



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
December 9, 2015 1:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

DECEMBER 9, 2015 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Ebony Simpson, Vice-Chair
Debra Caldwell
Justin Gunther
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Stephen Merriman, Jr.
Tess Scheer
Dr. Robin Williams

HDRB Members Not Present: Keith Howington, Chair
Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian
Andy McGarrity
Marjorie Weibe-Reed

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Call to Order and Welcome](#)

Ms. Simpson called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. She outlined the purpose and role of the Historic District Board of Review and explained the ground rules for the hearing of each petition. Staff will make its presentation, then the petitioner will have ten minutes to make their presentation, and the public will have ten minutes to comment.

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

2. [Petition of Dawson Architects | 15-006026-COA | 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue | New Construction Amendment](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for amendments to the New Construction, Aloft Hotel, project located at 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue as requested because the proposed changes are visually compatible and meet the design standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

3. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 15-006110-COA | 201 West Bay Street | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for signs at 201 West Bay Street, because they meet the standards and are visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

4. [Petition of Hansen Architects | 15-006115-COA | 25 East Broughton Street | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial - Facing North.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Historic Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Previously Approved Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photos and Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Samples and Specs.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve to amend the petition for a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations and rehabilitation of the building located at 25 East Broughton Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards: - PASS

1. Revise three of the four entrance doors to be centered within the recessed storefront.
2. Move the canvas awnings lower on the building facades.

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer
Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye

5. [Petition of Noble Investment Group | 15-006116-COA | 201 West Bay Street | Public Art, Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for sculptural panels on the Barnard Street façade of the building at 201 West Bay Street with the condition that attachment details are provided for staff approval, because it is visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Robin Williams

Robin Williams - Aye

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Abstain

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

6. [Approval for Adoption of the December 9, 2015 Agenda](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the adoption of the December 9, 2015 Agenda. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Tess Scheer

Justin Gunther - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Abstain

Robin Williams - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

7. [Approval of November 12, 2015 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [11-12-2015 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the November 12, 2015 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Abstain

Robin Williams - Aye

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

8. [Petition of Shauna Kucera | 15-004977-COA | 117 West Jones Street | Fence](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the removal of this petition from the final agenda. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Nicholas Henry

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Abstain

Robin Williams - Aye

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

9. [Petition of Kern & Co., LLC | 15-005547-COA | 31 East Jones Street | Demolition of Carriage House](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review

does hereby continue the petition until January 13, - PASS
2016 at the petitioner's request.

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Nicholas Henry

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Abstain

Robin Williams - Aye

10. [Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 15-005562-COA | 525 West Jones Street | New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review
does hereby continue the petition to January 13, - PASS
2016 at the petitioner's request.

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Nicholas Henry

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Abstain

Robin Williams - Aye

11. [Petition of Sawyer Design | 15-005563-COA | 23 West Gordon Street | New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass Carriage House](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review
does hereby continue to January 13, 2016 at the - PASS
petitioner's request.

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Nicholas Henry	
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

12. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 15-001384-COA | 600 East Bay Street | New Construction: Part 1, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass of a six to eight story hotel on the property located at 600 East Bay Street. The building will be located between Bay and River Streets with a rain garden area between this building and the adjacent new hotel building. The petitioner has expressed their intention is to receive LEED Platinum level certification.

The petitioner is also requesting a variance from the following window standard:

The distance between windows shall be not less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows. Paired or grouped windows are permitted, provided the individual sashes have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3.

In order to maintain the proposed areas of “white” space on the north, east, and west facades.

Ms. Michalak stated that on April 8, 2015, the HDBR denied the request for demolition of the Savannah Electric Power Company (SEPCO) building “because the building meets the criteria for historic status and the information provided regarding asbestos abatement did not justify the demolition.” After the denial of the demolition the petitioner requested a continuance for New Construction Part I: Height and Mass for the proposed new hotel. Staff recommended the following revisions to the Part I design as well. The applicant’s responses are italicized below each item:

1. Incorporate additional voids to the white spaces on the north, River Street façade, and the west, East Broad Street ramp façade, perhaps similar to the narrow, tall voids on the south and west facades.

**The petitioner has requested a variance to maintain the “white” spaces. However, additional voids have been incorporated within two of the architectural bays on the west façade and one of the bays on the north façade. A change in the fenestration along the south (Bay Street) façade will also necessitate a variance for this façade as well.*

2. Incorporate additional articulation to the east façade, in the form of windows, material change, green walls, or similar architectural device, particular towards the north and south of the façade where it will be more visible from River and Bay Streets respectively.

**The petitioner has requested a variance to maintain the “white” space on the east facade. However, additional articulation (not windows) has been incorporated within two of the five bays on this façade.*

3. Incorporate an additional walkway along the proposed building’s east façade, parallel with the previously approved stairway, and with the rain garden in the center.

**The additional walkway with the rain garden in the center has been added.*

4. Incorporate an additional entrance along both Bay and River Streets.

**An additional entrance has been incorporated along both streets.*

5. Ensure that the vertical dividers between the balconies are transparent above each balcony railing.

**The petitioner has requested to address this recommendation during Part II, Design Details; they have indicated that they intend to comply with the recommendation.*

6. Incorporate additional solids on the ground level between the two supporting columns to better form a wall of continuity at the valet parking area along River Street.

**The petitioner has requested to address this recommendation during Part II, Design Details; they have indicated that they intend to comply with the recommendation.*

7. Revise the seven foot tall solid wall along the rain garden area on the River Street façade to be more transparent so that the passage between the two buildings is further accentuated, particularly if a second, parallel stair is incorporated into the design.

**The height of the wall has been increased to 11 feet. *The petitioner has requested to address this recommendation during Part II, Design Details; they have indicated that they intend to comply with the recommendation.*

8. Add a transparent fence along the rain garden adjacent to East Bay Street to better form a wall of continuity.

**A wall/fence has been added between the two walkways along the rain garden. *The petitioner has requested to address the transparency of this wall/fence during Part II, Design Details; they have indicated that they intend to comply with the recommendation.*

9. Ensure that the parapet wall has a string course and coping.

**The petitioner has requested to address this recommendation during Part II, Design Details; they have indicated that they intend to comply with the recommendation.*

Ms. Michalak said that on May 28, 2015, the petitioner appealed the decision of the HDBR to the Zoning Board of Appeals [File No. 15-002278-COA]. The ZBA reversed the HDBR’s decision stating that the Board “abused its discretion in denying the demolition permit to the petitioners solely on the unrealized historic potential of the SEPCO building.”

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends:

1. Approval for New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass of a six to eight story hotel on the property located at 600 East Bay Street with the following conditions to be submitted for review by the Board with Part II: Design Details:
 - a. Additional articulation (not windows) has been incorporated within two of the five bays on this façade. However, staff recommends that, at a minimum, incorporate windows on the east façade, minimally within the architectural bays at the corners which will be highly visible from Bay and River Street.
 - b. Ensure that the vertical dividers between the balconies are transparent above each balcony railing.
 - c. Incorporate additional solids on the ground level between the two supporting columns to better form a wall of continuity at the valet parking area along River Street.
 - d. Revise the 11 foot tall solid wall along the urban garden area on the River Street façade to be more transparent so that the passage between the two buildings is further accentuated.
 - e. Revise the angled structural members at the second floor above the first floor valet area; staff recommends that they be a shape that is more compatible with other structural members on the building.
 - f. Ensure that the parapet wall has a string course and coping.
 - g. Reinstate the tree lawns along Bay Street.
 - h. Electrical vaults, meter boxes, and communications devices shall be located on secondary and rear facades and shall be minimally visible from view.
 - i. Provide mechanical screening details if any of the roof equipment will be visible from any public right-of-way.

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

2. Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the following standard:

The distance between windows shall be not less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows. Paired or grouped windows are permitted, provided the individual sashes have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3.

In order to maintain the proposed areas of “white” space on the north, east, and west facades, with the inclusion of “Condition 1.a.,” above because the variance criteria are met.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay acknowledged the staff members accompanying him at today's meeting. He stated that this is a unique site and the staff's report correctly identifies that it is outside the National Historic Landmark District. He wanted to remind the Board that the old retaining stone walls that are here will be completely preserved. They are replacing a non-traditional building on this site and although they have made no attempt to make this building look like a mid-century modern building, but have embraced the spirit of being deliberately non-traditional and have done so in a way that is 21st century. He said materiality will be covered in Part II - Design Details, but he wanted to remind the Board that this is not how they qualified for the height bonus.

Mr. Shay said they are interested in exploring in a unique way the idea of compatible contemporary architecture. They have taken inspiration from a number of hotels that are

from the same family of hotels. They are all over the world. He does not want the Board to think that this will be an attempt to bring them a "cookie cutter" contemporary compatible approach as this is a one-of-kind response to a very unique site.

Mr. Shay said they agree with the staff's recommendation for item 1.a. Their client has required that they not have windows that look directly across the 45 foot space into the windows of the Homewood Suites and for this reason, they do not have windows in the guest rooms. However, on the corners, they somewhat peek around. Their responses to the staff remaining recommendations are shown in italics as reported by Ms. Michalak. They agree with the wall of continuity and want to put in some plantings that would better make it solid and not read as a void. They agree with having the urban garden more transparent. They are looking at pulling the wall down from 11 feet to 8 and one-half feet. As a secondary entrance to the building, they are looking at the rooftop being an event space with a food and beverage outlet that will be open to the general public. They will bring the details of this in Part II. He said that by creating the balcony openings recessed into the main plain of the façade, creates a strong visible pilasters.

Mr. Shay said they will advocate for a tree lawn to be here, but it is in the city's right-of-way. However, since the City was receptive to the idea at another location, hopefully they will be receptive to a tree lawn here. They will do their best to have the electrical and communication boxes located on the secondary facades. He is hopeful that they will be able to find a way to put these devices in a vault.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that they agree with all of the staff's recommendations and she is aware that the petitioner has already addressed many of them. But, regarding the wall of continuity along the ground level of River Street, she is not sure that they are okay with the solution presented. The HSF would love to see what this looks like in a model or renderings. Their concern is that when looking at the model it appears that the building is on stilts as the first floor is primarily columns. They believe it works with the style of the building, but it is just not common for River Street. Therefore, this is why they felt the wall of continuity is important. Ms. Meunier said the HSF would like to see the vertical dividers minimized as much as possible.

Ms. Meunier said the HSF feels that a wall of continuity along the garden is not necessary here because it extends passed the building. The wall blocks the view of the passage of the stairs and rain garden. If it is a requirement by ordinance, then they understand it; but, they believe that it could be significantly reduced in height or possibly eliminated. They also agree with staff regarding making it more transparent in any way possible.

Ms. Meunier said with regards to the Bay Street elevation, it seems more like the back of the building. It does not have enough articulation. The HSF asks that if possible, add balconies or more recesses to better articulate this façade.

Mr. Shay, in response to the public comments, said as usual they listen to all the comments of HSF. They have not had a chance to study the comments they heard today. But he can say that there will be a lot more details pertaining to this in Part II; especially about the urban garden wall and the wall of continuity along River Street. They will model this carefully and ensure that they all are in some kind of agreement. He said there are historic

precedents for the vertical dividers. But, they want to study this is a contemporary way so that they will be unobtrusive in terms of casting shadows or making it be more than it has to be. This is a liability concern of the owner and the hotel. They want to make the balconies wide and deep enough so that they will be useful. Mr. Shay said they have studied the balconies for the south elevation and are not convinced that this is the right place to have them.

Mr. Shay said they will study ways to perhaps provide more depth to the articulation. In general, they agree; but they do not want to be held up with proceeding forward. They would appreciate going to the Zoning Board of Appeals with a favorable recommendation from the Review Board.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the elevations. A pier should never be placed above a door. There needs to be consistency in the centerline. The south elevation needs to be articulated better. The top story to the right is recessed and to the left it is projecting. It would be great if it is legible all the way up into one continuous piece. Dr. Williams asked the petitioner if he could restudy this. Mr. Shay answered that they will bring this back and show the Board exactly what it is. He explained that Ms. Ward reminded him that the reason this bay is a little wider is because they have a certain number of ADA rooms. They need to have a way to make the openings and spacing of the pilaster the same. They have done so with fenestration which is a part of Part II. But, when they come back with Part II they will be careful of how they fenestrate the openings on all three of the elevations.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

1. Approval for New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass of a six to eight story hotel on the property located at 600 East Bay Street with the following conditions to be submitted for review by the Board with Part II: Design Details:
 - a. Additional articulation (not windows) has been incorporated within two of the five bays on this façade. However, staff recommends that, at a minimum, incorporate windows on the east façade, minimally within the architectural bays at the corners which will be highly visible from Bay and River Street.
 - b. Ensure that the vertical dividers between the balconies are transparent above each balcony railing.
 - c. Incorporate additional solids on the ground level between the two supporting columns to better form a wall of continuity at the valet parking area along River Street.

- d. Revise the 11 foot tall solid wall along the urban garden area on the River Street façade to be more transparent so that the passage between the two buildings is further accentuated.
- e. Restudy the angled structural members at the second floor above the first floor valet area.
- f. Ensure that the parapet wall has a string course and coping.
- g. Reinstate the tree lawns along Bay Street.
- h. Electrical vaults, meter boxes, and communications devices shall be located on secondary and rear facades and shall be minimally visible from view. - PASS
- i. Provide mechanical screening details if any of the roof equipment will be visible from any public right-of-way.
- j. Revise the window rhythm on the north and south facades. The symmetrical pattern, with the largest window radiating from the center, is not compatible with the other contemporary elements proposed on the building.
- k. Restudy the Bay Street (south) façade to be more prominent as a “primary” façade.
- l. Restudy ground floor door locations throughout the building to ensure that piers do not terminate over doors on the floors above.

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

2. Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the following standard:

The distance between windows shall be not less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows. Paired or grouped windows are permitted, provided the individual sashes have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3.

In order to maintain the proposed areas of “white” space on the north, east, and west facades, with the inclusion of “Condition 1.a.,” above because the variance criteria are met.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Nicholas Henry

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Abstain

Robin Williams - Aye

13. [Petition of Hansen Architects | 15-002710-COA | 200 Block East McDonough Street | New Construction, Part II: Design Details \(North Building\)](#)

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

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

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

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Brown Ward.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 15-002710-COA.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of revisions to Part 1: Height and Mass and Part 2: Design Details of a new revised five story building between Drayton and Floyd Streets, and McDonough and Perry Streets. The building orients toward Perry Street although entrances are along all four facades. The building is part of a larger redevelopment project which also includes the parcel to the south. The two buildings will share one level of underground parking. The two buildings share similar detailing and design, but will be reviewed separately.

Ms. Harris explained that:

Part 1: Height and Mass was reviewed by the Historic District Board of Review on June 10, 2015 and was continued at the request of the petitioner.

Part 1: Height and Mass was reviewed again and approved by the HDBR on August 12, 2015 with the following conditions:

- Along Drayton Street, center the two double entrances beneath the space between the windows above;

The condition is met. The double entrances have been revised to be single entrances which are centered beneath the windows above.

- This building is part of a larger development with the parcel to the south, and both buildings contain very similar detailing and design. Incorporate additional

differentiation in detailing and design between the two buildings;

The condition is not met. The two buildings share very similar designs and near identical detailing.

- Restudy the one-story height piers on the ground level.

The condition is met. The pier structure has been revised somewhat though the one-story height piers on the ground level have been retained in a similar configuration.

Ms. Harris stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals granted a variance for the mechanical and access structures to be contained within the additional story on July 23, 2015 with the condition that the structures not be visible from the immediately adjacent streets, though not from the public right-of-way generally (15-003565-ZBA).

Ms. Harris stated that the height and mass of the project has been further revised as follows:

- The overall height of the building has increased from 72'10" to 77'6" (four feet, four inches total) on the rooftop structures;
- Two arched openings have been incorporated along the north and south facades;
- The number of entrances have been reduced on the north (McDonough Street) elevation from four to two;
- The two double entrances on the south (Perry Street) elevation have been reduced to a double entrance;
- The two double entrances on the west (Drayton Street) elevation have each been reduced to one double entrances;
- The two double entrances on the east (Floyd Street) elevation have been eliminated and the single entrance centered;
- The glass corners on each corner of the building have been eliminated;
- The canopies have been reduced in scale or eliminated;
- Hanging wooden planters and wooden swings are proposed to be attached to the building.

However, many of these revisions are not reflected on the mass model.

Ms. Harris stated that the City staff has some concerns regarding the safety to pedestrians on the adjacent sidewalks regarding the swings. Staff recommends that the swings be eliminated and benches be installed.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends a continuance of the revisions to Part I: Height and Mass and Part II: Design Details of the project at 200 East McDonough Street in order to address the following:

1. This building is part of a larger development with the parcel to the south, and both buildings contain very similar detailing and design. Incorporate additional differentiation in detailing and design between the two buildings, as per the condition of the Part I: Height and Mass approval on August 12, 2015.
2. Reduce the overall height of the building from 77'6" to 72'10" (four feet, four inches total) on the rooftop structures. The height of the tallest rooftop structure will

be 16'6" above the top of the parapet. Staff does not believe the height of the rooftop structure is visually compatible. Additionally, staff does not believe that the intent of the Zoning Board of Appeals condition has been met.

3. Increase the number of entrances on the north and east elevations to be both visually compatible and meet the standards which require one entrance per 60 linear feet of frontage and at intervals not to exceed 90 feet.
4. Change the two hanging swings along the south, Perry Street, façade, into benches.
5. Increase the height of the base on the rectangular storefronts to at least 18 inches to meet the standard.
6. Revise the arched storefronts to extend from a sill or base to meet the standard.
7. Revise both the ground floor plan uses and add additional exterior entrances to ensure that all street fronting elevations have active uses with individual primary exterior entrances to qualify for a bonus story.
8. Provide the following information:
 - a. A sample of the translucent acrylic panels and aluminum louvers;
 - b. A section through the arched storefronts;
 - c. The height of the proposed trellis.
9. Revise the model to reflect the revised design.

Dr. Henry said that there are many infractions with this project and the model was not revised. He asked staff why the Board is reviewing this petition today.

Ms. Harris said that the staff is recommending a continuance in order for the petitioner to address the concerns.

Ms. Simpson explained that the petitioner had a complete packet, but the staff had some concerns with the petitioner's packet.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Phelps said his first comment would be about staff's comment regarding the different detailing of the design. He said in going through this process, they have stated many times that they understand that this building and the south building will be reviewed separately. It is one hotel and will be operated by one manager and is connected by an underground garage. It is important that they be treated as new construction and will be built at the same time and that there is an identity between the two; and they are cognizant of this. They concur with staff that it is important about the streetscape level and some of the detailing that they create some differences in the street experience for the context of Savannah.

Mr. Phelps said they plan to provide an additional submittal to the Review Board including signage, exterior accessories, landscaping and all the street variances that need to be approved. Within Savannah, there is a history of duplicate buildings being built, but these buildings do evolve and create a different streetscape. They understand that they need to activate and they will return to the Board with the individual spaces.

Mr. Phelps said the height of the tallest rooftop structure is 16'-6". The staff does not believe that they have met the intent of the ZBA. However, they feel that they have met the intent of the ZBA. He explained that the reason this is raised up is because an elevator is here. There is a requirement for an elevator override in accordance with the equipment manufacturer. In their initial submittal, they had the elevator against the parapet which was a

6 foot setback from the parapet wall. In their second submittal, they pushed it back 14'-7" and in this submittal they are pushing it back even further so that it is not visible from the public right-of-way. The ZBA defines it as the sidewalk from the adjacent street, across the street from the building on McDonough Street, Perry Street, Floyd Street and Drayton Street. Therefore, standing on the sidewalk of McDonough Street, the extension is not visible because they have pushed it back. They have made the concession, Perry Street remains the same; Drayton Street is not visible and Floyd Street is not visible because it is pushed well within the footprint of the roof.

Mr. Phelps said regarding the staff's comment regarding increasing the number of entrances on the north and east elevations to be visually compatible and meet the standards, staff is applying standards when actually they comply with the qualifications for a south/west trust lot and not facing a square, it dictates that the entrances be located on the same street as historic buildings. Mr. Phelps explained that, therefore, they have provided the primary entrance so that the section that states you need to place entrances at 60 feet intervals and not less than 90 feet would not apply. If they were not south/west trust lot, then this would apply. But in addition to this, they have applied street access to McDonough Street and Floyd Street. In addition, they have removed the entrance from the kitchen area so that they could increase the outside dining on that street. They are willing to do the benches instead of the swings. The site slopes and if they are going to be at a one foot minimum, there is a potential for the base to get 2'-6" at the other end. He will update his email and deliver the archway to the staff. It is similar to the storefront and they had the same comment about the base; they are willing to comply, but they prefer to look at it as an average dimension and not fixed. With regards to the exterior entrances and added spaces, the ordinance states that the spaces including offices, retails, office lobbies and restaurants expand the length of the façade on the fronting elevation have to maintain an exterior entrance. The height of the trellis will be 9'-4.5" from the parapet.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Kirk Kubista of 233 Abercorn Street stated that he is immediately east of the proposals behind Floyd Street. He has been in support of the projects from the beginning and has appeared before the Review Board several times. He is still in support of the project. But, he would like to know where the power poles that reside on the back of Floyd Street that will service the buildings will be located. Mr. Kubista said he would rather see less doors on the back side of Floyd Street from the hotel. This would provide an opportunity for workers and others to slip outside and do what they want to do. It should only be one door for each building.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that they agree with staff on of their recommendations with the exception that they do not believe that the buildings should be differentiated. They understand that the buildings are to relate to each other and because of the branding ultimately anything that is done to differentiate them would make them look awkward. They will always look similar enough in being the same hotel.

Ms. Meunier said they agree with staff regarding reducing the overall height of the building and/or rooftop structures which appear to be the main concern. Although the issue appears to be the visibility of these and while they may not be immediately visible from each adjacent street, they feel that they will be visible from other areas. The HSF suggests that there be other ways of studying this such as color to make this disappear as much as possible. Ms. Meunier said she was not recommending this, but certainly a treatment for cell towers that do not want to be seen, in some cases they paint them a color that blends in

with the sky, etc.

Ms. Meunier said the HSF believes that there should be more active uses. They hear the concerns of the surrounding neighbors on Floyd Street not being a heavy traffic Street. Less traffic should be here. They agree with staff that on the McDonough elevation that the south and west elevations where the entrances are being identified that the uses are actually hallways and not meeting rooms. They do not feel that this meets the intent of active uses.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board's discussion focused primarily on the staff's recommendations and some additional items as follows:

1. This building is part of a larger development with the parcel to the south, and both buildings contain very similar detailing and design. Incorporate additional differentiation in detailing and design between the two buildings, as per the condition of the Part 1: Height and Mass approval on August 12, 2015. [The Board noted that varying the materials and other design elements may be sufficient to meet the condition.]
2. Reduce the overall height of the building from 77'6" to 72'10" (four feet, four inches total) on the rooftop structures. The height of the tallest rooftop structure will be 16'6" above the top of the parapet. Staff does not believe the height of the rooftop structure is visually compatible. Additionally, staff does not believe that the intent of the Zoning Board of Appeals condition has been met.
3. Increase the number of entrances on the north and east elevations to be both visually compatible and meet the standards which require one entrance per 60 linear feet of frontage and at intervals not to exceed 90 feet.
4. Change the two hanging swings along the south, Perry Street, façade, into benches.
5. Increase the height of the base on the rectangular storefronts to at least 18 inches to meet the standard. [This concern was resolved based on the petitioner's presentation that, due to the site's elevation change, the average height of the storefront will be 18 inches.]
6. Revise the arched storefronts to extend from a sill or base to meet the standard. [This concern was resolved based on the petitioner's presentation that, due to the site's elevation change, the average height of the storefront will be 18 inches.]
7. Revise both the ground floor plan uses and add additional exterior entrances to ensure that all street fronting elevations have active uses with individual primary exterior entrances to qualify for a bonus story.
8. Provide the following information:
 - a. A sample of the translucent acrylic panels and aluminum louvers;
 - b. A section through the arched storefronts;
 - c. The height of the proposed trellis.
9. Revise the model to reflect the revised design.
10. Reconsider the color and material change on floors 2-5 at the pilasters.
11. Consider revising the design of the window surrounds so as to not invoke shutters.

Ms. Simpson asked the petitioner if he wanted to ask for a continuance.

Mr. Paul Hansen came forward and said they need to know specific what the issues are. What he hears are false ideas; nothing that is a part of the ordinance; maybe some are guidelines. This is a 40 million dollar project and if they are to come back to this Board, what does the Board want them to bring back? He wanted to know what specifically is the Board unhappy with so they can address it. Mr. Hansen said he believes they have addressed all of Ms. Harris's comments, except number one which is a philosophical approach of these two buildings.

Ms. Simpson, in compliance with Mr. Hansen's request, along with the Board's input, restated the items that the Board feels the petitioner needs to comply with.

Mr. Phelps asked for the continuance.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the revisions to Part I: Height and Mass and Part II: Design Details of the project at 200 East McDonough Street at the request of the petitioner in order to address the board's comments as shown below:

1. This building is part of a larger development with the parcel to the south, and both buildings contain very similar detailing and design. Incorporate additional differentiation in detailing and design between the two buildings, as per the condition of the Part 1: Height and Mass approval on August 12, 2015. [The Board noted that varying the materials and other design elements may be sufficient to meet the condition.]
2. Reduce the overall height of the building from 77'6" to 72'10" (four feet, four inches total) on the rooftop structures. The height of the tallest rooftop structure will be 16'6" above the top of the parapet. Staff does not believe the height of the rooftop structure is visually compatible. Additionally, staff does not believe that the intent of the Zoning Board of Appeals condition has been met.
3. Increase the number of entrances on the north and east elevations to be both visually compatible and meet the standards which require one entrance per 60 linear feet of frontage and at intervals not to exceed 90 feet.
4. Change the two hanging swings along the

south, Perry Street, façade, into benches. - PASS

5. Increase the height of the base on the rectangular storefronts to at least 18 inches to meet the standard. [This concern was resolved based on the petitioner's presentation that, due to the site's elevation change, the average height of the storefront will be 18 inches.]
6. Revise the arched storefronts to extend from a sill or base to meet the standard. [This concern was resolved based on the petitioner's presentation that, due to the site's elevation change, the average height of the storefront will be 18 inches.]
7. Revise both the ground floor plan uses and add additional exterior entrances to ensure that all street fronting elevations have active uses with individual primary exterior entrances to qualify for a bonus story.
8. Provide the following information:
 - a. A sample of the translucent acrylic panels and aluminum louvers;
 - b. A section through the arched storefronts;
 - c. The height of the proposed trellis.
9. Revise the model to reflect the revised design.
10. Reconsider the color and material change on floors 2-5 at the pilasters.
11. Consider revising the design of the window surrounds so as to not invoke shutters.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

Part II: Design Details (South Building)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Checklist.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Specifications.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Brown Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [PART I- Submittal Packet- Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 15-002751-COA.pdf](#)

Mr. Patrick Phelps was present on behalf of petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of revisions to Part 1: Height and Mass and Part 2: Design Details of a new revised six story building between Drayton and Floyd Streets, and Perry Street and Perry Lane. The proposed building adjoins the one-story contributing building, formally the Smith's Texaco and more recently Motorini, which faces Drayton Street. The proposed building orients toward Perry Street. The building is part of a larger redevelopment project which also includes the parcel to the north. The two buildings will share one level of underground parking. The two buildings share similar detailing and design, but will be reviewed separately.

Ms. Harris stated that Part 1: Height and Mass was reviewed by the Historic District Board of Review on June 10, 2015 and was continued at the request of the petitioner.

Part 1: Height and Mass was reviewed again and approved by the HDBR on August 12, 2015 with the following conditions:

- Remove the parking access from Perry Street and orient it to Floyd Street or Perry Lane;

The condition is met. The parking access has been revised to Floyd Street and Perry Lane.

- Ensure that the standards for curb cut widths and sidewalks are met;

The condition is not met. The curb cut width dimensions were not provided and the standards regarding sidewalks are not met.

- This building is part of a larger development with the parcel to the north, and both buildings contain very similar detailing and design. Incorporate additional differentiation in detailing and design between the two buildings;

The condition is not met. The two buildings share very similar designs and near identical detailing.

- Restudy the one story height piers on the ground level;

The condition is met. The pier structure has been revised somewhat though the one-story height piers on the ground level have been retained in a similar configuration.

Ms. Harris said that the Zoning Board of Appeals granted a variance for one story above the Height Map on July 23, 2015 with the condition that the sixth floor not be visible from the immediately adjacent streets, though not from the public right-of-way generally (15-

003574-ZBA).

Ms. Harris stated that the height and mass of the project has been further revised as follows:

- The overall height of the building has increased from 76' to approximately 80' (the total height was not provided) on the rooftop structures. This is primarily due to the mechanical equipment being relocated to the roof of the sixth story (necessitating additional screening), whereas it was previously contained within the sixth story.
- One arched opening has been incorporated along the north facade;
- The two double entrances on the east (Floyd Street) elevation have been eliminated and the single entrance centered;
- The glass corners on each corner of the building have been eliminated;
- The canopies have been reduced in scale or eliminated;
- Hanging wooden planters and wooden swings are proposed to be attached to the building.

However, many of these revisions are not reflected on the mass model.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends a continuance of the revisions to Part I: Height and Mass and Part II: Design Details of the project at 200 East Perry Street in order to address the following:

1. This building is part of a larger development with the parcel to the north, and both buildings contain very similar detailing and design. Incorporate additional differentiation in detailing and design between the two buildings, as per the condition of the Part 1: Height and Mass approval on August 12, 2015.
2. Contain the mechanical equipment within the sixth story and eliminate the screening to reduce the structure to the previously approved height, to meet the intent of and be consistent with the Zoning Board of Appeals condition and the requirement that mechanical systems be contained within the bonus story.
3. Increase the number of entrances on the east elevation to be both visually compatible and meet the standards which require one entrance per 60 linear feet of frontage.
4. Change the two hanging swings along the south, Perry Street, façade, into benches.
5. Increase the height of the base on the rectangular storefronts to at least 18 inches to meet the standard.
6. Revise the arched storefront to extend from a sill or base to meet the standard.
7. Revise both the ground floor plan uses and add additional exterior entrances to ensure that all street fronting elevations have active uses with individual primary exterior entrances to qualify for a bonus story.
8. Provide the following information:
 - a. A sample of the translucent acrylic panels and aluminum louvers;
 - b. A section through the arched storefronts;
 - c. The total heights of all rooftop structures;
 - d. The width of the curb cut.
 - e. The driveway material.

9. Revise the site plan to ensure that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveways in materials, configuration and height.
10. Revise the model to reflect the revised design.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Phelps said regarding the staff's recommendations, they understand recommendation #1. He said regarding the height to the building; specifically the mechanical equipment, the Zoning Board of Appeals recommended approval. The number of spaces that align the streets have to be active in a primary entrance, multiple entrances to that space is not required. They will change the two hanging swings along the south, Perry Street, façade, to benches. They are okay with increasing the height of the base on the rectangular storefronts to at least 18 inches. Mr. Phelps said they will revise the arched storefront to extend from a sill or base to meet the standard. He wanted the Board to notice that regarding the multiple ground floor uses that retail office, lobby and restaurant span the façade and primary entrance for that space is maintained. He said on Perry Street they have the lobby to the south building and a bar meeting room. They are on the frontage of the street. He showed the Board where the primary entrances to the bar, meeting rooms, and lobby would be located. Mr. Phelps said the lobby is actually conceived as a retail space for the hotel. It is a secondary lobby space. The bar is a long narrow bar that stretches the entire façade. They are planning to have outdoor seating activated by two entrances into this space.

Mr. Phelps explained that the meeting room and flex space will be open. There will be a screening room that could be rented for game watching and movies. All of this will be open to the public. They will give accurate samples to the staff of what they are proposing for the panels and louvers. They sent the rooftop structures height to the staff this morning. Traffic Engineering will make a ruling on the curb cut. They have a concrete sidewalk and a concrete apron into the driveway. They are working with Streets Maintenance. The model will be revised to reflect the revised design.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Kirk Kubista of 233 Abercorn Street stated that he has heard a lot of testimony today and he appreciates a lot of what has been said. He wanted to speak to this building (the south building). Mr. Kubista said he wants the requirement regarding an additional door to be reconsidered. This is contiguous to the back of his home which they have a rooftop terrace and also a garden terrace coming from the area where they have their kitchen and dining area. They spend a great deal of time in these areas. He is fearful that if there are additional doors on the back of Floyd Street access, people will come here and smoke. Mr. Kubista said he does not want to see this everyday in the back of his home. A garage door is here that is accessed for the valet parking. He would like to see this be considered as the second door.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the 1Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that their comments are the same for this building as they made on the north building. However, based on the discussion for guiding the petitioner for a continuance is the materiality and possibly look at how the first level and higher levels are treated. The HSF would like to see that the cast stone or some differentiation in material be incorporated and simplify the pattern of the brick above it as opposed to making the entire building brick.

Mr. Phelps, in response to the public comments, concurred with the HSF comments. They would like to maintain differentiation between the materials at the base. This was informed by the Board as they went through the process of how they create a modern building, but not get handcuffed by creating a traditional base with the cornice line shaft at the top. They have simplified these elements and have changed the material.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board's discussion focused primarily on staff's recommendations and some additional items as follows:

1. This building is part of a larger development with the parcel to the north, and both buildings contain very similar detailing and design. Incorporate additional differentiation in detailing and design between the two buildings, as per the condition of the Part 1: Height and Mass approval on August 12, 2015. [The Board noted that varying the materials and other design elements may be sufficient to meet the condition.]
2. Contain the mechanical equipment within the sixth story and eliminate the screening to reduce the structure to the previously approved height, to meet the intent of and be consistent with the Zoning Board of Appeals condition and the requirement that mechanical systems be contained within the bonus story.
3. Increase the number of entrances on the east elevation to be both visually compatible and meet the standards which require one entrance per 60 linear feet of frontage.
4. Change the two hanging swings along the north, Perry Street, façade, into benches.
5. Increase the height of the base on the rectangular storefronts to at least 18 inches to meet the standard. [This concern was resolved based on the petitioner's presentation that, due to the site's elevation change, the average height of the storefront will be 18 inches.]
6. Revise the arched storefront to extend from a sill or base to meet the standard. [This concern was resolved based on the petitioner's presentation that, due to the site's elevation change, the average height of the storefront will be 18 inches.]
7. Revise both the ground floor plan uses and add additional exterior entrances to ensure that all street fronting elevations have active uses with individual primary exterior entrances to qualify for a bonus story.
8. Provide the following information:
 - a. A sample of the translucent acrylic panels and aluminum louvers;
 - b. A section through the arched storefronts;
 - c. The total heights of all rooftop structures;
 - d. The width of the curb cut;
 - e. The driveway material.
9. Revise the site plan to ensure that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveways in materials, configuration and height.
10. Revise the model to reflect the revised design.
11. Reconsider the color and material change on floors 2-5 at the pilasters.
12. Consider revising the design of the window surrounds so as to not invoke shutters.

Mr. Phelps said they would request a continuance, but wanted to get clarification from the staff regarding the entrances issue before they do so.

Ms. Harris explained that there are multiple standards that apply to entrances. She said that this particular standard applies to the criteria for a bonus story. She read that the standard says that "*multiple ground floor active uses permitted in a base zoning district (including but not limited to retail office, lobby, restaurant) span the length of the façade on all streets fronting elevations, (not including lanes) and maintain individual primary exterior entrances.*"

Ms. Harris said what staff is concerned about is they feel the bar certainly constitutes a public active base and has an entrance along McDonough Street, but the uses here do not have public access. The only public access point is into a hallway and staff does not feel the hallway constitutes the public use. If access could be provided into the meeting room and/or if the kitchen's use is reexamined to provide an active use, she believes would satisfy that particular standard.

Mr. Phelps requested the continuance.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the revisions to Part I: Height and Mass and Part II: Design Details of the project at 200 East Perry Street at the request of the petitioner in order to address the board's comments below:

1. This building is part of a larger development with the parcel to the north, and both buildings contain very similar detailing and design. Incorporate additional differentiation in detailing and design between the two buildings, as per the condition of the Part 1: Height and Mass approval on August 12, 2015. [The Board noted that varying the materials and other design elements may be sufficient to meet the condition.]
2. Contain the mechanical equipment within the sixth story and eliminate the screening to reduce the structure to the previously approved height, to meet the intent of and be consistent with the Zoning Board of Appeals condition and the requirement that mechanical systems be contained within the bonus story.
3. Increase the number of entrances on the east elevation to be both visually compatible and meet the standards which require one entrance per 60 linear feet of frontage.

4. Change the two hanging swings along the north, Perry Street, façade, into benches.
5. Increase the height of the base on the rectangular storefronts to at least 18 inches to meet the standard. [This concern was resolved based on the petitioner's presentation that, due to the site's elevation change, the average height of the storefront will be 18 inches.]
6. Revise the arched storefront to extend from a - PASS sill or base to meet the standard. [This concern was resolved based on the petitioner's presentation that, due to the site's elevation change, the average height of the storefront will be 18 inches.]
7. Revise both the ground floor plan uses and add additional exterior entrances to ensure that all street fronting elevations have active uses with individual primary exterior entrances to qualify for a bonus story.
8. Provide the following information:
 - a. A sample of the translucent acrylic panels and aluminum louvers;
 - b. A section through the arched storefronts;
 - c. The total heights of all rooftop structures;
 - d. The width of the curb cut;
 - e. The driveway material.
9. Revise the site plan to ensure that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveways in materials, configuration and height.
10. Revise the model to reflect the revised design.
11. Reconsider the color and material change on floors 2-5 at the pilasters.
12. Consider revising the design of the window surrounds so as to not invoke shutters.

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Abstain

Robin Williams - Aye

15. [Petition of Diversified Designs | 15-005575-COA | 302-306 West Gwinnett Street | New Construction: Parts I and II](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Context.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Gaston Ward.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Part I Drawings.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Foundation Height Diagram.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Materials Board and Specs.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Multi-Family Context Map and Photographs.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Similar access walkway and parking context photos.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Examples of Hipped Roof and Townhouse Streetscapes.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for revisions to New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass and Part II, Design Details of a row of three, attached, two-story townhouses along West Gwinnett Street known as 302-306 West Gwinnett Street. This is one part of a larger project consisting of multiple buildings on the site which is a full city block from West Hall Lane on the north, Jefferson Street on the east, West Gwinnett Street on the south, and Montgomery Street on the west. The parcels will be recombined and then subdivided into 15 individual lots with a shared parking lot in the center which will be accessed from the lane.

Ms. Michalak stated that at the November 12, 2015 HDBR Meeting, the Board approved Part I: Height and Mass for this project with the following conditions to be submitted for review with Part II, Design Details. The petitioner's responses are italicized below each item:

1. Increase the foundation height and the overall building height so that the building is more prominent as previously requested by the Board.

**The foundation height has been increased from 3 feet-2½ inches to 4 feet-4½; an increase of 14 inches. The overall building height has been increased from 35 feet-6 inches to 37 feet-10 inches; an increase of 2 feet-4 inches. The petitioner has also provided a "foundation height diagram" illustrating the foundation heights of buildings surrounding this site; particularly those facing Gwinnett Street. The foundation heights of contributing buildings which face Gwinnett Street range from 2 feet-10 inches to 6 feet-1 inch.*

2. Remove all faux windows from the side facades.

**The faux window was removed from the west façade. The petitioner clarified the "faux" window on the east façade; it is actually an opening into the rear porch.*

3. Add the gate and wall/fence along West Gwinnett Street to the site plan.

**They have both been added.*

4. Reduce the depth of the second floor balconies to a maximum of three (3) feet.

**They have been reduced to three (3) feet deep.*

5. Ensure that the baluster spacing does not exceed 4 inches.

**The baluster spacing is now noted as 4 inches on-center.*

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends:

1. Approve revisions to New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of a row of three, attached, two-story townhouses along West Gwinnett Street known as 302-306 West Gwinnett Street because the previous conditions are now met and because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.
2. Approve New Construction: Part II, Design Details of a row of three, attached, two-story townhouses along West Gwinnett Street known as 302-306 West Gwinnett Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards.
 - a. Ensure that the door frames are inset not less than three (3) inches.
 - b. Ensure that the small windows on the rear façade are an operable type permitted by the ordinance.
 - c. Provide additional information regarding the stoop foundation material.
 - d. Provide a color selection for the wood gates.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cramer thanked the Board and staff for the work they do for the City. They have addressed all of the Board's and staff's comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

None.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

1. Approve revisions to New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of a row of three, attached, two-story townhouses along West Gwinnett Street known as 302-306 West Gwinnett Street because the previous conditions are now met and because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.
2. Approve New Construction: Part II, Design Details of a row of three, attached, two-story townhouses along West Gwinnett Street known as 302-306 West Gwinnett Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS
 - a. Ensure that the door frames are inset not less than three (3) inches.
 - b. Ensure that the small windows on the rear façade are an operable type permitted by the ordinance.
 - c. Provide additional information regarding the stoop foundation material.
 - d. Provide a color selection for the wood gates.

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Nicholas Henry

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

16. [Petition of Diversified Designs | 15-005572-COA | 308-310 West Gwinnett Street | New Construction: Parts I and II](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Gaston Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Part I Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Context and Compatibility Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Foundation Height Diagram.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Mass Model.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Materials Board and Specs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Multi-Family Context Map and Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Rendering.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Similar access walkway and parking context photos.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Examples of Hipped Roof and Townhouse Streetscapes.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass and Part II, Design Details of a two-story duplex along West Gwinnett Street known as 308-310 West Gwinnett Street. This is one part of a larger project consisting of multiple buildings on the site which is a full city block from West Hall Lane on the north, Jefferson Street on the east, West Gwinnett Street on the south, and Montgomery Street on the west. The parcels will be recombined and then subdivided into 15 individual lots with a shared parking lot in the center which will be accessed from the lane.

Ms. Michalak said that at the November 12, 2015 HDBR Meeting, the Board continued Part I: Height and Mass for a similar project which consisted of a row of four, attached, two-story townhouses in order for the petitioner to consider the following items. The applicant's responses are italicized below each item:

1. Break up the building into two smaller buildings.

**The building has decreased from four units to a duplex. The applicant intends to apply for a second duplex to the west of this project site.*

2. Increase the distances between the buildings, possibly reducing the building widths.

**Six feet are proposed between this building and the building to the east. The western property line is three feet from the building; currently there are over 48 feet between this building and the building to the west.*

3. Restudy the lot coverage to be within the 75% maximum permitted.

**Both parcels are now within the maximum permitted lot coverage.*

4. Increase the foundation height and the overall building height so that the building is more prominent as previously requested by the Board.

**The foundation height has been increased from 3 feet-2½ inches to 4 feet-1/4 inch ; an increase of 9 ¾ inches. The overall building height has been increased from 35 feet-6 inches to 39 feet-3 inches; an increase of 2 feet-9 inches. The petitioner has also provided a "foundation height diagram" illustrating the foundation heights of*

buildings surrounding this site; particularly those facing Gwinnett Street. The foundation heights of contributing buildings which face Gwinnett Street range from 2 feet-10 inches to 6 feet-1 inch.

5. Staff recommends that more windows be added to the west façade and that the one faux window on the east façade be removed.

**Three more windows were added to the west façade for a total of five. The petitioner clarified the “faux” window on the east façade; it is actually an opening into the rear porch.*

6. Increase the pitch of main side-gable roof to at least to a minimum of a 4:12 pitch to meet the standard.

**The roof pitch has been increased to 5:12.*

7. Ensure that the baluster spacing does not exceed 4 inches.

**The baluster spacing is proposed to be 5.5 inches on-center.*

The Board also stated that the petitioner could return with both Parts I and II for review at the next HDBR meeting.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends:

1. Approve New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of a two-story duplex along West Gwinnett Street known as 308-310 West Gwinnett Street because the previous conditions are now met and because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.
2. Approve New Construction: Part II, Design Details of a two-story duplex along West Gwinnett Street known as 308-310 West Gwinnett Street with the following condition to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards.
 - a. Ensure that the door frames are inset not less than three (3) inches.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cramer came forward and entertained questions from the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Monica Letourneau said when she looked at the entire streetscape, it looks a lot like Jefferson Street now with the gaping holes as some of the buildings have been taken down during the years. However, she thinks back to the Sanborn map and the street shows five large buildings that have a grandness to it. She believes the petitioner has done a great job by adding some of that grandness back, increasing the height and adding the wrought iron work, but she is concerned that now they have the six foot wide gated corridor between two buildings. This may set a precedent for what a petitioner might want in the future. Ms. Letourneau said by approving what they see today would give the impression that six feet is an allowable width for future building space between future buildings and the ones that have already been approved. Her concern is that six feet is not enough space. Therefore,

she would love to see the space between the building to the west and the clapboard building be more generous and try to follow the guidelines in looking at the adjacent buildings for height and mass. Some width and space need to be maintained between these buildings.

Ms. Ginger Schroder stated that she and her husband own the property. This is her fourth time coming before the Board. Ms. Schroder said she appreciates what the Board said. She believes that they have tried to make this a "win, win situation." They believe that they are setting the tone for Gaston Ward.

Mr. Cramer, in response to the public comments, asked Ms. Michalak to show the Ward map. He wanted the Board to see the historic townhouses they have in this ward and how far they are away from each other. He believes that what the neighbor is looking at is the Victorian District that is across the street. However, they are in the Historic District and one row house is 3' - 4" between the building and the other is 5' - 4" between the buildings. He does not believe that the Board cannot comply everybody's opinion, but they have to comply with what is in the district.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Scheer asked staff if the ordinance states the distance requirement between buildings.

Ms. Michalak stated that the only thing the ordinance states specifically is the visual compatibility factor which is called the rhythm of structures on the streets. She read that the *"relationship of the structures to the open space between it and the adjacent structures shall be visually compatible with the open spaces between contributing buildings to which it is visually related."*

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

1. Approve New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of a two-story duplex along West Gwinnett Street known as 308-310 West Gwinnett Street because the previous conditions are now met and because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.
2. Approve New Construction: Part II, Design Details of a two-story duplex along West Gwinnett Street known as 308-310 West Gwinnett Street with the following condition to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards.
- PASS
- a. Ensure that the door frames are inset not less than three (3) inches.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Robin Williams
Debra Caldwell - Aye
Justin Gunther - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Tess Scheer - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Abstain
Robin Williams - Aye

17. [Petition of Diversified Designs | 15-005576-COA | 316-320 West Gwinnett Street | New Construction: Parts I and II](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Gaston Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Part I Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Context and Compatibility Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Foundation Height Diagram.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Mass Model.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Materials and Specs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Multi-Family Context Map and Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Similar access walkway and parking context photos.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Examples of Hipped Roof and Townhouse Streetscapes.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for revisions to New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass and Part II, Design Details of a row of three, attached, two-story townhouses along West Gwinnett Street known as 316-320 West Gwinnett Street. This is one part of a larger project consisting of multiple buildings on the site which is a full city block from West Hall Lane on the north, Jefferson Street on the east, West Gwinnett Street on the south, and Montgomery Street on the west. The parcels will be recombined and then subdivided into 15 individual lots with a shared parking lot in the center which will be accessed from the lane.

Ms. Michalak said that at the November 12, 2015 HDBR Meeting, the Board approved Part I: Height and Mass for this project with the following conditions to be submitted for review with Part II, Design Details. The applicant's responses are italicized below each item:

1. Increase the foundation height and the overall building height so that the building is

more prominent as previously requested by the Board. (The Board recommended that this be the tallest of the proposed buildings along Gwinnett Street.)

**The foundation height has been increased from 3 feet-2½ inches to 4 feet-6½; an increase of 16 inches. The perceived overall building height (to the eaves) has been increased from approximately 27 feet-6 inches to 20 feet-10 inches (to the eaves). The petitioner has also provided a “foundation height diagram” illustrating the foundation heights of buildings surrounding this site; particularly those facing Gwinnett Street. The foundation heights of contributing buildings which face Gwinnett Street range from 2 feet-10 inches to 6 feet-1 inch.*

2. Remove all faux windows from the side facades.

**Four (4) more windows have been added to the east façade. The petitioner clarified the “faux” window on the west façade; it is actually an opening into the rear porch.*

3. Add the gate and wall/fence along West Gwinnett Street to the site plan.

**They have both been added.*

4. Ensure that the balustrades do not exceed 36 inches high and that the baluster spacing does not exceed 4 inches.

**The balustrades are 36 inches high and baluster spacing is now noted as 2 inches on-center.*

The Board also recommended approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for two (2), 7 percent variances and one (1), 6 percent variance to the maximum lot coverage of 75 percent permitted in the RIP-A zoning district.

Furthermore, the petitioner has changed the roof shape from a hipped roof to a parapeted roof in order to address the Board’s comments that this be the tallest building along Gwinnett. This is now the building that will be perceived as the tallest due to the revised roof design.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends:

1. Approve revisions to New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of a row of three, attached, two-story townhouses along West Gwinnett Street known as 316-320 West Gwinnett Street because the previous conditions are now met and because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.
2. Approve New Construction: Part II, Design Details of a row of three, attached, two-story townhouses along West Gwinnett Street known as 302-306 West Gwinnett Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards.
 - a. Continue the bracketed eaves along the east façade.
 - b. Incorporate a coping at the top of the parapet walls.
 - c. Ensure that the door frames are inset not less than three (3) inches.
 - d. Ensure that the small windows on the rear façade are an operable type permitted by the ordinance.
 - e. Provide a color selection for the wood gates.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cramer said that he agrees with all of the staff's recommendations with the exception of turning the brackets. He said historically, if a building is next to it, the brackets are not turned around. He said there are three examples within a block. Therefore, this is the reason he did not turn the brackets. He showed the Board a building on Barnard Street where one end has the brackets, but the other end does not. Mr. Cramer informed the Board that he has two other examples. The other three row houses that are on Hall Street that collates to this corner does the same thing. Another historic row house on Bolton Street is in this same block and has six units, but the brackets stop at the edge of the building. He asked the Board to please consider this.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Monica Letourneau said it seems to her that if it is a stucco building, it is being implied that behind it is a masonry building and that the lintel would be broader than what is shown to go above the window. She said may be the lintels should be 4" beyond the windows rather than what is shown, which appears to be an inch wider than the window on each side. They appear not to do what they would have traditionally done. Ms. Letourneau said she knows this is new construction and may be it should not have the historic honesty to it; but she believes it would look better.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) agreed with Ms. Letourneau. Even though it is new construction, it is being built to look like older traditional. Ms. Meunier said they agree that the lintels should come out more. Their main concern is that the eave that is applied to the parapet is fine and certainly is in the style of the building. However, where it turns the corner is awkward. They agree with staff, but obviously the petitioner has shown examples where it does not turn around. Otherwise, they have no issues except for the color of the roof which they believe is proposed to be white. This is an odd color for standing seam. The HSF suggested using a darker color. Ms. Meunier said the white color is a little stark particularly in contrast to the black.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the brackets. Ms. Scheer said she is okay without the eaves on the east. They see a lot of examples downtown of buildings that were attached are no longer attached. This somewhat evokes this especially with having open lots. Once a building is built there, having the brackets here would make them look awkward. Personally, this makes it look like something was there initially. Dr. Williams said the cornice needs to come to the end of the building. The porch cornice projects beyond the wall plain below; and therefore, should project above the wall plain above. Thicken the cap of the knee wall caps on the front stoops. They discussed the lintels.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review
does hereby:

1. Approve revisions to New Construction: Part I,

Height and Mass of a row of three, attached, two-story townhouses along West Gwinnett Street known as 316-320 West Gwinnett Street because the previous conditions are now met and because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

2. Approve New Construction: Part II, Design Details of a row of three, attached, two-story townhouses along West Gwinnett Street known as 302-306 West Gwinnett Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards.
 - a. Continue the bracketed eaves to the corner of the front façade and turn the corner; the eave does not have to extend the full width of the east façade.
 - b. Incorporate a coping at the top of the parapet walls.
 - c. Ensure that the door frames are inset not less than three (3) inches.
 - d. Ensure that the small windows on the rear façade are an operable type permitted by the ordinance.
 - e. Provide a color selection for the wood gates.
 - f. Extend all "non-arched" window lintels a minimum of 4 inches beyond both sides of each window.
 - g. Thicken the knee wall caps on the front stoops to be compatible with the main building's belt course.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

18. [Petition of Sottile and Sottile | 15-006050-COA | 346 MLK Jr. Blvd. | Rehabilitation](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 15-006050-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Currie Town Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial east.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial north.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial west.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial south.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Application.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- drawings.pdf](#)

NOTE: Dr. Williams and Mr. Gunther are employees of SCAD as is Mr. Sottile. Mr. Sottile is not representing SCAD, but a private firm. Therefore, there is no need for Dr. Williams and Mr. Gunther to abstain. This has been discussed by the Board numerous times and the City Attorney has made a ruling on this issue.

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The proposed project consists of the rehabilitation of approximately nine buildings located within the block bounded by West Charlton Street on the north, MLK Jr. Blvd. on the west, West Jones Street on the south, and West Jones Street on the east. The general scope of work includes rehabilitating the buildings by repairing cornices, repairing and painting siding in kind, restoring existing windows and replacing non-conforming windows with new wood single pane windows to match existing, replace downspouts, etc. Many of the original storefronts, door and window openings have been infilled over the years. The project proposes uncovering infilled openings and adding new storefronts, windows and doors as appropriate.

The specific scope of work, beyond the general rehabilitation scope, includes:

- 340-342 MLK: Add new signage band above storefront; remove existing infill and restore storefront to original configuration- add granite base; add awnings windows, and doors in existing infilled openings on north façade.
- 344 MLK: Remove existing infill and restore storefront to original configuration- retain existing brick base; replace existing side entrance door with new wood and glass door;
- 346 MLK: Add new aluminum storefront in existing opening, retain existing stucco base;
- 350 MLK: Add new aluminum storefront in existing opening, retain existing stucco base;
- 352 MLK: Add new aluminum storefront in existing opening; add new wood base; add awning; replace door on second floor, south façade with window; replace existing door on Jones Street with new wood door;
- 414 West Jones Street: Retain existing sliding doors in open position; install aluminum storefront in existing opening;
- 412 West Jones Street: Infill oversized window opening with copper cladding; add balcony; replace door;
- 411 West Charlton Street: Add metal canopy; add steel cable guard rail above parapet.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval for the rehabilitation of the 300 block of Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. with the following conditions:

1. The repointing is consistent with Preservation Brief 2: Repointing Mortar Joints in

Historic Masonry Building, the mortar composition is provided, and that a four by four foot test patch is installed for staff review and approval;

2. Attach the canopies, awnings and balcony through the mortar rather than the masonry to ensure minimal damage;
3. Provide a sample of the copper cladding to staff for review and approval;
4. Ensure that the door frames are inset at least three inches from the façade;
5. Increase the height of the storefront base on 340-342 MLK to 18 inches to meet the standard;
6. Ensure that the storefronts are inset at least four inches from the façade;
7. Ensure that the awnings and canopies have a minimum vertical clearance of eight feet above the sidewalk;
8. Ensure the balusters do not exceed four inches;
9. Provide the location of the electrical meters, HVAC units, refuse storage areas, etc. to staff for review and approval;

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

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Sottile said he is honored to have the opportunity to address the Board today on behalf of the ongoing efforts that are being planned to revitalize MLK Jr. Boulevard and Montgomery Street corridor. This property is a key part of that effort. They have looked at this site for many years along with the SDRA and now with the I-16 Flyover Removal Initiative.

Mr. Sottile thanked the staff for their review of the project and they acknowledge the recommendations. Mr. Clements of his office met with staff earlier this week and discussed the comments. They will relocate all the electric meters to a discreet location.

Dr. Henry thanked Mr. Sottile for the work they are planning to do in this area.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that they agree with the staff's recommendations. The HSF is pleased to see the rehabilitation efforts of an entire block. Ms. Meunier asked if any documentation is being used to recreate the storefronts. She believes staff said that there is a photo.

Mr. Sottile, in response to public comments, stated that they are using all available photos to try to recreate the storefronts. They are working closely with the staff and the State Preservation Office.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams, for clarification, asked staff that with recommendation #8 if they were saying that the width of the balusters not be more than 4 inches. Staff answered yes, that the width between the balusters not be more than 4 inches.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the rehabilitation of the 300 block of Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. with the following conditions:

1. The repointing is consistent with Preservation Brief 2: Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Building, the mortar composition is provided, and that a four by four foot test patch is installed for staff review and approval;
2. Attach the canopies, awnings and balcony through the mortar rather than the masonry to ensure minimal damage;
3. Provide a sample of the copper cladding to staff for review and approval;
4. Ensure that the door frames are inset at least three inches from the façade unless it is determined that a different historic inset exists;
5. Increase the height of the storefront base on 340-342 MLK to 18 inches to meet the - PASS standard;
6. Ensure that the storefronts are inset at least four inches from the façade unless it is determined that a different historic inset exists;
7. Ensure that the awnings and canopies have a minimum vertical clearance of eight feet above the sidewalk;
8. Ensure the width between the balusters do not exceed four inches;
9. Provide the location of the electrical meters, HVAC units, refuse storage areas, etc. to staff for review and approval;

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

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

19. [Petition of Felder & Associates | 15-006051-COA | 641 Indian Street | Rehabilitation and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photos and Specs.pdf](#)

Ms. Gretchen Callejas was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations to the building located at 641 Indian Street. The building is proposed to become “Ghost Coast Distillery” as follows:

- All man doors, overhead doors, front and rear decks, and stairs will be removed from the exterior of the building. All existing openings will receive new doors and/or storefront. The northeast corner of the building will receive two new large storefront openings.
- New horizontal clerestory accent windows are proposed on the front and east facades.
- New concrete steps with railings will be added to the existing loading ramp at the front of the building. They will be located in front of the main entrance door into the retail space.
- New pre-fabricated metal awnings will be added over the existing loading dock entrance doors on the east and west façades.
- The building will receive a new TPO roof with tapered insulation that will not be visible from any public right-of-way.
- Several new pieces of equipment are proposed on the roof. Five foot high canvas mechanical screening is proposed on the roof along the front edge of the building. It is supported by metal framing and extends out from the face of the building over the main entrance door to create an awning in this location. A canvas samples was not provided with the submittal packet. The petitioner stated that it will be provided to staff for review at a later date.
- The entire building will be painted; colors were not provided in the submittal packet. The petitioner stated that they will be provided to staff for review at a later date.
- A 200 square foot fascia sign is proposed on the front façade to the east of the main entrance door; no other information about the sign was provided.
- A 30 square foot projecting sign is proposed on the front façade near the east corner of the building; no other information about the sign was provided.
- A dumpster enclosure is indicated on the site plan at the northwest corner of the property; however, no other information was provided with the submittal packet.

- A new sidewalk, parallel parking on the property, and two curb cuts are proposed along Indian Street in front of the building. The widths of the curb cuts were not provided and the sidewalk does not continue over the driveways.
- The building footprint and lot coverage are proposed to remain unchanged.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval of the alterations to the building located at 641 Indian Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Provide physical color and material samples for all proposed new products.
2. Provide the material for the flush doors proposed on each façade.
3. Revise the flush doors on the front façade to less of an industrial type door to be compatible with the other storefront type doors on the front façade.
4. Ensure that the clerestory accent windows are not inset less than 3 inches from the face of the building.
5. Revise all storefront to extend from a sill or a base to meet the design standard.
6. Ensure that the two new curb cuts do not exceed 20 feet in width.
7. Revise the new sidewalks, where intersected by new driveways, to serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveways in materials, configuration, and height.
8. Screen the equipment shown to the east of the building within the utility easement. Submit the design to staff for review and approval.
9. Certify the proposed refuse storage area on the site plan. It shall be located within the building or shall be screened from the public right-of-way.
10. Revise all proposed signage to meet the standards are described within the report, provide additional information as required for signs, and remove one principal use sign from the front façade.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Callejas thanked the Board for reviewing their petition. They agree with most of the staff's recommendations. They will provide a concrete sill if this is acceptable and will bring the color samples back at a later time. The easement for the utility equipment is on the adjacent property which is not their property. They are hopeful that the new owners will screen the equipment. The flush doors are hollow metal and will be inset three inches. They want to keep the horizontal feel of the building, but just wanted to add the awning to the front of the building to pinpoint the entrance and tie it all together. They will submit for their signage later also.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion centered around the fabric screening on the roof, the colors, and the doors. The petitioner informed the Board that the doors will be hollow metal.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations to the building located at 641 Indian Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Provide physical color and material samples for all proposed new products.
2. Ensure that the clerestory accent windows are not inset less than 3 inches from the face of the building.
3. Revise all storefront to extend from a sill or a base to meet the design standard.
4. Ensure that the two new curb cuts do not exceed 20 feet in width. - PASS
5. Revise the new sidewalks, where intersected by new driveways, to serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveways in materials, configuration, and height.
6. Provide screening details for the dumpster that is indicated on the site plan.
7. Revise all proposed signage to meet the standards are described within the report, provide additional information as required for signs, and remove one principal use sign from the front façade.
8. Remove all fabric mechanical screening, the awning, and the pole support.

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

[20. Petition of Dawson Architects | 15-006113-COA | 321 Montgomery Street | New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 15-006113-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Currie Town Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- narrative.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Model Photos.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Revised Drawings.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass of a new six story building at West Harris and Montgomery Streets. The building is oriented to face West Harris Street and features a symmetrical façade with flanking bays and recessed center bays. The petitioner is also requesting a variance from the standard which requires a bay width of “not less than 15 nor more than 20 feet in width.”

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

1. Reduce the floor to floor heights and roof screening in order to reduce the overall height of the building to be more visually compatible;
2. Increase the setback along the west property line so that voids can be incorporated as this elevation will be very visible from MLK Jr. Blvd;
3. Add additional solids between the columns of the drop off area to provide a more consistent wall of continuity;
4. Provide the height of the storefront base;
5. Ensure the wall heights do not exceed 11 feet;
6. Ensure that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway. The sidewalk should be maintained on the public right-of-way;
7. Relocate the electric meter to Montgomery Street, a secondary street.
8. Provide additional direct access to the coffee shop from Montgomery Street, such as removing the gate and providing an additional break in the wall;
9. Redesign the bay spacing to meet the standard requiring 15-20 widths;

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

Ms. Harris additionally reported that staff recommends denial of the variance to allow bays less than 15 feet because the variance criteria have not been met.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Deacon thanked the staff for their comments and thanked the Board for reviewing their petition. She said that regarding reducing the floor heights and the overall building height, they want to keep the height as designed, but if the Board strongly agrees with staff, they will try to reduce the height and bring this back with their Part II review. She said regarding staff's comment pertaining to the west elevation setbacks, initially they did not have windows along this recessed area, but they are allowed to have 15% openings if they are three feet off of the property line. This is what the window spacing shows. They feel this is

a great addition to this elevation and if the Board and staff agree, they would like to add this to their design. She said that the staff has said that they would like for them to provide additional solids at the entry drop area. However, they feel that the entry piece is important to the overall design of the building and gives a sense of entry of the building. Therefore, they prefer to keep it as designed and develop it further. However, if this is something that the Board and staff feel strongly about, they can add additional screening either through a screening element that is incorporated into that entry piece or through some other landscaping that would provide some continuity along that elevation.

Ms. Deacon said the height of the storefront base is 24 inches and the fence will not exceed 11 feet. They intend to include an uninterrupted sidewalk at a point along Harris Street. They attended their site plan review (SPR) and have already reviewed the comments with everyone involved. They were told to maintain their utilities along Harris Street because this is basically the end of the I-16 off-ramp and they do not want utility vehicles parked here that would impede the traffic. She said regarding providing additional direct access to the coffee shop from Montgomery Street such as removing the gate and providing addition break in the wall, they have removed the fence, but they feel this would need to be defined this in Part II. They were told that the Alcohol Ordinance says that if they are going to serve alcohol, they will need to be gated. However, they will look at other means.

Ms. Deacon said they feel they are justified regarding their variance request based on the building type and their specified site. There are no large buildings in this ward that would meet this standard.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they have a general concern about the development of taller buildings being developed in this area. Therefore, they agree with staff about possibly reducing as much height as possible on this building. However, they feel that the configuration of solids to voids are successful on this building. They like having more windows on the west façade and agree with the inclusion of pilasters or other articulations as shown on some of the other facades.

Ms. Deacon, in response to public comments, said they were happy to meet with the HSF regarding their design. They have coordinated some of their comments to further meet their design.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion centered around the drop off area; access to the coffee shop; and the electric meter location. They discussed the height of the building. This building is six stories and the Liberty Street garage is approximately the next tallest building. They agreed with leaving the height as proposed.

The Board discussed the variance request and agreed to recommend approval of the variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals to allow bays of less than 15 feet because the variance criteria have been met.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for Part 1: Height and Mass with the following conditions to be submitted with Part 2: Design Details:

1. Incorporate additional voids in the west elevation which will be very visible from MLK Jr. Blvd;
2. Restudy the drop off area to provide a more consistent wall of continuity;
3. Provide the height of the storefront base;
4. Ensure the wall heights do not exceed 11 feet;
5. Ensure that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway. The sidewalk should be maintained on the public right-of-way;
6. Restudy the electric meter location; - PASS
7. Provide additional direct access to the coffee shop from Montgomery Street, such as removing the gate and providing an additional break in the wall;

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

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals of the variance to allow bays of less than 15 feet wide because the variance criteria have been met.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Nicholas Henry

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Abstain

Robin Williams - Aye

21. [Petition of Hansen Architects | 15-006114-COA | 113 West Broughton Street | Color Change, Alterations, Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Picture 1.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Picture 2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [historic resources cards.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Revised Design.pdf](#)

Ms. Alexis AuBuchon was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sara Farr gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for color changes, alterations, and signs at 113 West Broughton Street. The alterations will be limited to a new storefront. The area above the storefront will not be impacted with exception of color changes. The storefront is proposed to be covered in break metal cladding powder coated black. The existing metal glazing mullions will remain and be painted matte black. The existing glazing assembly will also remain. New storefront doors will also be installed with custom door pulls. New black stucco cladding will be installed over the existing storefront base. Two new signs are also proposed. She said that the petitioner submitted a revised design of the storefront.

Ms. Farr reported that staff recommends approval of the petition for storefront alterations and signage at 113 West Broughton Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Paint chips of the proposed colors are provided;
2. The storefront is redesigned to incorporate more articulation;
3. The stucco cladding material is clarified;

because otherwise the work meets the standards and is visually compatible.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. AuBuchon explained that the existing stucco will be painted. The storefront will match the height of the pilaster. The existing metal glazing mullions will remain and be painted matte black. She said the revised design to staff only concerned the top banding.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that she had not seen the revised design. Ms. Meunier stated that she agreed with the staff's recommendations.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the color; the materials; and the design.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations and signage at 113 West Broughton street, because the work meets the standards and is visually - PASS compatible.

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther
Second: Nicholas Henry
Debra Caldwell - Aye
Justin Gunther - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Tess Scheer - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Abstain
Robin Williams - Aye

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

22. [Petition of Debra Caldwell | 15-005955-COA | 223 East Jones Street | Staff Approved- Garage Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 223 East Jones Street 15-005955-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 223 East Jones Street 15-005955-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Danielle Jarvis | 15-006034-COA | 507 East McDonough Street | Staff Approved - Demolish Deck](#)

Attachment: [COA - 507 East McDonough Street 15-006034-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Jarvis 507 E McDonough-PLANS 08-26-15.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Catherine Browne | 15-006120-COA | 431 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 431 Habersham Street 15-006120-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of Kris Knowles | 15-006141-COA | 535 - 549 East Macon Street | Staff Approved - Security Cameras](#)

Attachment: [COA - 535-549 East Macon Street 15-006141-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of William H. Greenwood | 15-006143-COA | 306 East Huntingdon Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair and Replacement](#)

Attachment: [COA - 306 East Huntingdon Street 15-006143-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Rick Wissmach | 15-006256-COA | 114 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Roof and Stoop Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 114 East Oglethorpe Avenue 15-006256-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 114 East Oglethorpe Avenue 15-006256-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Joshua Beckler for Coastal Canvas Products | 15-006152-COA | 300 Drayton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 300 Drayton Street 15-006152-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 300 Drayton Street 15-006152-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Joshua Beckler for Coastal Canvas Products | 15-006272-COA | 322 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 322 West Broughton Street 15-006272-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 322 West Broughton Street 15-006272-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Martin Smith for SCAD | 15-006260-COA | 32 Abercorn Street | Staff Approved - Replace Cornice](#)

Attachment: [COA - 32 Abercorn Street 15-006260-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [2015_Lucas_CorniceRepair.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of John Post for Commonwealth Construction | 15-006296-COA | 403 East Hall Street | Staff Approved - Color Change, Stucco Repair and Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 403 East Hall Street 15-006296-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 403 East Hall Street 15-006299-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Luis Burgos for Hansen Architects, PC | 15-006302-COA](#)

Attachment: [COA - 118 East Broughton Street 15-006302-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 118 East Broughton Street 15-006302-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Ernie Davis for Davis Enterprises | 15-006326-COA | 525 - 527 East Broad Street | Staff](#)

Approved - Roof Repair

Attachment: [COA - 525 - 527 East Broad Street 15-006326-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 12-9-15.pdf](#)

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

35. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, December 17, 2015 at 3:30 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

36. [Next Regular Meeting - Wednesday, January 13, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

37. [2016 HDBR Schedule of Meetings Calendar](#)

Attachment: [HDBR 2016 SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS.pdf](#)

38. [Presentation of 2016 Savannah's Historic Districts Calendar](#)

Ms. Michalak gave the report on the Presentation of the 2016 Savannah's Historic Districts Calendar. In honor of the 50th Anniversary of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the staff compiled the 2016 calendar. The Savannah Historic Districts calendar was initiated to promote awareness of our numerous historic and cultural resources. The calendar highlights 12 historic districts on the National Register of Historic Places.

Ms. Simpson thanked the staff for the calendar. They are beautiful and informative.

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

39. [Nominating Committee Report](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve Stephen Merriman, Jr., Chair and Margaret Weibe-Reed, Vice Chair as officers for 2016. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Abstain

Robin Williams - Aye

40. [HBDR Retreat- Summary](#)

Attachment: [Malik Watkins Presentation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Roberts Rules of Order- Overview.pdf](#)

Attachment: [2015 - Board Retreat Summary.pdf](#)

Ms. Harris reported that Dr. Malik Watkins's presentation that was given at the Board's Retreat was attached to the Board's packet.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

41. [Adjournment](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, Vice-Chair Simpson adjourned the meeting at 7:19 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen I. Harris
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem