building is a wall of the continuity, but they are creating another wall that needs to be continuous in front of the building. It is reading as the sidewalk wall of continuity.

Dr. Williams stated that the building is the main line of continuity. He wonders about the one little piece of wall that is centered on the courtyard. Is it adjacent to a porch or is it just hovering in the middle of the entrance to the courtyard?

Mr. Howington said he believes it is sort of the gateway to the courtyard.

Dr. Williams stated it helps with the continuity.

Ms. McClain asked that in terms of visual compatibility, what is it compatible to?

Mr. Howington stated he would say such as the wall that was added to the Family Dollar store on MLK to provide something behind it.

Ms. McClain said but here it is trying to mimic a wall.

Mr. Howington explained that maybe the gap could be decreased. This would help Mr. Gunther's concern.

Ms. McClain said she agrees with staff recommendations for Part I. She said there is a lot to consider in Part II. She believes Part II needs to come back to the Board. However, the walls are a part of Height and Mass.

Mr. Howington said the Board could carry this over to Part II.

Mr. Beacham said regarding Part II, they realize there are a lot of items which are minor and they are agreeable to them.

Mr. Howington explained to Mr. Beacham that normally if there were not so many items, the Board would feel comfortable with looking at them today. In this regard, he senses that the Board would rather that he ask for a continuance for Part II and the Board would vote on Part I today.

Mr. Beacham said they are agreeable to this.

Ms. McClain stated that the Board did not discuss the variance. Would the variance come back with Part II?

Mr. Howington said it would come back with Part II. However, he would let the petitioner respond to this.

Mr. Beacham explained that this is such a substantial component of the design, he does not know what is appropriate in this forum, but they would like to get some reading on the variance so that they can come to the next meeting prepared.

Mr. Howington informed him that the Board could vote on the variance today. The petitioner has stated that he prefers just as presented with the modular masonry materials is requesting a variance to help break up the massing.

Ms. McClain asked, "isn't there specific requirements pertaining to whether a variance may be granted?"

Mr. Howington answered yes. The variance requirements are listed in the staff's report.

Ms. Harris explained that she also put a hard copy in each Board member's folder.

Mr. Howington read the variance criteria. "The Board shall make a finding for each criterion below and submit a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals:
Special Conditions: Special conditions and/or circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, buildings, or structures involved and which are applicable to other lands, buildings

or structures in the same zoning district; and the special conditions and/or circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant; and the special conditions and/or circumstances are not purely financial in nature so as to allow the applicant to use the land, buildings or structures involved more profitably or to save money."

Mr. Howington asked the Board if they felt that any of the criteria were met as a special condition.

Dr. Williams said this site is somewhat like the Selma Street site that the Board reviewed in one of its earlier meetings. He said most of what they see fits the dead end. There are no titling blocks here. No special conditions exist.

Mr. Howington read the literal interpretation which states that "literal interpretations of the provisions of the regulations would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district or within the same or immediately adjacent ward under the terms of the Ordinance and would result in unreasonable hardship on the applicant." The literal interpretation does not deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other property owners and is not an unreasonable hardship on the applicant.

Mr. Howington read the minimum variance requirement which states that "the variance, if granted, shall be the minimum variance necessary to make possible the reasonable use of land, buildings, or structures." The variance is not the minimum necessary to make reasonable use of the land.

Mr. Howington read the special privilege not granted section which states that "the variance shall not confer on the applicant's property any special privilege that is denied by this Ordinance to other lands, buildings or structures in the same zoning district."

Mr. Howington read the general consistency which states that "the variance shall be consistent with the intent of this Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan, and shall not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare."

Mr. Howington said if the Board makes a motion in favor of the variance, then the motion would need to state the finding of fact related to the variance criteria.

Dr. Williams asked if the windows are taken out, would the 75% of the solids just include the Montgomery Street elevation?

Ms. Harris answered that it is not on the other elevation. She believes that the standard requires that it be on the street facing façade.

Dr. Williams said on the south façade is mostly where the Hardi-siding is proposed.

Ms. Harris explained that it would have to face the street as it was setback. This is somewhat a gray area. She explained that if the Board remembers that with the Selma Street project, they talked a lot about recesses whether to include the recessed areas and the Board discussed that if it is setback as deep as it is wide, not to include it as a general guide.

Dr. Williams said he understands what is causing the percentage to come down on the Montgomery Street elevation is the Hardi-plank on the first floor of the building and the sprandrel panels.

Ms. Harris pointed out the sections that would be brick and stucco is above.

Dr. Williams asked if that cannot be stucco.

Ms. Harris stated that it does not necessarily have to be the same color as the brick beneath. It could be a different color to achieve a different contrast. It could be stone or another material. She read that the materials required states "building walls on street fronting facades shall incorporate modular masonry materials in the form of brick cast stone, stone, concrete formed or assembled as stone to achieve a human scale over a minimum of 75% of surface area (including windows, doors and curtain walls). The remainder of wall surface may incorporate other materials [Section (n)(6) Exterior Walls]." She explained that this is the guidance.

Mr. Beacham asked that based on the Board's discussion, the only option available to this design would be brick in order for them to ask for a variance.

Mr. Howington informed him that the Board would need to make a finding of fact.

Dr. Williams asked if precast concrete was used on the SCAD museum.

Ms. Harris explained that the SCAD museum is a monumental building. It is exempted from the large scale requirements; same thing applies to the Jepson Center.

Dr. Williams asked if precast concrete panels would be a solution here.

Ms. Harris explained that this would be her reading of it. She believes that there is enough flexibility if the Board wanted a policy that says precast concrete panels constitutes modular masonry. However, her only hesitation in this would be that the intent of the Ordinance clearly reads to create a "human scale." Therefore, if they look at the scale of the precast concrete panels they can be massive. She does not really know if they meet the intention of a human scale. Also, if the Board looks at how true stone on historic buildings is usually what is the maximum size that you find in stone panels.

Mr. Howington informed Mr. Beacham that he believes the Board likes the design broken up, but unfortunately they cannot find justification for it.

Mr. Beachman said there is firewall in the corridor at the base leading into the courtyard area. They could by the building code be defined as two buildings. Would this relieve them from a large project as mentioned?

Mr. Howington informed the petitioner that it would be seen as one project.

Board Action:

1. The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve Part 1 Height and Mass for new construction at 515 Montgomery Street with the condition that the low walls in front of the entrances restudied to be more visually compatible
2. The Savannah Historic District Board of

Review does hereby continue the petition for Part 2 Design Details of new construction at 515 Montgomery Street at the request of the petitioner to address the following:

- Provide the current proposed lot coverage.
- Submit mortar colors, gate colors, metal accent on fence colors;
- Change the hardi siding to have a smooth finish;
- Ensure that the proposed doors are inset at least three inches;
- Replace the fiber cement panels be replaced with a different material;
- Ensure the square windows are double hung, awning or casement;
- Ensure the storefronts extend from a sill along the Montgomery and Gaston Streets.
- Ensure that the storefront glazing is inset at least four inches from the façade.
- Ensure that all sections of the building have a stringcourse; - PASS
- Change the stair material from concrete to an approved material to meet the standard;
- Change the brick wall color to match that of the main structure;
- Ensure that the sidewalk continues to serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration and height;
- A “security fence” is noted along the western parcel boundary but specific information was not provided. Provide additional information regarding the security fence;
- The Montgomery Street façade incorporates 49% masonry materials. Staff recommends that the quantity of types of materials be

reduced and the masonry be increased to meet the standard;

- Ensure that all window and door insets meet the four inch standard.

3. The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby recommend denial of the variance request from the 75% modular masonry material requirement to allow 49% masonry to the Zoning Board of Appeals because the variance criteria are not met.

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye

22. [Petition of Jerry Lominack for Lominack Kolman Smith Architects | 14-005535-COA | 660 East Broughton Street | Rehabilitation](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Rebecca Fenwick was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sara Farr gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for rehabilitation work on the Foundry Building, identified as Building A, at 660 East Broughton Street. The building is part of the Kehoe Iron Works site. The rehabilitation work includes selective demolition to remove brick infill within the arched openings above the windows on the south façade of Building A. In order to restore the profile of the original arched openings, which were open, the existing windows will also be removed and replaced with single-light, single-sash arched steel windows.

Ms. Farr explained that in the first and third bay, entrances were created within the window openings. These will be removed, brick will be installed to window sill height to match the existing, the concrete sills will be replicated and single-light single-sash arched steel windows will be installed. In the central opening, a four-light steel window will be installed. All windows will be steel Hope's Jamestown 175 Series painted Sherwin Williams Green Bay (#6481 B-G/B/32).

Ms. Farr stated that on October 9, 2013, the HDBR approved the rehabilitation and an addition to the Machine Shop building. On November 7, 2013, exploratory removal of brick on the south facade of Building A was approved. On July 9, 2014 rehabilitation work was approved on Buildings B and C and on November 19, 2014 staff approved rehabilitation work on Buildings A and C.

Ms. Farr reported that staff recommends approval of rehabilitation work at 660 East Broughton Street on the south façade of the Foundry Building, Building A, with the condition that the new windows are inset a minimum of 3 inches from exterior face of the building, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the preservation standards. This work includes the installation of new brick and concrete sills in bays one and three and the removal of the steel windows and brick under the window arches. These windows will be replaced with single-sash arched steel windows manufactured by Hope's and painted Sherwin Williams Green Bay (#6481 B-G/B/32).

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Fenwick stated that they in agreement with the staff's recommendations.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for rehabilitation work at 660 East Broughton Street on the south façade of the Foundry Building, Building A, with the condition that the new windows are inset a minimum of 3 inches from exterior face of the building, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the preservation standards. - PASS
This work includes the installation of new brick and concrete sills in bays one and three and the removal of the steel windows and brick under the window arches. These windows will be replaced with single-sash arched steel windows manufactured by Hope's and painted Sherwin Williams Green Bay (#6481 B-G/B/32).

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye

Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye

23. [Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 14-005568-COA | 7 Drayton Street | Roof Addition](#)

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Project Narrative.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings and Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Specifications.pdf](#)
Attachment: [14-000690-COA - Previously Approved Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a 1-story roof addition for the historic 5-story commercial building located at 7 Drayton Street, also known as the American Building. The addition will be approximately 11 feet high at its tallest point. It has an angled footprint that is approximately 50 feet wide by 80 feet deep and is set back from the front (Bay Street) and east (Drayton Street facades). The design of the addition is contemporary and uses modern materials.

Ms. Michalak stated that on March 12, 2014, the Board approved alterations to the building. This included alterations to the ground floor, southwest corner recessed entry area and to enclose the existing light well on the west façade of the building with an addition. This work has not been constructed to date; however, this work is indicated on the drawings for the current petition that is under review. This petition modifies the previous approval in design (per the submitted elevations), increasing the infill's height and changing the configuration and design of the infill's materials. She said that more recently, on October 8, 2014, the Board denied the request to replace the windows with aluminum clad, double-paned windows.

Ms. Michalak stated that the addition will be highly visible from all public rights-of-way. Staff did an extensive walk of the area.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends to continue the petition for a 1-story roof addition on the historic 5-story commercial building located at 7 Drayton Street in order to address the following:

1. Set the addition back from the south (lane) and west facades, and increase the addition's setbacks on the east and north (front) facades.
2. Reduce or eliminate the projecting canopies on the rooftop addition.
3. Provide voids on the lane and west facades of the proposed rooftop addition.
4. Provide all manufacturer's specifications, material selections, and color selections for the proposed rooftop addition.
5. Ensure that the door, window, and storefront insets meet the standards.
6. Add a string course to the parapets on the proposed rooftop addition to meet the design standard for parapets.
7. Provide proposed new electrical equipment locations.

Ms. Scheer asked Ms. Michalak if she could think of any footprint that would be small enough so as not to change the roofline.

Ms. Michalak answered that it is hard to know that without having a proposal for such. She thinks that there could be some setbacks that are shorter in height and potentially may not be visible from some angles.

Dr. Williams asked, "what is above the little windows?" Is there a sixth floor?

Ms. Michalak answered no; that is the building that is behind this building.

Dr. Williams stated that he was making reference to this building. He explained that on top of this building there are some openings.

Ms. Michalak said those are the railings.

Dr. Williams asked if a high attic is on the inside of this building. This building has a very high wall. He does not know if there is a cross-section through the existing building showing the floors.

Ms. Michalak said the building is 11feet high. Therefore, it is actually above the parapet.

Mr. Gunther asked Ms. Michalak if she could speak to the Board's approval of the light well.

Ms. Harris said the staff report is on the website which will explain this. She stated that the infill of the light well did not go all the way up to the top of the building. It was lower.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lynch stated that they are aware that rooftop additions are sensitive. They spent a considerable amount of time making sure that the site lines from the street would minimize any visual impact. Therefore, they respectfully disagree that it will be a highly visible addition. He said as the Board can see their site lines on Drayton Street and from Bay Street and probably beyond that there is minimal visibility impact. The cantilevers are open air and to some degree is not a part of the roof structure. Therefore, it is not a solid mass.

Mr. Lynch said looking at the roofline, they will see that the actual building is setback a minimum of 10 feet from the edge of the structure. The parapet of this building is about 16 inches wide and the cornices are four feet. The extra wide cornice blocks the majority of the structure. He said, pointing to an area, that you will probably be able to see the fascia and projection of the sun louver and probably the projection of this sun louver. But everything beyond that will be minimally visible, if at all visible. Even on the lane side, they tried to bring it back at least to some amount so that they would not be close up to the parapet on the south and west facades. Mr. Lynch said that on the lane side passed the elevator, they had to bring the building out closer to the parapet. They had to set it basically 12 inches and it will be on the back of the parapet, but they wanted to be able to express the existing chimney and the elevator component of the building shaft and align the new construction with the previous submittal that was previously approved.

Mr. Lynch explained that the materials along that side of the building will be the same exact materials that were used for the addition; two different metal panel types, a corrugated metal panel type and a flat panel.

Mr. Lynch said they agree with the staff's comments for the openings on the side. He explained that if the Board looks at the roof plan, they will see that there is a substantial amount of service space on the back of the building. The majority of the materials facing the public rights-of-way are glass which is transparent. But, they will still need some

service space on the building; a bathroom and a commercial kitchen. In some areas, they have limited openings. They certainly will work with staff to add some windows. They could add a series of the windows on the back. This is a modern building and, therefore, they minimized the string course and they are hoping to do this with reveals and the metal panel. If necessary, they can punch some additional openings. They will further work with staff on this.

Mr. Lynch said regarding staff's other comments, they will ensure that the window storefronts are the same. Their main fact of justification was that they would match exactly match what was previously approved in their earlier submittal. He believes that they did not understand the item about the electrical, but it is existing and will remain in place. Mr. Lynch entertained questions from the Board.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Lynch if he said the projecting cantilevers are sun louvers.

Mr. Lynch answered that they are sun louvers and are integrated into the roof. They are basically open air.

Dr. Williams asked if the sun louvers would provide shade.

Mr. Lynch answered yes. However, they are transparent and, therefore, you can see through them. They will be at the edge of the roof.

Dr. Williams said that on the north side since the sun does not shine from the north, theoretically there is no need for shade except for a couple of days in June and there still would not be that much sunlight.

Mr. Lynch stated that they could work with staff to eliminate that projection.

Dr. Williams said since the Bay Street façade is the one that is most critical, there are some things that can make the addition less prominent.

Mr. Lynch said they could make this change. But looking at the section that Dr. Williams is talking about, unless you are standing on the back of Factors Walk you really don't see it from the front. He believes the projection projects a littler further out. They might be able to bring it back a little.

Dr. Williams said this is a unique situation where they can go at least another 100 feet further north to the Cotton Exchange. On a normal street, the site line that is provided would be the right site line, but in the context of this building, the site line is further to the north.

Mr. Lynch said they looked at the three main views that they thought would be problematic. He said that from the lane, you might see the top portion of the projection, but it will be minimal. They tried to keep this in line with the previous submittal.

Ms. Caldwell said that staff reported that there will be some visibility.

Mr. Lynch stated that he believes that the staff and he differs in their opinion. He said they extensively went through the site lines, studies and models to show exactly what the impact would be. If you stood maybe half the way down Bay Street, there would be a little of the top that you would be able to see, but in accordance with the other rooflines that you are able to see, this is a minimal comparison.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said the petitioner said that the addition would be minimally visible, but it appears that there is a difference of

opinion of where it will be visible. Maybe there needs to be more exploration. Dr. Williams mentioned the site line drawings. She has some photos that the staff provided and it appears that there may be some potential options. Possibly, some type of visual test might show the four corners of where the edge of the addition would be. Then they would walk around and view that to see if it would be visible with or without the cornices. They agree with staff that setting it back, it will be visible.

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

Mr. Lynch said they will get with staff to satisfy the concerns. But on the setback issue he is not sure how many more studies they can do of the different viewpoints.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Lynch if he addressed staff recommendation #6 regarding the parapet on the string course addition.

Mr. Lynch stated that just as he discussed about their previous submittal, they discussed that it is a contemporary structure and they thought just some banding would be successful.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Howington said he believes there are many places that you will see the rooftop addition. There is no way to build a rooftop addition without seeing it if you get far enough down Bay Street or Drayton Street. There is absolutely no way you can build something on top of this building without seeing it. This is his personal opinion. He does not know what this might do for them, but he thinks that the petitioner has provided what other petitioners provide is a site line showing the minimum obstruction upon the streets that complements other streets with other rooftop additions. They set it back on the most public facades and this means Drayton Street and Bay Street. The nonpublic sides to the west and south of the site are less concerns to him.

Dr. Henry said he has a problem with the visibility, you will see the addition.

Mr. Gunther said the Ordinance clearly states that "a rooftop addition should almost always be setback at least one full bay from the primary elevation as well as from the other elevations if that building is freestanding." He pointed out that this building is freestanding and is highly visible and should be setback one bay.

Dr. Williams said it appears to him that the main wall is the projecting canopy. He guesses it does not angle out and the wall is the southernmost projection, but further north, it is setback further than one bay.

Mr. Gunther said it still freestanding and is visible from all sides. On the western lane side, it should also be setback.

Ms. Scheer said on this building, the addition will be visible from the right-of-way. This building is 115 years old.

Ms. Caldwell asked "what did the previous approval involve?"

Mr. Lynch explained that it was for multifamily and loft.

Ms. Caldwell asked if this is the same owner.

Mr. Lynch answered yes. But, now they want a restaurant use.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Lynch what happens to the plan if he does it the way the Ordinance prescribes.

Mr. Lynch answered that they are at a minimum of square footage presently. They have

looked at options, but it just takes up too much square footage. He said based on their previous approval, they thought this extension of this would be less visible than the rooftop addition. Therefore, they were trying to be as sensitive as possible. They knew that in some areas it would be visible, but these are somewhat the less prestigious elevations of this building. They thought that it was more appropriate that if they have to make it visible, that it be visible on the lane side.

Dr. Williams said it seems that there are a lot of options for the petitioner to explore a lot of modifications that will mitigate the visibility. The louvers could be pulled back and what the petitioner said about the west side. A restudy of their restaurant might allow them to go towards Bay Street on the west side. The staff has recommended a continuance.

Mr. Howington told Mr. Lynch that it appears that the Board is in favor of him requesting a continuance.

Mr. Lynch said he, just as Mr. Shay said, would rather get a vote today, but if they have to go with a continuance, he would rather come back with another route.

Mr. Howington informed Mr. Lynch that it is his decision, but he will leave that up to him. If he wants to call for a vote today, he can do so.

Mr. Lynch said they prefer that the Board vote on their petition today. If they have to resubmit it as a separate project, he is not sure it would come back. But, he agrees that they will work with staff on lessening the impact of the louvers. He said with regards to the setback issue, he believes that they have pushed it back as far as they could.

Mr. Howington told him that if he comes back with louver changes, that will be a separate project. He entertained a motion.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the petition for a 1-story roof addition on the historic 5-story commercial building located at 7 Drayton Street because the proposed work does not meet the preservation standards for rooftop additions within Preservation Brief 14-New Exterior Additions to Historic Building Preservation Concerns. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Debra Caldwell
Debra Caldwell - Aye
Justin Gunther - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Marjorie W Reed - Nay
Tess Scheer - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

24. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 14-005575-COA | 501 East Bay Street | Part 1: Height and Mass New Construction](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 14-005575-COA.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Washington Ward.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

Ms. Weibe-Reed recused from participation in this petition. She serves as a consultant to Dawson Architects.

Mr. Neil Dawson was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of Part 1: Height and Mass of a new four story mixed-use office/residential building at the southeast corner of East Bay and Price Street. The fourth floor is recessed to reduce the overall visual impact. The proposed building has entrances on both Price and East Bay Street. Parking is beneath the building and is accessed from East Bay Lane. The Bay Street façade features two bays while the Price Street façade feature five bays. Eight residential units are located on floors 2-4, while office/retail space is located on the ground floor. Ms. Harris explained that because of the parking restrictions on the site, it is only 30 feet wide. In order to meet the structured parking setback of 30 feet, you would essentially have to eliminate three of the four parking spaces. They have discussed with the petitioner of making a two to three storefront set in this bay that could be advertising display area and this would allow for the parking spaces behind it to be maintained. Staff feels that there is minimum spacing on the building, they would be supportive of that coming back for Part II, Design Details. The petitioner is also requesting a variance from the 30 foot parking setback requirement along Price Street.

Ms. Harris gave the background data on the site. The site historically contained a number of two story wooden buildings. By 1973 the lot is vacant. In 2005, the Historic District Board of Review approved a similar petition for the site but the project did not materialize. The site is within Washington Ward and is adjacent to a parking garage. There are no contributing buildings on the block face. There are a variety of building types along Bay Street, including single family residential as well as more industrial, warehouse type structures. On corner lots, the buildings orient primarily towards Bay Street but some buildings are oriented towards the east-west streets.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of Part 1: Height and Mass for a new four story building with the following conditions to be submitted with Part 2: Design Details:

1. Restudy the entrance within the central bay on the Price Street façade to be more symmetrical in order to emphasize the verticality of that bay;
2. On the southernmost bay on the Price Street façade, eliminate the parking space and add a storefront.
3. Ensure that the window and door frames are inset at least three inches from the façade.

4. Ensure that the storefront glazing is inset at least four inches from the face of the building.
5. Add an additional awning above the Bay Street entrance to better address Bay Street.
6. Ensure that the parapet on the fourth floor has a stringcourse.
7. Locate the refuse storage area.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends denial of the 30 foot structured parking variance because the variance criteria have not been met.

Ms. Harris read the following email from Mr. Bill Steube of the Downtown Neighborhood Association into the records: "Should the 501 East Bay Street development be approved as presently conceived please make it clear to the HDBR that the neighbors in the Washington Square Ward and the DNA want to keep the parking space fronting along Price Street notwithstanding the recommendation of staff to eliminate it. Given the 40 foot width of the lot, eliminating the space would still result in all but one of the the adjacent parking spaces being within 30 feet of Price Street and a variance would be required for those spaces. As a compromise, a vitrine window adjacent to the parking space, consistent in design with the other store fronts fronting Price Street, would give the appearance of a retail space compatible with the balance of the street front. The area already suffers from a lack of parking given the many VRBO facilities and the proximity of the Brice hotel and restaurant. Eliminating one or more spaces in the project would only exacerbate the difficult situation. Please let me know if you do not feel comfortable presetting this position to the HDBR. Best regards, Bill."

Mr. Howington said another building is highly visible here. They can see the penthouse from the east façade and south façade. It is very much the same.

Ms. Harris explained that this is new construction and this is the main difference.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson said they agree with staff recommendations. They believe that the staff found that the standards were met with the exception of one case which was the parking adjacent to Price Street. If you drive down Price Street, it is obvious that almost every house that faces the east/west streets has a carriage house in the rear that has structured parking on Price Street. They found that almost throughout the district that in residential areas that carriage houses have structured parking directly adjacent to north/south streets. The standards allow for parking entrances off of north/south streets. Therefore, they could have potentially asked for a garage door on Price Street, but they felt this was inappropriate.

Mr. Dawson said given the context that they are in which is more residential than Bay Street, they agree with staff and Bill Stuebue's recommendation to use a display window on that lot to give a little more softer retail look to the building. He said they also agree with the comments about addressing Bay Street with a little more articulation in terms of the awnings over the entrances and also addressing the entrance off of Price Street to be a little more consistent. Consequently, they felt that all of the staff's comments were appropriate.

Dr. Williams stated that a very large tree is on the site which will have to be removed. He said last year a building had to be setback because the tree was there. He asked Mr. Dawson if this has come up in their conversation with the city.

Mr. Dawson answered no; they have taken the project to SPR and this was not an issue. He said it is a significant cottonwood tree. He is sure that if this is a problem, SPR will let them know.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that they agree with staff's comments. However, they feel that the more commercial nature of the building, particularly along Price Street is not in keeping with the smaller residential buildings on this street. They suggest reorienting the focus to Bay Street which is more commercial in nature and the building would be oriented to Bay Street in this situation on the corner. By making this the primary façade and relocating the entrance there, they feel it would make Bay Street the context so that commercial would be more appropriate as opposed to Price Street now where the context is more residential. Ms. Meunier said hopefully this would make Price Street more secondary and more respectful to the residential nature. She said if they look at Price Street, presently there is a lot of glazing and it seems much more commercial in nature whereas on Bay Street they feel it is being treated a little more as a secondary façade now that there are punched openings. Therefore, may be this needs to be switched and focus on some of those west glazing punched openings on Price Street may help with this.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Muenier how they felt about the storefronts on Price Street.

Ms. Meunier answered that they are not opposed to having some storefronts on Price Street. But, they believe the focus is to make the primary entrance towards Bay Street. They are not suggesting that they completely eliminate the storefront of the commercial use on Price Street. She believes that the suggestion that was given by staff with having a minimal storefront window could still work.

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

Mr. Dawson responded that their context on Bay Street is a bit of an anomaly with the two-story parking deck. A two-story residential building to the west of this site was moved here in the late 1960s or 1970s. This is not at its original location. This section of Bay Street is strictly an anomaly when you consider the five, six, seven and the American building, their neighbors that will possibly be six stories as well. This is a bit of an anomaly including that the Height Map allows for the properties north of Bay Lane to be more commercial and taller in nature. Mr. Dawson said, pointing to an area, that while he completely understands, they tried to address this by having the residential entrance here, this is really just a small professional office about 400 or 500 square feet. So it will really nominally impact on the neighborhood whereas the primary commercial entrance would be off of Bay Street. They are trying to be respectful to the neighborhood, they did not feel that it was appropriate to do a bar or any other thing that can go in this zoning district. Mr. Dawson said they tried to be respectful to the neighborhood in terms of the use, size, and the entry locations.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry said he has had a lot of people talk with him about this. One report is that the parking situation is constantly getting worse. He believes what is being proposed is a good solution.

Dr. Williams asked staff if the canopy they proposed for the Bay Street elevation is to be just over the entrance or over the whole façade.

Ms. Harris explained that the awning is just for the central entrance.

Dr. Williams stated that just as Mr. Dawson said, the Bay Street commercial activity is the principal one, but he agrees with Historic Savannah that it does not read as the principal one with that vertical element which is obviously the stair hallway. It would be interesting to know what could be done with the Bay Street elevation without necessarily changing the

Price Street elevation to make it more principally commercial such as maybe extending a canopy across the façade as one possible solution; and maybe changing the punched openings. He agrees that it reads very residential. Dr. Williams does not believe the lane side is an issue, but he believes that are some relatively minor things that could be done to the Bay Street elevation without large changes to the design that would help in giving it a more commercial character.

Mr. Howington stated that, therefore, the feeling is that the smaller windows have a more residential feel and this is a commercial feeling with the larger doors.

Mr. Dawson said they will be willing to restudy the Bay Street to create a more concept sympathetic elevation there and maybe restudy the center mass so that it has a little less window so that it would not seem like all of the residents coming out are looking into the neighborhood. He believes they could restudy these two elements in the Part II submittal. He said maybe they have done more design for Part I than they should have because it is only height and mass. But, because of the small scale and setting, they felt it should be articulated.

Ms. McClain stated that the windows are a part of Part I.

Mr. Howington explained that the windows are a part of Part I. He is sure that Mr. Dawson wants a vote today. He told Mr. Dawson, however, he believes that Ms. McClain is asking if he would be willing to bring back Part I and Part II at one time by asking for a continuance now with the understanding that the windows will be modified since they are a large part of Part I Height and Mass.

Mr. Dawson stated that to him that this would be an easy part of the motion to be made that the windows on Bay Street be restudied to comeback in Part II. However, he believes to continue it does not give him a sense of how the Board might vote for Part II.

Mr. Howington explained that Mr. Dawson is asking for a vote today with the understanding that the windows and the façade openings be restudied on Price Street.

Dr. Williams said if this is a commercial storefront elevation and if there a canopy is here, where will the signage be placed.

Mr. Howington said it will end up on the canopy.

Dr. Williams said a blade sign could be here.

Mr. Howington said the signage would be a separate petition. They will deal with this in a separate submittal.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for Part 1: Height and Mass for a new four story building at 501 East Bay Street with the following conditions to be

submitted with Part 2: Design Details:

1. Restudy the entrance within the central bay on the Price Street façade to be more symmetrical in order to emphasize the verticality of that bay;
2. On the southernmost bay on the Price Street façade replace the louvers with a storefront display area;
3. Ensure that the window and door frames are inset at least three inches from the façade;
4. Ensure that the storefront glazing is inset at least four inches from the face of the building; - PASS
5. Add an additional awning above the Bay Street entrance to better address Bay Street;
6. Ensure that the parapet on the fourth floor has a stringcourse;
7. Locate the refuse storage area; and
8. Restudy the window and door configuration on both Price and Bay Streets to ensure that the Bay Street façade is more commercial in nature and the Price Street façade is more residential.

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby recommend approval for the 30 foot structured parking variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals because the variance criteria have been met.

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

25. [Petition of Nic Pollock for Alchemy Restoration | 14-005396-COA | 352 Lincoln Street | Staff Approved - Color Changes](#)

Attachment: [COA - 352 Lincoln Street 14-005396-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Savannah HBR Application2 Submittal Packet 352 Lincoln Street 14-005396-COA\(3\).pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Calvin Parker for Sorrel Weed House Corporation | 14-005403-COA | 6 West Harris Street | Staff Approved - Stucco and Shutter Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 6 West Harris Street 14-005403-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 6 West Harris Street 14-005403-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Josh Beckler for Coastal Canvas Products | 14-005422-COA | 207 West York Street | Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 207 West York Street 14-005422-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package -207 West York st..pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Andy McGarrity | 14-005534-COA | 330 Drayton Street | Staff Approved - Stucco Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 330 Drayton Street 14-005534-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [02Preserve-Brief-MortarJoints \(2\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [HDBR-GirlScout-Writeup-11-10-14 \(2\).pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Amended Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects, PC | 14-005536-COA | 660 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 660 East Broughton Street 14-005536-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 660 East Broughton Street 14-005536-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of E. Puljung for Hansen Architects | 14-005564-COA | 22 West Harris Street | Staff Approved - Stucco Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 22 West Harris Street 14-005564-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 22 W. Harris St. -14-005564-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Cameron Shadron for Signarama | 14-005615-COA | 10 Barnard Street | Staff Approved - Color Change Sign](#)

Attachment: [COA - 10 Barnard Street 14-005615-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package - 10 Barnard St. - 14-005615-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Natalie Aiken for Hansen Architects, P.C. | 14-005671-COA | 101 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 101 West Broughton Street 14-005671-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 101 West Broughton Street 14-005671-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Michele Ingram for Bank South | 14-005672-COA | 18 West Bryan Street | Staff Approved - Sign Reface and Awnings](#)

Attachment: [COA - 18 West Bryan Street 14-005672-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [banksouth-rendering.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Amended Petition of Natalie Aiken for Hansen Architects, P.C. | 14-005674-COA | 309 East Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Rear Porch Addition](#)

Attachment: [COA - 309 East Gaston Street 14-005674-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 1 - 309 East Gaston Street 14-005674-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 2 - 309 East Gaston Street 14-005674-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Josh Bull for Greenline Architecture | 14-005706-COA | 601 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Remove Metal Finials](#)

Attachment: [COA - 601 East Bay Street 14-005706-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 601 East Bay Street 14-005706-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Shannon Murphy for Ram Jack of South Carolina | 14-005745-COA | 546 East Congress Street | Staff Approved - Repair and Stabilize Foundation](#)

Attachment: [COA - 546 East Congress Street 14-005745-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 546 East Congress Street 14-005745-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Alex Ormond | 14-005757-COA | 502 Price Street | Staff Approved - Replace Existing Fence](#)

Attachment: [COA - 502 Price Street 14-005757-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 502 Price Street 14-005757-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects, PC | 14-005785-COA | 126 West River Street | Staff Approved - Install Exhaust Fan](#)

Attachment: [COA - 126 West River Street 14-005785-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Top Deck Exhaust Hood - CaptiveAire Fan NCA16FA 14-005785-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Top Deck Exhaust Hood - Drawing Set 14-005785-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of James E. Lewellyn | 14-005816-COA | 221 East Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Windows](#)

Attachment: [COA - 221 East Gaston Street 14-005816-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 221 E. Gatson St. 14-005816-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Petition of Richard K. Wissmach | 14-005843-COA | 220 East Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Light Fixtures](#)

Attachment: [220 East Gaston Street 14-005843-COA Light Fixtures 12-02-14 \(2\).pdf](#)
Attachment: [COA - 220 East Gaston Street 14-005843-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 12-10-14.pdf](#)

Mr. Howington explained the report on work performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness is attached to the Agenda.

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

42. [2015 Calendar of Meetings](#)

Attachment: [HDBR 2015 SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS.pdf](#)

Mr. Howington stated that the 2015 Calendar of Meetings is attached for the Board's review.

Ms. Harris stated that Mr. Thomson just pointed out that the November 11 meeting is on a holiday. Therefore, they will need to reschedule this meeting. She will revise the calendar to update the November meeting.

43. [CANCELLED Special Called Meeting - Thursday, December 11, 2014 at 2:30 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street, New Meeting Date TBD](#)

Mr. Howington reported that the Special Called Meeting scheduled for Thursday, December 11, 2014 at 2:30 p.m. has been cancelled.

Ms. Harris said the latest now is everyone who confirmed previously that they can attend the meeting on Friday, December 19, 2014 if it is moved to 2:00 p.m., we will have a quorum. Therefore, the Board members who said they could attend on Friday, December 19, 2014 at 11:00 a.m., the question is will they be able to attend the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

44. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, December 18, 2014 at 3:30 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

Mr. Howington said he will get with staff about the next Case Distribution and Chair Meeting as he will not be able to meet on Thursday, December 18, 2014.

45. [Next Meeting - Wednesday, January 14, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

46. [Vinyl Awning Policy](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [11-17-14 Coastal Canvas Letter.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner, Mr. Glenn Wood of Coastal Canvas Products, requested that a determination of Visual Compatibility for various awning fabric types, particularly vinyl fabric, within

the Savannah Historic District. At the November 12, 2014 Board meeting, the petitioner presented the Board with a list of addresses that represent a variety of awning fabric types currently in use throughout the Savannah Historic District. The petitioner also presented the Board with a variety of awning fabric samples to examine during the meeting.

Ms. Michalak stated that the Board determined that it is possible that both acrylic and vinyl awning fabrics can be visually compatible on a case-by-case basis. The determining factors with regard to whether a fabric is visually compatible are: reflectivity and texture. The Board stated that a fabric that is smooth and/or reflective, regardless of its actual material composition, is not visually compatible because those qualities do not represent historic fabrics.

Ms. Michalak passed Mr. Wood's binder to the Board that contained his letter. She explained that the first couple of products he provided are associated with his letter and not necessarily products that he is proposing. She stated that the first group that the Board is reviewing, staff is recommending those products as visually compatible and the second group, staff is recommending as not visually compatible.

Dr. Williams asked if some of the awning fabrics that staff is recommending for approval are vinyl.

Ms. Michalak answered yes.

Ms. McClain said she agrees with the fabrics that staff has recommended as visually compatible. They are a nice quality. Staff has done a good job.

Mr. Howington said the goal of this is that they have a list of approved manufactures and fabrics. He said that any future awning submittals that are not a part of these manufactures will be submitted to staff and the Board for future approval.

Ms. Caldwell said one of the fabrics that the staff considered visually compatible has a shiny look.

Ms. Michalak said that staff discussed that fabric at great length.

Ms. Caldwell said she is leery of this particular fabric. She reminded the Board of the lengthy discussion they had pertaining to the rust color at one of their meetings.

Ms. McClain said maybe it's the color and not the fabric.

Dr. Williams said maybe the fabric, as pointed out by Ms. Caldwell, needs to be removed from the visually compatible list.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she thought the Board was going to come up with a specification.

Ms. Michalak explained that the staff's recommendation breaks this down and the information will be put into a policy document.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked if visual compatibility is the criteria they are using to

judge the fabrics.

Ms. Michalak answered yes. She said that awnings are usually reviewed at the staff level. They will be reviewing the fabrics based on a low rate of reflectivity and the texture.

Mr. Howington said this is just an approved list and other manufactures can be submitted for review on an individual basis.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby finds the following awning fabrics visually compatible:

1. Sunbrella Awning/Marine, Woven Acrylic Fabric
2. Sattler, The HighTex Company, 100% Premium Acrylic Fabric
3. Herculite Natura, High Performance Awning Fabric
4. Dickson Solar Protection Fabric
5. Or equivalent (to be reviewed and approved by staff)

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby finds the following awning fabrics visually incompatible due to their smooth finish and/or reflective nature:

- PASS

1. Weathertyte Advanced Awning Fabric, High-Performance Vinyl Substrate Fabric
2. Patio500, Vinyl Laminated Polyester Fabric
3. Ultrashade Plus, Laminated Vinyl Fabric
4. Soltex, Extrusion Coated Fabric with a Polyurethane Top Coat
5. Preconstraint Ferrari, Biface Varnish Finish Fabric
6. Coast Line Plus, PVC Composite Fabric
7. BTF-19, PVC Coated Polyester with PVDF/Acrylic Finish
8. Or equivalent (to be reviewed and approved by staff)

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

New Business

47. [2015 Officer Elections](#)

Dr. Henry reported that the nominating committee consisted of Ms. Simpson, Mr. Merriman and he. They nominated Mr. Keith Howington, Chair and Ms. Ebony Simpson, Vice-Chair as the 2015 officers for the Historic District Board of Review.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the Nominating Committee's report for the following officers for 2015: Keith Howington, Chair and Ebony Simpson, Vice Chair. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

48. [Discuss Conflict of Interest Policy](#)

Dr. Henry stated that he was not questioning the integrity of any Board members. His point is the appearance of a conflict. He has served as a dean. One Board member actually reports to the dean. To him this could be a major problem. Dr. Henry said he wanted the Board to keep in mind also that at one time they had a Board member who wanted to present his own projects to the Board and they denied it. That Board member resigned. Dr. Henry said he believes the Board did the right thing. He said that Ms. Weibe-Reed just recused herself because he guesses that somebody asked her to.

Ms. McClain said Ms. Weibe-Reed may not have consulted on the project that was before the Board, but in the past she has served as a consultant to Dawson Architects and, therefore, she might have believed that recusing herself was appropriate.

Mr. Howington said Ms. Weibe-Reed serves as a consultant at different times for Mr. Dawson. Therefore, she has a financial interest in his projects outcomes. He said he has friends and clients that present, but that they are not his projects and, therefore, he does not believe that he necessarily has to recuse himself because of someone in the audience that he knows.

Dr. Henry said that would be different, but what he is talking about is when a Board member reports directly to the boss. To him this is a conflict.

Mr. Howington said he was not trying to be argumentative. Harley Krinsky, for example, is his client on different projects, but he could view that and say if he votes against or for his project, then he will not hire me for another project. He cannot recuse himself every time Mr. Krinsky brings a project to the Review Board. This is a small town and Mr. Krinsky will bring many projects to the Review Board.

Dr. Henry said this is different. The person he is referring to reports constantly on other things to this person.

Mr. Howington said they report to him, but not as a SCAD project.

Dr. Henry said he finds this strange.

Dr. Williams asked Dr. Henry if he was predicating this opinion based on his perception of the dean or simply on the fact that he reports to him. He said that Dr. Henry predicated his comments on finding his view what a dean is and how important that role is.

Dr. Henry said even without that it would still be the appearance of a conflict of interest.

Dr. Williams stated that the dean's position at SCAD is nothing like what Dr. Henry would have served at Georgia Southern or any other academic institution. Deans at SCAD do not have the kind of power that you would associate with for a normal dean nor does he make the decision over his fate at SCAD. Human Resources does, but not he.

Ms. McClain asked Dr. Williams if the dean does his performance reviews.

Dr. Williams answered yes, but the review includes other factors that go beyond him.

Ms. McClain asked Dr. Williams if, from his review, he can get raises or increases in pay as a result of his yearly performance or appraisal.

Dr. Williams answered yes.

Dr. Henry said he believes that this Board is suffering a loss of authority because every city body in sight is overruling them. This means that they, as a

Board, need to do everything conceivably possible to retain their integrity.

Mr. Howington said that the City Attorney and other attorneys have addressed this specifically and, therefore, he cannot overrule the City Attorney.

Dr. Henry said the City Attorney only gives them a recommendation.

Mr. Thomson said his recommendation would be to use the City Attorney's response as a guideline. As he has said before, it is the individual's determination of whether or not he/she has a real conflict or there could be a perception of conflict which deals directly to a financial interest. He said the way he has informed the MPC is whether they are able to make an objective decision based on the circumstances of the perceived potentials or do they declare a conflict of it. If this is the case, then they should make a public statement that there could be a perceived conflict. The individual then states whatever is the perceived conflict.

Dr. Henry said they as members of this Board, they should respect the opinion of anyone who asks them to recuse themselves as long as they are honestly presenting their case.

Mr. Thomson said no one else can judge whether there is a conflict, except the individual.

Dr. Henry said this is not entirely true.

Ms. McClain said the Board can write a policy that will be all encompassing. She asked if the Board has a written policy on conflict of interest. What she saw from the City Attorney was their opinion/recommendation.

Mr. Howington said it was based on Robert's Rule of Order.

Ms. Harris said it was based on the Code of Ethics from the National Alliance of Preservation which is a part of the Historic District Board of Review by-laws. The code does not specifically address this exact situation. Therefore, they asked the opinion of City Attorney that this is the Code of Ethics that they have that the Board has adopted if in his opinion in this situation should there be a recusal or not. The City Attorney looked at that and said from what he saw he did not believe that a recusal is required.

Dr. Henry said this is not true in DeKalb County. He said that he asked Ms. Harris get him a copy of what DeKalb County uses.

Mr. Thomson said other elected board members of the commission vote to basically censor the member.

Dr. Henry said they do not censor, but recuse.

Mr. Thomson said that is not correct. It says "censor" them. But, as he has said he believes it is the individual's decision and conscious that should decide this. If the Board votes to not have Mr. Gunther vote on a petition that is censorship.

Dr. Henry said he was proposing that the Board of Review adopted DeKalb's

County "Code of Ethics" regarding "conflict of interest."

Dr. Williams recommended that the City Attorney review DeKalb's County Conflict Policy to see how compatible it is with their municipal ordinances and by-laws. They are not in DeKalb County.

Mr. Thomson said the individual has to decide and the Board votes whether or not they agree with the individual. The conflict starts with the individual. They have some people who might want to recuse themselves as they do not want to vote on an issue because it is controversial.

Mr. Howington said the members of this Board are here for a reason and unless they have a direct conflict, they should be doing what they were put in this position to do which is to make decisions.

Ms. McClain said she would be uncomfortable if she came for a review and her employee what sitting on a board and she/or he commented negatively about something, if she was a selfish person, she might want to get back at that employee and come up with a way to discipline that person. Conceivably, it can happen.

Ms. Scheer said that as an employer, she would have to be able to justify any decision that she makes. If someone comes back with a question, she will have to justify her negative decision.

Ms. McClain said she agrees in part that it would be the individual's decision. If they want to err on the side of caution and respect the appearance of impropriety, then they should recuse. This Board had a big discussion with Jerry Lominack who was very upset as it did not go as he wanted it to.

Mr. Howington said the difference here is if he, as Chair, wanted to come off the Board and present one of his projects, how would that look to the public. This would definitely be a conflict. But, these were not SCAD projects. He asked Dr. Williams if Mr. Sottile is his boss at Sottile and Sottile.

Dr. Williams answered no.

Dr. Henry said he finds this to be a tricky question.

Ms. McClain stated that Mr. Sottile has his private firm that he works for and he serves as a supervisor at SCAD.

Dr. Williams said that Mr. Sottile is not his employer, nor is he is boss, but he is a supervisor. Mr. Sottile cannot fire him.

Ms. McClain said in the academic world, she guesses Mr. Sottile could play a part in the additional classes that Dr. William teaches.

Dr. Williams said answered no; this is up to him. He said that Mr. Sottile has been coming before this Board for some time. He said Mr. Sottile presented the Cay Building. The first iteration of this Height and Mass was in the context of the Broughton Street project.

Dr. Henry said he has the records. It was presented to the Board that Dr.

Williams had a working relationship with him, but that was misleading.

Ms. McClain asked Dr. Williams if Mr. Sottile was his direct supervisor at that time.

Dr. Williams said during the Cay Building he was.

Ms. Caldwell stated that if the City Attorney has said there was nothing that he saw where they should recuse themselves, it should be okay. She believes that their two Board members and also Mr. Sottile have a high level of integrity. Ms. Caldwell said she believes that Mr. Sottile would ask them to recuse themselves if he thought it could be a problem.

Dr. Williams said he knows that Dr. Henry's perception would be that anything that is presented would be framed by fear or repercussion.

Dr. Henry answered sure.

Dr. Williams asked who among them, when the Board was reviewing the Height and Mass on the River Street Hotel, came through as the most aggressively critical of this project than he. He said that he called for a vote which Ms. Weibe-Reed supported opening this up. He is not afraid.

Ms. McClain said she wonders how Dr. Williams feels when he goes back to his setting.

Dr. Williams said he has no fear. He said had the City Attorney made a determination that it was a conflict, he would recuse himself immediately. He respects the concern, but he also respects the authority of the City Attorney.

Mr. Howington said he believes they have talked about this enough. The main things he sees here are twofold: 1) the City Attorney has recommended that he does not see a conflict and 2) Mr. Thomson has said clearly that it is up to the individual and his/her conscious. If the individual does not feel that they have a conflict, then he believes this is the way it should be.

Dr. Henry said he does not want the Board to believe that he put this out.

Mr. Howington said this was in the newspapers last month. If someone does not understand the conflict of interest issue after all the discussion this Board has had on it, then he apologizes for their lack of misunderstanding. This conflict of interest was discussed before that meeting, at that meeting, and at the last meeting when it was brought up.

Mr. Howington said if a Board member perceives that they have a conflict of interest they should make it known and recuse themselves. But it is not an "easy out" because the Board would vote on this. For example, he could say because he has a relationship with someone that he does not want to vote on the project. But, this does not give him a reason to get out of it.

Mr. Thomson explained that when this came up in the past, he asked the individual if they had a financial relationship in some way. If the individual answered no, then they did not need to recuse themselves.

Mr. Gunther said before he reviewed anything that was presented by Mr. Sottile he had reservations. So, he asked Ms. Harris to check on the issue. She checked with the City Attorney and got a response. He was told that it was okay to participate in the discussion. Consequently, he went on the pretense that everything was fine as long as he was objective in his decision-making. He said he made it known at that meeting.

Ms. Harris said she recommends that staff put an Agenda item for an amendment to the By-Laws at the next meeting and the Board can vote it up or down.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSG) said this works both ways. As a dean, he could be harboring some grudge. What if a Board member brings up the issue that she/he perceives that there is a conflict between certain parties, then the individual should be given the opportunity to explain why there is or is not a conflict.

Ms. McClain said this is what she was asking Dr. Henry; just put it out for the record and make a public statement so that the public is made aware.

Mr. Howington explained that this was done at the last meeting. This will be on their January 14, 2015 Agenda and the Board will have an opportunity to vote on the amendment.

Ms. Scheer extended an invitation to the Board and Staff to go on a tour of Bonaventure Cemetery, Sunday, February 1, 2015. She needs the head count by January 25, 2015 to make the determination if she needs to schedule more than one tour. Ms. Scheer said that Ms. Harris will be in charge of getting the invitation out. The tour will probably be in the afternoon and on a Sunday.

Mr. Thomson said February 1 is Super Bowl Sunday.

Ms. Scheer said then she will change the date to February 15, 2015 if this is okay with the Board.

Mr. Carey said he should have brought this up at the Retreat and maybe the Board did, but now they are getting a lot of new construction. He said it would be good if they got some training or a work session on this topic. Mr. Carey said he was not saying that they are not equipped to handle this, but they can use some fine-tuning on this topic.

Ms. McClain said they talked about a strategic plan. Maybe the new construction aspect could be a part of their strategic plan for their next retreat. They could have someone come in and conduct this.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

49. [Adjourned.](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Howington adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen Harris
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem