



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
June 8, 2016 1:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

JUNE 8, 2016 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Stephen Merriman, Jr., Chair
Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian
Debra Caldwell
Jennifer Deacon
Dr. Betsy Dominguez
Kellie Fletcher
Keith Howington
Becky Lynch
Andy McGarrity

HDRB Member Not Present: Justin Gunther
Tess Scheer

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

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

1. [Approval of Consent Agenda June 8, 2016](#)
2. [Petition of Savannah Taphouse | 16-002301-COA | 125 East Broughton Street | Sign](#)

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

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for an after-the-fact under-awning sign at 125 East Broughton Street with the condition that the entrance is recessed 12 inches and the base constructed of a contrasting material, because otherwise the work meets the standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

3. [Petition of Chris Gimenez | 16-002686-COA | 107B Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for after-the-fact installation of a principal use projecting sign for the new basement business located at 107B Whitaker Street as requested because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

4. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 16-002715-COA | 214 Drayton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [16-002715-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the proposed signs at 214 Drayton Street with the condition that the under canopy signs have a ten-foot clearance above the sidewalk, because the proposed signs are visually compatible and meet the sign ordinance. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

5. [Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects | 16-002749-COA | 2 West Bay Street | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for renovations at 2 West Bay Street with the following conditions:

1. The awning material is revised and submitted for staff approval;
2. The foldaway door is inset a minimum of four inches; - PASS
3. The new railing balusters are not more than four inches apart;

because otherwise the work meets the standards and

is visually compatible.

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

6. [Petition of The Hitch | 16-002784-COA | 300 Drayton 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 the fascia principal use sign and projecting principal use sign at 300 Drayton Street with the condition that the signs are mounted only into the mortar, because otherwise the work meets the standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

7. [Adoption of Agenda for June 8, 2016 Meeting](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby adopt the June 8, 2016 Meeting Agenda. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Debra Caldwell
Second: Andy McGarrity
Debra Caldwell - Aye
Jennifer Deacon - Aye
Becky Lynch - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Andy McGarrity - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain
Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye
Kellie Fletcher - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

8. [Approval of May 11, 2016 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [05-11-2016 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic Board of Review does hereby approve May 11, 2016 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Debra Caldwell
Second: Kellie Fletcher
Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye
Becky Lynch - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Andy McGarrity - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain
Debra Caldwell - Aye
Jennifer Deacon - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Kellie Fletcher - Aye

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

9. [Continue All Items to Next Regular Meeting](#)

10. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 15-001384-COA | 600 East Bay Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

11. [Petition of Ryan Benjamin Kelly | 16-001156-COA | 111 East President Street | Signs](#)

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

12. [Petition of Ken Brown | 16-001649-COA | 615 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Alterations and](#)

Additions

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

13. [Petition of Paul Cobet | 16-002724-COA | 24 East Liberty Street, Unit 83/73 | After-the-fact Door Replacement](#)

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

14. [Petition of Barnard Architects | 16-002725-COA | 202 East Gaston Street | Alterations and Addition](#)

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

15. [Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 16-002753-COA | 606 Abercorn Street | Addition](#)

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

16. [Petition of SignArt | 16-002781-COA | 10 Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

17. [Petition of Hansen Architects | 16-001665-COA | 457-459 Tattnall Street | New Construction: Part I and Part II](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

Attachment: [Tattnall St Existing Conditions Photos.pdf](#)

Erik Puljung 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 for a 3-story duplex with a 2-story duplex carriage house for the vacant properties located at 457 and 459 Tattnall Street. The proposed buildings are located on the newly subdivided parcels on the southern portion of the block between Tattnall and Jefferson (east and west) and Alice and West Gaston Street (north and south).

Ms. Michalak explained that at the April 12, 2016 HDBR Meeting, the Board approved Part I, Height and Mass for the main house this project with the following conditions (petitioner comments are in italics following the condition):

- a. Ensure that the door frames are inset not less than three (3) inches from the exterior surface of the façade of the building.
(The frames of the doors are inset greater than 3" from the exterior surface.)
- b. Add lower rails to all balusters and railings.
(Lower rails have been added and detailed for the exterior handrails.)

- c. Ensure that the window sashes are inset not less than three (3) inches from the exterior surface of the façade of the building.
(The window sashes are inset greater than 3" from the exterior surface.)
- d. On the site plan:
 - Indicate that the garage sloped aprons are not located on the public right-of-way.
 - Indicate that each curb cut does not exceed 20 feet in width.
 - Indicate that the sidewalk is a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.
 - Indicate the proposed refuse storage areas for the carriage house.
(We have provided the civil plans for the project articulating the sidewalk and driveway information.)
- e. Restudy the lintel design.
(We have extended the soldier course lintel beyond the edge of the window and door openings.)
- f. Remove the false windows on the north façade.
(The false windows on the north façade have been removed.)

Ms. Michalak said for the carriage house, the Board requested that the buildings be restudied with regard to the following:

- a. Restudy the carriage house roof shape to be more compatible with the main building and to meet the carriage house roof standard which requires the roof to be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by a parapet.
(We have modified the roof form to be a low slope shed roof surrounded by a parapet to match the main house.)
- b. Restudy the carriage house siding to be a material that is more compatible with the main building's brick material.
(The carriage house siding has been changed to match the main house brick veneer.)
- c. Restudy the stair locations with regard to the overall mass of the building.
(We have considered the stair access to the carriage house and have found it best to keep the exterior stairs on the side of the building.)

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass and Part II, Design Details for a 3-story duplex with a 2-story duplex carriage house for the vacant properties located at 457 and 459 Tattnall 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. Redesign the carriage house stair locations as previously requested by the Board.
2. Redesign the sloped aprons to be inside the garages so that the slope does not occur on the public right-of-way.
3. Revise the front stair treads from PVC to be wood to meet the standard.
4. Ensure that the selected columns are the wood composite type and not the PVC or fiberglass types.

5. Ensure that the windows on the rear façade of the carriage house are an operable type permitted by the standard.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Puljung explained that on page C-3 of the civil plans that are included in the Board's package, they can see more clearly as it explains the 4-foot-wide uninterrupted accessibility area for the sidewalk. He said that the front stair material will be revised to kiln dried pressure treated wood material. They will get with staff on the color, but they do intend to use a solid color stain that matches the color they have already discussed. They were imagining to use fiberglass for the purlin columns, but they are proposing to use a manufactured wood column that is a laminated wood material which is also a structured column; this is a much more stable wood column to use than an actual post of this size. Mr. Puljung said they will change their plan to this. The rear windows are operable casement windows on the courtyard side of the carriage house.

Mr. Puljung said regarding the carriage house, the original staff report for height and mass did not have a concern about the location of the stairs, but came up in the meeting; and they have studied two different ideas for the carriage house stairs. They will be looking at putting the stairs in the courtyard. They have approximately 12 feet – 11 inches from frame-to-frame, He said they lose brick veneer thickness from this, thus leaving basically 12 feet. If they introduce the stairs into the courtyard they are left with 8 feet of usable space in the courtyard. They believe this would completely diminish the function and the enjoyment of the courtyard space, He said they also looked at keeping the stairs in place and actually build the building around them which would have increased their lot coverage into the 86 percent range. However, they did not want to pursue that because of the site being small. Mr. Puljung said their initial idea is to keep the carriage houses as they are and minimize the impact of them on the site. Now, their request is to get the stairs approved on the side because it will be a benefit to the adjacent property owner and it will reduce the mass of the overall structure. This will keep them in compliance on their lot coverage allowance of 75%. They are presently at their allowable lot coverage.

Mr. Puljung showed the Board some pictures of houses within the area that have side stairs. Their side steps will be concealed by the tall masonry wall and by a gate.

Mr. McGarrity asked how tall is gate elevation.

Mr. Puljung answered that the wall is eight feet and the fence is six feet.

Ms. Deacon asked if the stairs on the outside of the building would not count towards the lot coverage.

Ms. Michalak answered the stairs would not count towards the lot coverage because they are uncovered.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Martha Reardon lives at 223 Alice Street which is adjacent to their property. Ms. Reardon said she is in favor of not covering up the stairs because they come about two feet to her property. If the stairs are covered, the roof would also touch her roof.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass and Part II, Design Details for a 3-story duplex with a 2-story duplex carriage house for the vacant properties located at 457 and 459 Tattnell 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. Redesign the sloped aprons to be inside the - PASS garages so that the slope does not occur on the public right-of-way.
2. Revise the front stair treads from PVC to be wood to meet the standard.
3. Ensure that the selected columns are the wood composite type and not the PVC or fiberglass types.
4. Ensure that the windows on the rear façade of the carriage house are an operable type permitted by the standard.

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

18. [Petition of Barnard Architects | 16-002176-COA | 210 & 214 West Gwinnett Street | New Construction: Part I and Part II](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Charlton Ward.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [GHS 1935 Photograph.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Mr. Scott Barnard was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for an amendment to Part I, Height and Mass and approval for Part II, Design Details of two residential buildings to be located on the vacant parcels at 210 and 214 West Gwinnett Street. A duplex will face West Gwinnett Street and a 6-unit building will face Tattnell Street. Parking will be accessed from Gwinnett Lane. All buildings are proposed to be 3-stories high. The site is located at the south end of the Savannah Historic District, along Gwinnett Street which is the border between the Savannah Historic District and the Victorian Historic District. Adjacent contributing buildings include single-family detached homes on relatively large lots. Many of the houses are setback from Gwinnett Street.

Ms. Michalak said that at the May 11, 2016 HDBR Meeting, the Board approved Part I, Height and Mass for this project with the following conditions (responses are in italics following the condition):

1. Redesign the 6-unit building by rotating two units to face Gwinnett Street so that the Gwinnett Street façade becomes the primary façade.

(The two units were not rotated; however, the end unit's Gwinnett Street façade was redesigned to better address Gwinnett Street.)

2. Redesign fenestration alignment on the rear facades of both buildings.

(The fenestration alignments have been redesigned.)

3. Redesign each unit's front entry door to be a pair of doors, a central door with two sidelites, or one single wider door.

(The front entry doors have been redesigned to be a single full-width door.)

4. Increase the height of the first story to 11 feet and the height of the second story to 10 feet. Mitigate the required additional height elsewhere on the building, preferably the height of the parapet.

(The floor to floor heights have been revised to meet the standards and the height of the parapet has been reduced. The overall height of the 6-unit building is now 34 feet-2 inches and the duplex is 34 foot-8 inches which were changed from 34 feet and 34 feet-6 inches respectively.)

5. Provide exact window sizes.

(Exact window sizes have been provided and are consistent with the sizes previously provided by staff in Part I.)

6. Reconfigure or add more windows to the south façade of the 6 unit building facing Gwinnett Street.

(The windows have been reconfigured and increased in quantity in conjunction with the redesign of this façade to better address Gwinnett Street.)

7. Provide fence height.

(Wood fences are proposed to be 6 feet-4 inches high and the brick and metal fences are proposed to be 5 feet-10 inches high.)

8. The HVAC units are proposed to be located on the roof. Per a sightline drawing provided with the submittal packet the units may not be visible from the public right-of-way. If, during construction, it becomes clear that the roof HVAC units will be visible screening shall be provided. The screening detail is to be provided to staff for review and approval prior to installation.

(The petitioner does not believe that the units will be visible.)

Ms. Michalak noted that, additionally, the applicant has requested Height and Mass amendments to the 6-Unit Building. Roof access is now proposed for the four northernmost units. This includes four access stairs and guardrails above the flat roof plane.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass and Part II, Design Details of two residential buildings to be located on the vacant parcels at 210 and 214 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:

1. Provide all required information for the roof stair access structures and guardrails including but not limited to: height, all other dimensions, materials, colors, and specifications for any other products proposed to be used.
2. Removed the louvered enclosures from between the front stoops.
3. Revise the vertical Hardi siding with a faux wood finished proposed within the parapet to be a material more compatible with materials on visually related contributing buildings.
4. Revise the columns from fiberglass to wood or wood composite material.
5. Revise the handrails on the front stoop stairs to meet the standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Barnard stated that relative to the roof access, due to a lack of time in their information, they are withdrawing number one; #2. - they will remove the louvers between the front stoops; #3 – he understands the ordinance saying no fake wood. They want to remain with the hardi which is the product they have on the lower portions. Hardi has a vertical board siding, but it does not come in a smooth texture. This is why they use the space gapping matches the horizontal gapping below. It appears compatible and is very high. The texture will really not be visible; 4. He believes at some point; the Review Board has agreed to allow non-wood siding. There are many benefits to this. This is great as it does not absorb moisture, does not rot; and holds paint better. Also, this makes the Historic District look better longer. Mr. Barnard stated that he believes this was a wise choice. But this only happened when Hardi stated making a reasonable profile (the thickness) so that it looked like wood. Therefore, there is a precedent in the community for product that is not wood, nor historic, but it is good for the community. Mr. Barnard said pertaining to columns, staff still has their hands behind their back because the ordinance says wood columns or wood composite. Mr. Barnard said a good traditional wood column has details. He does not believe that somebody will be able to tell that fiberglass columns are not wood. It is one of the better products and is fiberglass. It is paintable, which is another benefit. Columns tend to sit on the ground and a lot of time they are on surfaces where they are getting water

splashed on them from the rain, and the age-old problem is they get rotten at the base. The material they are asking approval for allows them to minimize that problem and the small pieces of wood. This will keep the Historic District looking better, longer with less maintenance.

Mr. Barnard said they will follow the standards regarding the handrails if the Board feels this is necessary. He said he would respectfully argue, though, that the section that shows a simple guardrail only is appropriate for this architecture as it is contemporary. He said the staff and Board are overly restricted by the “standards.” Therefore, the standard is not met, but in contemporary architecture where the code does not require a guardrail, they do not need anything there. They want a handrail so at that the people using the stairs will be able to use the stairs safely. In their attempt to be compatible contexture good contemporary architecture, he calls it simple Victorian. Consequently, they just want a clean simple design.

Mr. Howington asked if the glass handrail will be on the front corner on Gwinnett Street.

Mr. Barnard answered yes.

Ms. Deacon asked if there is a detail for this installation.

Mr. Barnard said they will provide this. He explained that they intend to carry the same simple inch and one-half inch round between the columns and a small one-inch at the base. They will be happy to provide more detail on this to staff.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Hisoric Savannah Foundation (HSF) said at the last meeting, the HSF spoke on having the end unit address Gwinnett Street and they were in agreement with staff that the redesign and end units successfully addresses Gwinnett Street. They believe that it is visually compatible as proposed. Ms. Meunier said the HSF discussed the additional stair on the end unit on Tattnall Street that the door is on Gwinnett Street. She said she does not know whether they have an answer either way about whether it is more appropriate to keep the door, but it certainly continues the rhythm on Tattnall Street. When they look at the renderings, there is no door there; so, it is not as misleading, but they did discuss this topic.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that the Gwinnett Street fenestration has been addressed. The Board discussed the columns, the louvered enclosures between the front stoops, and the Hardi siding. The Board agreed that the louvered enclosures between the front stoops be removed; that the petitioner revise the vertical Hardi siding with a faux wood finished within the parapet to be a material more compatible with materials on the visually related contributing buildings; and revise the columns from fiberglass to wood or wood composite material. Mr. McGarrity asked about the roof.

Mr. Barnard said they got the staff’s comments on Monday morning, therefore, it is a quick turnaround. He said they are eliminating the roof access and the glass handrails.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review
does hereby approve the petition for Part I, Height

and Mass and Part II, Design Details of two residential buildings to be located on the vacant parcels at 210 and 214 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:

1. Remove the louvered enclosures from between the front stoops. - PASS
2. Revise the vertical Hardi siding with a faux wood finished proposed within the parapet to be a material more compatible with materials on visually related contributing buildings.
3. Revise the columns from fiberglass to wood or wood composite material.

Vote Results

Motion: Jennifer Deacon

Second: Keith Howington

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

19. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects |16-002196-COA | 607 Drayton Street | New Construction: Part I Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [16-002196-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Forsyth Ward.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Photos.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Public Comment- Welcher.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Public Comment- Krembs.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval of a revised submittal of Part 1: Height and Mass of a new five story building facing Forsyth Park on a vacant lot with Drayton Street to the west, Huntingdon Street to the north, and Goodwin Street to the east. Two floors of parking are located underground beneath the building. The building forms and “L” shape, wrapping a courtyard along Goodwin Street. A smaller three story building is located on the southeast corner of the parcel which also serves as the entrance to the underground parking.

Ms. Harris explained that the petitioner has drawn from nearby Mid-Century Modern buildings within the vicinity for architectural inspiration, including the Chatham Apartment Building to the east and the additions to the Candler Hospital Building (now the Savannah Law School) to the north.

Ms. Harris said a similar petition was reviewed by the Board on May 11, 2016 and was continued at the request of the petitioner in order to address the following; revisions are in italics:

1. Eliminate the sixth story to be consistent with the Height Map and visually compatible in terms of height and scale;

The sixth story has been eliminated.

2. Reduce the height of the tower element to be visually compatible in terms of height and scale;

The tower element has been eliminated.

3. Add additional voids to the north, Huntingdon Street façade, to be visually compatible and meet the standard which requires that the distance between windows is not greater than two times of the width of the windows;

Additional voids have been added.

4. Add additional voids to the east, Goodwin Street, façade to be visually compatible and meet the standard which requires that the distance between windows is not greater than two times of the width of the windows;

Additions voids have been added.

5. Incorporate additional voids in the upper floors of the south façade, which will be very visible from Drayton Street above the adjacent building, even if that means setting this portion of the building back further from the property line to be visually compatible;

Additional voids have been added.

6. Incorporate voids on the east and north façades of the three story building at the southeast corner of the parcel to be visually compatible and meet the standard which requires a minimum of 20% voids;

Additional voids have been incorporated.

7. Increase the height of the second story to 12 feet to meet the standard;

The height of the second story has increased to 12 feet.

8. Ensure that the parapet has a string course to meet the standard;

A string course has been added to the parapet.

9. Ensure that the height of the wall on the east (Goodwin) elevation does not exceed 11 feet;

The height of the wall on the east elevation is 11 feet.

10. Incorporate an additional massing standard to meet the requirement that a minimum of two massing elements be utilized;

The roofline variation massing standard has been incorporated.

11. Incorporate an additional horizontal element at the southern third of the west façade of the building, between the fourth and fifth stories, in order to meet the massing standard requiring a base, middle and top;

An additional horizontal element has been incorporated on the west façade.

12. Incorporate additional height variation to meet the standard requiring roofline variation if continuous rooflines are greater than 120 linear feet;

Height variations have been incorporated into the rooflines along Drayton and Huntingdon Streets.

13. Locate the elevator overrun within the bonus story to meet the standard;

The elevator overrun is located within the bonus story.

14. Incorporate two additional entrances along Huntingdon Street to access the dining area and the lobby in order to meet the intent of the criteria for the bonus story and meet the standard which requires one entrance for every 60 linear feet of frontage;

The ground floor entrances have been redesigned.

15. Redesign the window groupings to form bays of not less than 15 feet nor more than 20 feet wide to meet the standard.

The bays have been redesigned to meet the standard.

Ms. Harris said, additionally, tree lawns have been incorporated along the north, Huntingdon Street façade. A planting area has been incorporated within the setback along Drayton Street. A more prominent entrance has also been incorporated along Drayton. As designed, a variance from the standard which requires that, "*all Mechanical or Access structures shall be contained within the additional story,*" will be required.

Ms. Harris informed the Board that some standards in the Large Scale Development section which apply to residential zoning districts and some standards apply to all other zoning districts. This zoning district is an RIP-D zoning district which means that it has residential in the name. She explained that most of the districts within the Historic Districts are RIP-A, RIP-B; RIP-C; RIP-D; and there are some districts such as BC; BC-1; etc. There is a provision in the ordinance that states that "for the purposes of this section, RBC" which is another residential district, "an RIP-C shall follow the standards for an R

District." Ms. Harris stated that RIP-D is not mentioned, but it is more intensive than RIP-C. Consequently, staff requested an interpretation from the Zoning Administrator as to how to apply the standards. Does the RIP-D district fall under the residential standards or does it fall under the commercial standards because it is a mixed use district that allows for more intensive uses. Ms. Harris said the Zoning Administrator determined that the RIP-D district falls under the "all other district" category, not residential category in terms of what standards to apply. She explained, therefore, what the Board sees in the staff report are the "other districts" standards applying to the RIP-D district in accordance with the interpretation of the Zoning Administrator.

Ms. Harris said regarding the additional standards for large scale developments, there is a requirement that all mechanical and access structures be contained in an additional story. This standard is not met as proposed. They have stair towers in the mechanical room that are not located in the bonus story. She explained that the petitioner has selected the ground floor active uses standards in order to qualify for the bonus story.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of Part I: Height and Mass with the following conditions to be resubmitted with Part II: Design Details because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Restudy the roofline variation elements on the Huntingdon and Drayton Street facades to not give the appearance of an additional story.
2. On the north, Huntingdon Street façade, on the ground floor, continue the consistent storefront pattern at the area of solid reserved for signage.
3. Locate the stair towers and mechanical room within the bonus story.
4. Incorporate two additional entrances along Huntingdon Street to access the hybrid areas, and one additional entrance along Drayton Street to access the dining area.

Ms. Harris reported also that staff recommends denial of the request for the stair towers and mechanical room to not be contained within the additional story, because the variance criteria have not been met.

Ms. Harris noted that staff received several emails this morning from various neighbors. These emails are attached to the agenda.

Mr. McGarrity asked with the roofline variations, if only the windows are to be restudied.

Ms. Harris answered yes. It is not the height, but the design element of having open windows instead of another decorative detail. This could come back to the Board in Part II – Design Details.

Ms. Lynch asked that if the bonus story is granted would this include all the mechanical equipment.

Ms. Harris answered only the access structures.

Ms. Caldwell said this is a residential area. If the designation has an R in front of it, it should follow the same guidelines for the residential requirements.

Ms. Harris explained that the Zoning Administrator made the interpretation previously that RIP-D should follow the application of the "other" districts.

Ms. Caldwell said Ms. Harris stated that she got clarification which is generally sent to the Board so they could be aware of it, but they did not get the clarification notice.

Ms. Harris said if she had known this would be an issue, she would have attached it to the Board's packet; however, if the Board wants it, she would be happy to print it and give it to the Board. She explained that an interpretation was made by the Zoning Administrator in unequivocal terms that the RIP-D district should be reviewed as other districts. This does not only apply to this lot, but to any RIP-D district.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay stated that as staff has reported, at the May 11, 2016 meeting there were 15 concerns of a technical nature that the staff identified. Today, they have made revisions that address favorably the concerns. There is one conclusion that he wanted to address. When they made their petition they did not request any variances as they believed they presented a petition that met all the standards. However, at this time the decision to make a recommendation that you deny the variances are of the staff's initiation and not theirs. At the staff report level, they agree with all four of the staff's recommendation. Therefore, they are asking the Board to approve Part I -Height and Mass and let them bring back their response to the conditions along with Part II. He believes this is the best path forward.

Mr. Shay said they will restudy the roofline variations elements to see whether there is something they can do differently so that it will not be interpreted as an additional story. The additional entrances on Huntingdon Street and Drayton Street was mentioned, they hoped that the corner entrances would be helpful to those streets. They believe it is important to note that this intersection is most appropriate for people to walk across Drayton Street to Forsyth Park. It connects to the fountain and to the pavilion that is in the center. They are hopeful that having corner entrances could be a central feature of their design and they believe that the entrances that are on the corner count as being entrances that are on the main streets. Mr. Shay said he does not want to sacrifice this design element, but they will do their best as they move forward with Part II to look at whether or not they can add even more entrances on the street. As far as the area on the storefront which is solid, they like white spaces in their design; he understands the standards do not allow this [but this is one of the many areas which the standards were developed primarily to guide designers and developers in the direction of making compatible buildings] but were established for the four historic districts, therefore, tend to guide them to 19 century solutions. They will restudy this and comeback with additional ideas. Nevertheless, he wanted to present their logic to the Board. Regarding item #3, they were told to comply, but he does not totally agree with staff's interpretation of the standard. The standards in the staff's report clearly state that a mechanical room does not count as a story and stairwells do not count as a story. The bonus story is not a gift, but was earned by virtue of the ordinance. There is a way to qualify for the bonus story. It is not restricted in height. They could present a story here that is 20 feet high; it may not be compatible and would have to pass other standards. But his point is the bonus story is not restricted in height; a stairwell by its nature is a taller space, but the stairs only traverse below the area of the bonus story. They believe this is subject to interpretation. He has done design for more than 20 hotels in the Historic District of Savannah, and two of them have qualified for the bonus story. In both of these cases, both of the stairwells go all the way up through the building to the top. When they go all the way up to the top that there are some life safety code reasons why this is supposed to happen. They will comply with number 3, but they would like to have the opportunity to explore how they can also meet the code in doing so.

Mr. Shay said at this time, they are not requesting a variance; they believe that their building meets the standards and when they come back in Part II, they will demonstrate to the Board

how it meets the standards.

Mr. Howington that on the corner elements, the one on the inside corner appears to be more successful in his opinion.

Mr. Shay explained that they have been encouraged to make the main entrances of the building overall address Drayton and Huntingdon Streets. They are highlighted in a way that if someone was approaching the building would clearly read that as being the main entrance. From a circulation standpoint for the reasons he has described to the Board, that corner entrance is the way that one would leave the building if they are already in the building and knew their way around to get to the intersection where it is actually safer to cross Drayton Street. It is similar to the same condition a block further to the south where the Mansion has their intersection.

Mr. Howington said he was referring to the fenestration above at the roofline and why the other vertical element turns.

Mr. Shay explained that he believes it is a private street [Huntingdon Street] but it functions as a public street. They believe that one of the main ways that people will approach the building for the first time, is likely to be along Abercorn Street; then they come to Drayton Street. From Abercorn Street, however, they believe that when you get to the corner you are able to legibly read that this is the location and is at least one of the entrances to the building. He explained that the reason this side is more exaggerated in vertical is that you can see in the foreground that it is in the context of a 15 story building. Consequently, they felt this was the side where verticality was more appropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Martin Smith said he was present speaking on behalf of SCAD who owns two neighboring properties on the same block-face, 618 Drayton Street which is an 1872 three story townhouse and 622 Drayton Street which is an 1877 two-story house. Mr. Smith stated that SCAD is not opposed to development at 607 Drayton Street nor are they opposed to a hotel. Today, he wanted to share with the Board the reasons why they should not approve this application. He said that the staff's report states that the Zoning Administrator made a ruling that the RIP-D follows the other zoning districts provision. He believes this is what Ms. Harris explained to the Board and public earlier today.

Mr. Smith said he wanted to direct the Board's attention to page 36 from a development standards that what they were provided was a piece of text that was taken out of context from this page. Table 1 clearly says all R-zoning districts. The next category is all other zoning districts. He said, therefore, he believes that this passage clarifies that R-B-C and RIP-C also follow all "R" zoning districts. If it is interpreted that RIP-D does not follow the "R" zoning districts, then you could also interpret RIP-A does not follow the "R" zoning district. This is not a zoning confirmation letter. He thinks that something that is so important as granting a bonus story is worthy of having an official determination from the Zoning Administrator a little bit more than just a casual email between two colleagues. Mr. Smith said he believes it would prudent for the Board to see an official zoning letter that would further explain this. He said they will also attend the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) meeting and share their thoughts on this issue.

Attorney Dolly Chisholm stated that she was representing the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF). Attorney Chisholm said they, like SCAD, do not oppose a hotel on this site. But, they were present to ensure the integrity of the height map and also they would

like an official confirmation of what the zoning regulation means. In the past, when she has dealt with the Zoning Administration and asked for some definition, they would always say that this is not an official or this is an official confirmation. Based on the email that Mr. Smith just put before the Board and that she has seen, it does not say that it is an official determination that RIP-D does not meet the requirements of large scale, but has to follow the height map. It says that they cannot find a determination from the previous administrator, but I think this is what it means. The reasoning is because it does not specifically say RIP-D, then RIP-D falls into other. This is just an interpretation. But another interpretation would be it does not specifically say RIP-A or RIP-B and these are residential and have to follow the height map. They cannot forget the time and effort that went into the Height Map and give something an extra story and go against the height map based on an email that was not official.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said based on the discussion that has already been before the Board and based on their comments of the design as proposed, it would be drastically changed by the reduction of an additional story. Ms. Meunier encouraged Mr. Shay to seek a continuance so the height and mass issue could be resolved.

Mr. Dicky Mopper stated that he had two questions. They are talking about the height map, but where were they when Flank development on Perry Street was built? Where were they with the Kessler project on the River? Where were they last month when the discussion of height came up when an applicant came in and reduced an entire story based on comments from this Board and now they are going back today with the public coming in and saying they don't even think the petitioner should have that.

Dr. Nicholas Henry said he was present as a resident of the Historic District. He agrees essentially with everything that has been said. He pointed out that Review Board is a diverse group. In essence, they all are in agreement that this is a massive addition to a residential area. Dr. Henry believes it is well done and he like many others do not have anything against hotels, but they do need to look at the context; the appropriateness; and do their homework again to be sure if this is really appropriate. He believes it presents some real problems.

Dr. Roland Summers said he was representing the Georgia Medical Society as Past President and Chairman of the Board. He wanted the Board to go back and look at the model they saw last month. The three facilities to the south of the proposed building are overshadowed in height and appropriateness.

Mr. Shay in response to the public comments stated that he had not heard that line of reasoning or anything of this until 10 minutes ago. He said he has proceeded in good faith meeting with the MPC staff, meeting with people concerning what standards apply and his submission last month he asked for what he thought was a modest variance for an area building that would not be visible from the street and they approved that in the immediate context of a 15 story building with a two story penthouse next to it. As a consequence of the concerns of this Board he will come back in good faith and eliminate the only element that really seemed to be objectionable and required them to comeback for a variance. So the controversy over whether the Zoning Administrator has done his job appropriately, is not something that he has the ability to address. He pointed out that when he did the design for the building, that he consulted the same matrices that one of the public speakers, Martin Smith, had. In reference to Mr. Summers of the Georgia Medical Society, he believes it is fair to point out that the building immediately adjacent to this proposed project is a four story building. The bonus story that they have earned by following the standards is only one

story higher than the four story building.

Mr. Shay said as far as the suggestion that he request a continuance so that lawyers and others can do their job, he is not in a position to be able to do that today. He has done his very best due diligence to determine what the standards are, work closely with staff, the Board, and the public to follow everything he knows about the standards. If the Board approves their height and mass today and if there is some legal opinion or whatever makes it impossible, they will be back before the Board.

Mr. Shay asked for a vote.

Mr. Thomson, MPC Executive Director, said since this is a two-part process they could recommend approval of Part I with a condition that the zoning decision is resolved. The staff can get a copy of the email they received from the Zoning Administrator.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the email. They felt the email did not qualify as an official statement and lacked sufficient information they needed to make their decision.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the petition for Part 1: Height and Mass of a new five story building at 607 Drayton - PASS Street due to the lack of sufficient information regarding the zoning and whether the project qualifies for a bonus story.

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Nay
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Nay
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

20. [Petition of Reardon Design, LLC | 16-002202-COA | 526 East Jones Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Mr. James Reardon was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for a two-story addition to the rear of the property located at 526 East Jones Street. The ground floor deck and the deck on top of the 1-story rear addition will be removed. The new 2-story addition will be 12 feet deep and 18 feet-6 inches wide and will have a small deck with a stair descending into the rear yard. The roof of the addition is proposed to terminate under the eaves of the main building.

Ms. Michalak stated that the petition was continued from the May 11, 2016 HDBR Meeting in order for the petitioner to consider the following (responses are in italics):

1. Redesign the addition to maintain the essential form and integrity of the historic property, not alter the main roof shape, not create a false sense of historical development, be reversible, and not alter spatial relationships.

(The project was revised so that the main roof shape is not altered; the roof of the addition terminates under the main building's eave. However, the remainder of the original historic openings on the rear façade are still proposed to be altered and the addition is still the full width of the rear façade.)

2. Revise the addition's foundation piers to be either brick or add true stucco over the proposed concrete block.

The addition's foundation piers are brick. However, brick and mortar samples were not provided.

3. Provide the materials for the pair of doors on the addition.

(A specification was provided for the doors indicating that they are wood and glass.)

4. Provide the window muntin profile and width.

(This information was provided; however, the muntin width is 1 1/8" wide with a colonial muntin profile neither of which meet the standards.)

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval of the the petition for a two-story addition to the rear of the property located at 526 East Jones 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. Revise the addition to minimize the loss of historic openings on the rear façade of the historic building.
2. Provide brick and mortar samples for the new piers.
3. Revise the addition to be narrower.
4. Revise the window muntins to be a maximum of 7/8 inches wide and have a profile that simulates traditional putty glazing.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Reardon stated that last month when he was at the meeting they had conversation about the height and he brought the height down. He thought that would address the addition. He is

dealing with a narrow property. Their three townhomes are connected. The middle townhome is 12 feet deeper and has the same roof to the back and the one to the left is actually shallow. He did not go back any further than the adjacent property. It is more detailed to the front. He has done what he could in detailing to make it look like an addition.

Ms. Caldwell asked Mr. Reardon if he was saying that he did not agree with the staff's recommendation.

Mr. Reardon answered that his client would like to get the full width. But, he does understand if it cannot be approved that way.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the width, windows, doors, and the historic fabric. Possibly, one side of the wall could be brought in at least three to six inches. The headers could be left in place and expand the opening on the ground floor. The petitioner indicated that he will work with staff to minimize the reduction of the historic fabric as much as possible.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a two-story addition to the rear of the property located at 526 East Jones 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. Revise the addition to minimize the loss of historic openings on the rear façade of the historic building. - PASS
2. Provide brick and mortar samples for the new piers.
3. Revise the addition to be narrower.
4. Revise the window muntins to be a maximum of 7/8 inches wide and have a profile that simulates traditional putty glazing.

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Andy McGarrity

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye

Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

21. [Petition of Richard Mopper | 16-002750-COA | 214 West Bay Street | Alterations and Addition](#)

Attachment: [16-002750-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- drawings and photographs.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Additional balcony photographs.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. McClain disclosed that her office is located in a building that is owned by Mr. Mopper. She does not see this as a conflict of interest.

Mr. Richard Mopper was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting alterations to 214 West Bay Street as follows:

- On the River Street elevation, on the fifth floor, the existing balcony over one opening will be replaced with a new balcony over three openings.
- The two existing windows on each side of the balcony window will be replaced with French doors to match the existing balcony French door.
- On the Bay Street elevation, on the fourth floor addition, the addition will be expanded to the south 12 feet and an elevator incorporated. Existing windows and door will be reused.
- The parapet wall on the west façade of the rooftop will be extended as the west wall of the addition.

Ms. Harris said the petitioner is also requesting a variance from the standard which limits residential balconies to three feet to allow a four foot six inch balcony.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the alterations to 214 West Bay Street with the following conditions because the project is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Retain the existing window openings as-is on the River Street elevation.
2. Reduce the width of the proposed balcony to four feet to be consistent with other balconies on the building.
3. If the balconies and doors are approved as proposed, ensure that:
 - a. The door frames are inset not less than three inches from the façade; and
 - b. The proposed doors are wood.
4. Reduce the rooftop addition to the minimum size possible to accommodate the elevator, not alter the parapet, and to be the least visible.

5. If the rooftop addition is approved as proposed, ensure that:

The windows utilized meet window standards including but not limited to the 5:3 ratio and material standards;

- a. Inset the door frame and windows not less than three inches from the façade.
- b. Ensure the door meets the door standards.

Ms. Harris additionally reported that staff recommends approval of an alternate variance, a variance to allow four foot balconies rather than the requested variance to allow four foot six inch balcony, because the variance criteria for a four foot balcony are met.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Mopper came forward and stated that he wanted to make the following statement to be recorded in the records: He is the real estate broker for a client that has equitable title for 607 Drayton Street. The petition was denied by the Review Board on a zoning decision, and not on the standards of visual compatibility. The Board made its decision based on comments made by an employee of SCAD and the Historic Savannah Foundation's Attorney over the Zoning Administrator's statement that he believed the property met the zoning requirements. This decision may have significantly reduced the client's value.

Mr. Mopper said that 214 West Bay Street is zoned BC-1. This is not residential property. It is a commercial building. The fact that he lives in the unit does not stop the fact that it could be a restaurant, a law office or his real estate office. Therefore, he believes it is inappropriate to say that it is limited to a residential balcony of three feet. The balcony is a little bigger than three feet; it is three feet - four inches. He said it is significantly important to note this because staff looking from River Street is looking up and making a determination of the size of his balcony from 50 feet below. If he has a balcony that is six or seven inches taller than the ones below, you will notice the visual compatibility. From a commercial point of view, he does not need a variance for an increased size on the balcony. Mr. Mopper said he believes the balcony should be approved.

Mr. Mopper said with regards to the existing windows, he would like to see the windows come down lower if they do not do the door. The building was not built in 1910, but around 1850. Significant changes to the building have taken place over the years; so no one can tell apparently as staff believes it was built in 1910. It was originally built as a four-story cobblestone construction. The fifth floor was added in 1920. It now extends over Factors Walk which it did not originally do. Therefore, over the years, extremely significant changes have been done to historical architecture of the building. Mr. Mopper said regarding the rooftop portions where they want to make the addition, he is happy to just have the addition be adequate for the elevator. He personally believe that visual compatibility will be suitable because what will be seen is a jut-out coming out 10 or 12 feet from the building.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with the staff recommendations. Based on the drawings that were presented for the elevator, she

took staff's recommendation to mean that they may not have to extend 10 or 12 feet out. Ms. Meunier said they were looking for some more direction because they agree that this may not be visual compatible. The visual compatibility needs to be reduced and keep it as far away from the Bay Street view is what the HSF recommends.

Mr. Mopper in response to public comments, said he wished the elevator could be housed inside, but when you look at the parking from the side elevation, you will realize that they are actually coming up from inside the building below and at 12 feet back is the only way they will be able to do it.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the balconies, doors, and windows. They also discussed the rooftop and variance request. They Board discussed recommending approval of an alternate variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals, a variance to allow four foot balconies rather than the requested variance to allow four foot six inch balcony, because the variance criteria for a four foot balcony are met.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations to 214 West Bay Street with the following conditions because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Reduce the width of the proposed balcony to four feet to be consistent with other balconies on the building.
2. Ensure that the door frames are inset not less than three inches from the façade and that the proposed doors are wood.
3. Reduce the rooftop addition to the minimum size possible to accommodate the elevator, not alter the parapet, and to be the least visible.

- PASS

The Board recommends approval of an alternate variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals, a variance to allow four foot balconies rather than the requested variance to allow four foot six inch balcony, because the variance criteria for a four foot balcony are met.

Vote Results

Motion: Dr. Betsy Dominguez
Second: Andy McGarrity

Debra Caldwell	- Nay
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

22. [Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 16-002752-COA | 532 Indian Street | Alterations and Addition](#)

Attachment: [16-002752-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [North Oglethorpe Ward.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Becky Lynch recused from participation in this petition. She is an employee of Lynch Associates Architects.

Dr. Dominquez disclosed that she is an employee of SCAD, but she is not involved in this project.

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting signage, alterations and additions to the existing building and parking lot at 532 Indian Street. The proposed project includes the addition of:

- Screening walls and gates along the south edge of the parking lots with signage;
- A structured entrance and gate at the east parking lot with signage above;
- A pedestrian gate structure; and
- A trellis attached to an existing structure.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the proposed additions to 532 Indian Street with the following conditions because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Reduce the vehicular entrance portion of the structure and the curb cut to 20 feet wide to be more visually compatible and meet the standard.
2. Revise the material of the west section of wall to be board formed cast in place concrete to be compatible with the adjacent building.
3. Reduce the size of the “SCAD” supplemental ID sign to 20 square feet to meet the standard.
4. Ensure that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration and height.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lynch stated that Martin Smith of SCAD was accompanying him at the meeting. They do not have any issues with staff comments regarding reducing the size of the "SCAD" supplemental ID sign to 20 square feet and to ensure that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in material, configuration and height. Mr. Lynch said they are not sure about staff's recommendation #1 which states to reduce the vehicular entrance portion of the structure and the curb cut to 20 feet wide. The standards for curb cuts is 24 feet. Therefore, they are waiting to get some information from the staff about whether they can reduce it to 20 feet. The existing path is 25 feet. They are shifting it over about 10 feet, but it will essentially be the same width. They will be okay with reducing it to 20 feet if Traffic Engineering say that they can do so. They want to be sure that the trucks will be able to make the proper clearance into the driveway and not have issues with the gateway design. Mr. Lynch asked the Board to approve this and they will work with staff to get this issue resolved.

Mr. Lynch said regarding the staff's recommendation #2 concerning revising the material of the west section of wall to be board formed cast in place of concrete to be compatible with the adjacent building, they really want to keep this as an architectural wood detail. They have some wood detailing in the entry and doors. This will tie in with another project they did not the street. It is already a concrete block wall now. Therefore, they thought using wood would actually be appropriate. They want to call attention more to the gateway entrance.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Lynch that the dimensions on the plans say 28 feet but this is from structure-to-structure and not the actually curb cut. He said that Mr. Lynch's actual curb cut will be 20 feet; but, he has to work with SPR

Mr. Lynch explained that presently, they have 24 feet and 28 feet clear from the edge of the construction. But, as they can see, with the required radius, the curb cut is getting close to the edge of the building. Therefore, they still have the curb cut issue.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the curb cut. SPR will need to make its decision on this matter. Staff explained to the Board that one alternative to the curb cut issue would be to have an entrance and an exit; this would be only one-way traffic in and one-way traffic out. The Board could consider this option in order to meet the standard of a 20 foot maximum. Ms. Deacon stated that she likes the design and it would take a lot of redesigning to accommodate the option that staff presented. She agreed with the petitioner regarding the wood siding; she likes the differentiation of the materials. The Board found that using wood would be appropriate.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the proposed

additions to 532 Indian Street with the following conditions because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Work with SPR staff to reduce the width of the curb cut if possible.
2. Reduce the size of the “SCAD” supplemental - PASS ID sign to 20 square feet to meet the standard.
3. Ensure that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration and height.

Vote Results

Motion: Andy McGarrity

Second: Keith Howington

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

23. [Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 16-002755-COA | 116 Whitaker Street | Alterations and Additions](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Becky Lynch recused from participation in this petition. She is an employee of Lynch Associates Architects.

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

Ms. Sara Farr gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations and an addition at 116 Whitaker Street. The site includes four buildings, which have been combined into one over time. These buildings are broken up into Buildings A,B,C, and D with work on each as described below:

Building A

Building A is located on the southern half of the site. It is currently covered in a non-historic stucco veneer. This stucco will be removed and the brick below will be cleaned, repaired, and repointed where necessary. The cast iron columns will also be cleaned and repainted. The wood storefront will be rebuilt along the west and south facades. The

cornice will be rebuilt out of metal using historic images as reference. Wood elements and windows will be repaired or replaced in kind as necessary. The roof will be resurfaced with a TPO membrane roof. The chimneys will be recapped with triple arched brick shrouds that are visible in historic photographs. The third floor exterior wall on the north façade will be cleaned, repaired, and repointed where necessary and two new openings created. These will align with the two windows on the south façade. Two windows will be removed where the addition is adjacent to the building.

Building B

Building B is a two story brick building. It had a wood storefront entry on the ground floor. The stucco veneer will be removed and the brick cleaned, repaired, and repointed where necessary. A wood storefront will be installed on the ground floor. The original cornice will be rebuilt out of metal using historic photographs as reference.

A one story addition will be added to the east on the roof. This addition will be clad in smooth coat stucco and new wood double hung 1 over 1 windows will be installed on the new third floor on the west façade. The entire addition will be set back approximately 22 feet from the Whitaker Street façade.

Building C

This building is a two story wood frame structure. The material beneath the non-historic stucco veneer is unknown, but interior demolition has revealed that the original lap siding remains. This may be covered by the later faux half timbering. Regardless of the material beneath, a ground floor wood storefront will be rebuilt. It will be infilled between new square columns similar to the one remaining on the north façade. The metal cornice will be rebuilt using historic photographs as reference. The missing windows will be replaced with wood, double-hung 2 over 2 windows, and the side gable roof will be resurfaced with architectural asphalt shingles.

Building D

This building is a one and half story brick masonry building that appears to have been built as an infill building and is entered from the lane. The only exposed side is the north façade. The cupola window opening, currently covered with asphalt shingles, will be restored using wood 4-lite windows. The clerestory/transom openings will be infilled with new wood 2-lite windows. A new metal double door will replace the existing metal single door. Another single metal door will be added and aligned under an existing transom window. The stucco infill will be removed and replaced with a brick veneer. All brick will be repainted. The hipped roof will be resurfaced with a TPO membrane. The cupola roof will be resurfaced with a seamed metal roof.

Ms. Farr stated that a COA (15-002132-COA) was previously approved for exploratory demolition at this site, which revealed the brick beneath the stucco veneer. On December 10, 1997, a COA (HBR 97-1065) was approved to uncover arches, remove wood trim, stucco and paint, add awnings, and alter the display windows. The existing stucco was likely installed at this time, though there does appear to be some existing stucco when this application was approved.

Ms. Farr reported that staff recommends approval of alterations and the addition at 116 Whitaker Street to address the following conditions:

1. Provide colors, stains, and material samples;
2. No harsh treatments are used to remove the stucco or repoint the brick;
3. Reconsider the removal of the two windows on Building A. Staff recommends

maintaining them in place if possible or storing them on site;

4. Restudy the design of the entrance to the rooftop terrace to reduce the loss of historic material;
5. Ensure that windows on the historic structures will be single pane;
6. Lower the storefront base on Building C to a maximum of 24 inches;
7. Revise the parapet on the addition to have a string course;
8. The exterior expression of the height of the addition is increased to a minimum of 10 feet;
9. Identify the location of the refuse areas, electrical vaults, meter boxes, and communications devices on the plan;
10. Provide a minimum of 10 feet of clearance above the sidewalk for the sign;
11. Provide details for the mounting of the sign.

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

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lynch explained that this will be a federal tax credit project. They have already met with the tax credit consultant and he did not believe any of the issues were problematic. He said regarding staff's recommendations, #1 - they will provide the colors, stains, and material samples; #2 - they will not use harsh treatments; #5 - they are using single pane windows. He said the majority of the windows are actually existing; #6 - concerning lowering the storefront base on Building C to a maximum of 24 inches - they have photo documentation of the building that shows the storefront at a higher elevation. Consequently, they were replicating that and felt it was appropriate; #7 - they can add a string course; #8 - they are actually 10 feet from the finished floor to the top, but they felt it important to keep the addition underneath the cornice line of the existing structure so that they would not damage more historic material; #9 - the existing electrical service is located on the back of the building. The refuse will be located inside the building; #10 is okay and #11- they have pictures of signs that are lower than 10 feet.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Lynch to address #3 and #4.

Mr. Lynch stated that they talked with their tax consultant about this and they did not have an issue with it. It is a secondary elevation and is not visible from the street. They can certainly look at reducing this to a single opening. He believes that each opening is 36 feet of material that they are removing. They will be okay with shifting it to the center and have a double door with sidelights. Nothing is here now, but it will not be visible from the street.

Mr. Lynch said they are utilizing the openings on the interior of the building, but they can store the windows on site.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they are happy to see the rehabilitation of these buildings. They agree with all of staff's comments. The HSF is in favor of the project.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the height of the addition, the string course on the parapet, and the storefront base height on Building C. The Board found the intent of the commercial buildings height standard was met, since the addition is 10 feet tall including the height below the parapet. They found the height to be visually compatible for an addition. The Board also found that since the parapet would be minimally visible from the public right-of-

way that a string course was not required and, due to the design, would not be visually compatible. They also found that the intent of the storefront base standard was met with Building C, because historic images indicate that the storefront base height exceeded 24 inches. The applicant also indicated he would create one door opening to access the roof terrace.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations and the addition at 116 Whitaker Street to address the following conditions:

1. Provide colors, stains, and material samples;
2. No harsh treatments are used to remove the stucco or repoint the brick;
3. Reconsider the removal of the two windows on Building A. Staff recommends maintaining them in place if possible or storing them on site;
4. Restudy the design of the entrance to the rooftop terrace to reduce the loss of- PASS historic material;
5. Ensure that windows on the historic structures will be single pane;
6. Identify the location of the refuse areas, electrical vaults, meter boxes, and communications devices on the plan;
7. Provide a minimum of 10 feet of clearance above the sidewalk for the sign;
8. Provide details for the mounting of the sign.

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

Vote Results

Motion: Jennifer Deacon

Second: Keith Howington

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Nay
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Material Specifications.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Howington recused from participation in this petition. He is an employee of Homeline Architecture.

Mr. John Deering was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sara Farr gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for alterations to 427 Barnard Street. The following alterations are proposed:

- The north side of the porch will be extended 2 feet. The details will match the existing porch, and parts and pieces will be re-used.
- Demolition of the existing porch stairs on the west side. New stairs will be constructed on the west side with details that match the existing.
- On the west façade one door and one window will be removed. They will be replaced by a larger opening containing double French doors with a transom flanked by two tall windows.
- Two windows on the south side will be permanently shuttered.
- Three windows will be removed on the north façade and replaced with taller windows. The existing single French door with a transom will be removed and replaced with double French doors with a transom.

Ms. Farr reported that the staff recommends approval of the alterations to 427 Barnard Street with the condition that the shutter material is specified and approved by staff, because otherwise the work meets the standards and is visually compatible.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Deering said the shutters will be wood. He entertained questions from the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Gary Arthur of the Beehive Foundation said 427 Barnard was built in the late 1990s. They hold a conservation easement to the property. They have made it clear to the staff and petitioner that they do not give permission for the alterations to be done. Mr. Arthur read a statement that was prepared by the Beehive Foundation.

Ms. Zelda Tenenbaum stated that she was present as the first owner of 427 Barnard Street. She said her husband was present also. Harvey Jones was the original architect of 427 Barnard Street. Ms. Tenenbaum said that Mr. Deering is aware of the easement. She said they petitioned to do some alterations to the house, but were turned down because of the easement and they honored the decision. Ms. Tenenbaum asked the Board to remember the easement that the Beehive Foundation holds on this property.

Attorney Harold Yellin said the easement was not with the current petitioner, but with the Tenenbaums. When the petitioner purchased this property, the easement was not in the change of title. Attorney Yellin explained that this means there is no reference to

the easement in the deed; nor is there reference to the next owner. He said perhaps more importantly, if the Board looks at the actual Beehive's easement, there is no legal description and he has a copy. There is no exhibit A. The deed to the Tenenbaums was listed as 202-B, page 253 and the easement was 203-G, page 624.

Attorney Yellin said the easement is unenforceable. He asked the Board to approve the petition as it is visually compatible. They are mindful that they may have to fight this later. But, today this is not the forum to decide what is legal.

Mr. Merriman said the Review Board meeting is not the place to decide whether there is an easement or whether there is not an easement.

Ms. McClain stated the easement is not an issue for this Board. This has to be worked out between those parties.

Ms. Harris explained that the Board is deciding the case based on the ordinance and standards. The easement is a separate issue between the parties that are involved.

Ms. Caldwell asked why the easement matter was not worked out before the petition came to the Review Board.

Ms. Harris explained that there is no requirement that it be worked out. The petitioner has a right to apply to the Board at any point. If the Beehive Foundation has a legal right to tell the petitioner no, the project would not be able to move forward. She said they deal with the easement issue regularly with the Historic Savannah Foundation.

Mr. Sheldon Tenenbaum said Mr. Deering was well aware of the deed restrictions on 427 Barnard Street.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board approved the petition without conditions, because the petitioner specified the shutters would be constructed of wood.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review
does hereby approve the petition for alterations to - PASS
427 Barnard Street.

Vote Results

Motion: Andy McGarrity

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Becky Lynch - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

25. [Petition of Homeline Architecture | 16-002757-COA | 509 1/2 Tattnall Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial - Facing West.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Gaston Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Examples of Charleston Single House.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Examples in Savannah.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs and Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Mass Model.pdf](#)
Attachment: [16013_Supplemental Photographs.pdf](#)

Mr. Howington abstained from participation in this petition. He is an employee of Homeline Architecture.

Mr. John Deering was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for the construction of a two-story, single-family home on the vacant parcel located at 509 ½ Tattnall Street. Formally the side yard for the historic building located at 509 Tattnall Street, these parcels have recently been divided. The two car garage is within the footprint of the main building and is accessed from Jefferson Street.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval of the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for the construction of a two-story, single-family home on the vacant parcel located at 509 ½ Tattnall Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II, Design Details for review by the Board because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Redesign all of the fenestration on the front façade to be more compatible with visually related contributing buildings; this includes ensuring that each window meets the 5:3 ratio and add more voids to either side.
2. Redesign the front entrance configuration to be visually compatible with surrounding contributing buildings.
3. Increase the height of the second story to 10 feet minimum.
4. Ensure that the door frames are inset not less than 3 inches.
5. Redesign the front handrails to have balusters and a bottom rail and ensure that the height does not exceed 36 inches.
6. Ensure that the sloped apron to the garage doors is not on the public right-of-way and that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Deering stated that they believe the building that they have designed is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. There are many different buildings types in the area; new three story brick townhomes, new three story stucco townhouses, and small wooden cottages that are historically here. Mr. Deering said a lot is influencing this street. The façade that they have developed actually addresses this. They have been careful in trying to preserve the character of the neighborhood, but not mimicking or copying the 19 century houses in this ward. In responding to the one-story cottages on the left, they thought they would do the side entrances and keep it one story. He said regarding the 9 foot second story height, they intentionally violated the ordinance and reduced this a foot to keep it more in line with the blacksmith building next door. They want to keep the second floor 9 feet so that it corresponds better with the historic building next door. In the neighborhood directly across the street from the blacksmith shop is a house that was built as a two-flat apartment building; it has the triple windows that they have introduced on their house. They line up and have greater than the 5:3 ratio. The ordinance says that they can have windows that are grouped together as long as each one meets the 5:3 ratio. All of their windows meet the 5:3 ratio.

Mr. Deering showed the Board some side entrances that are in the ward. He pointed out that this is not an anomaly. They based the side entrance on the architectural elements that exist presently in the Historic District. The doorframes will be inset three inches from the façade. Mr. Deering said they would like to address the front handrails at the Design Details meeting next month. They will try to ensure that sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height, even though the sidewalk is discontinuous just south of this site. It does not continue at all.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with all of staff's recommendations. Ms. Meunier said they have heard the petitioners comments regarding the front façade and saw the examples. But, their concern is the façade needs to be broken up into bays as opposed to just a single bay. Having one big bay makes the massing appear to be larger as opposed to breaking it up with multiple window bays. Ms. Meunier said they believe that in some ways the 5:3 ratio is being met and paired windows are fine, but some of the examples that were used were all examples of projecting bay windows. Typically, an adjoining window bay created a little more rhythm. Therefore, they believe this is why the current configuration feels a little out of place.

Ms. Meunier said regarding the side façade, they suggest restudying the lighting pattern of the glazing and possibly simplify it a little more. They believe that the carriage houses are well-designed.

Mr. Deering in response to the public comments, said they intentionally did not want to build a three bay house with the front façade and the punched openings for reasons he said earlier. They wanted to have a fresh approach. The windows meet the 5:3 ratio and group windows are permitted by ordinance. He believes they have done a good job; and he believes further that the spandrels help and differentiate this house as a new house from the historic house. Mr. Deering said they would like for the Board to consider the elevation

and project that they have presented.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The majority of the Board members believed the height is not visually compatible. The side elevation could use some refinement. They agreed with the staff's recommendations. There are some items that need to be addressed in Part II - Design Details.

Mr. Merriman asked if the 10 feet height minimum is required by ordinance.

Ms. Michalak answered yes. A variance would be needed for the building to be 9 feet as requested by the petitioner. She explained that the foundation height of the building could be lowered to be more compatible with the other buildings.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the construction of a two-story, single-family home on the vacant parcel located at 509 ½ Tattnell Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II, Design Details for review by the Board because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Redesign all of the fenestration on the front façade to be more compatible with visually related contributing buildings; this includes ensuring that each window meets the 5:3 ratio and add more voids to either side. - PASS
2. Increase the height of the second story to 10 feet minimum.
3. Ensure that the door frames are inset not less than 3 inches.
4. Redesign the front handrails to have balusters and a bottom rail and ensure that the height does not exceed 36 inches.
5. Ensure that the sloped apron to the garage doors is not on the public right-of-way and that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

Vote Results

Motion: Dr. Betsy Dominguez

Second: Andy McGarrity

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye

Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Nay
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

26. [Petition of Homeline Architecture | 16-002758-COA | 20 West Jones Street | Alterations, Additions, and New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass Carriage House](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Context.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Mr. Merriman explained that this petition is requesting to build a carriage house. It is connected to the main house with a hyphen. The petitioner believes the carriage house comes under the ordinance as an addition since it is connected to the main house. Typically, the Board has in the past reviewed carriage houses, even those connected with a hyphen, as new construction. This means that it has to be reviewed in two parts. This means that a requirement for the petitioner's package to be complete is that there be a mass model. There is no mass model before the Board today. Therefore, technically, this is an incomplete package. However, the petitioner has agreed that if the Board will hear the presentation, give him feedback, and he will ask for a continuance and come back before the Board the next time with Parts I and II. He will come back with his model to complete Part I [the Board will not hear Part II without the model].

Ms. McClain said in the past, the Board has not heard a request without a complete application.

Mr. Merriman explained that an incomplete package usually does not get this far as it would automatically be continued. But, since this is a different and unique situation, the wording is a little vague and there were some misunderstanding, he as chair made the decision to hear this petition. Nevertheless, the Board has the right to override his decision. If 2/3 majority of the Board members vote not to hear the petition today, then it will not be heard.

Mr. McGarrity asked staff if there is a good reason for the Board to hear the petition today.

Ms. Harris explained that when the petitioner submitted the application, he believed it was an addition. Staff disagreed and believed it was a Part I - Height and Mass issue. They discussed this with Mr. Merriman who agreed with staff. Ms. Harris said she informed the petitioner that the Board would have to review the petition as Part I application. They have had discussions back and forth about how it was to be reviewed. Ultimately, it is the Chair's call that it is being reviewed as new construction. There were some mitigating factors that the petitioner did believe that it was an addition and, therefore, a mass model was not required. She explained that the staff is comfortable going forward without the mass model provided that the mass model is submitted to the Board before a vote is taken on Part I - Height and Mass.

Mr. Deering said there is nothing in the ordinance that defines an addition or new construction. The only place a definition is mentioned of an addition is in the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. He explained that their proposed addition at 20 West Jones Street is not equal to or greater than the size of the existing structure. Therefore, it is an addition. It is not unclear, it is written in the instructions in the application. They meet the one definition; therefore, they wanted it to be heard as an addition.

Mr. Deering said Ms. Harris and he talked; Ms. Harris said the carriage house portion would be heard as Part I and Part II. He disagreed. There are other aspects to the project; it is not just new construction. There will be alterations to the main house. Mr. Merriman and he discussed hearing the application with the alterations and Part I - Height and Mass - he did not want a continuance, but a vote on the alterations, but would bring the model back for Part II.

Mr. McGarrity moved that the Board hear the petition today. This was seconded by Dr. Dominguez. The motion passed 7 to 1. [Ms. McClain opposed].

NOTE: Mr. Howington abstained from participation in this petition. He is an employee of Homeline Architecture.

Mr. John Deering was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations to the main building, additions to the main building, and Part I, Height and Mass of a two-story carriage house which is attached to the addition for the property located at 20 West Jones Street.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for the alterations and additions to the main building for the property located at 20 West Jones 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. Incorporate some kind of break between the corner of the historic building and the new elevator addition.
- b. Retain windows (and other architectural features) on site that are proposed to be removed on the rear façade for possible future reversal of the work.
- c. Provide a stucco color selection and finish texture, clarify paint color locations and provide physical samples, and provide a metal roof color sample.
- d. Do not enclose the 3rd floor of the historic side porch.

Ms. Michalak reported additionally that staff recommends approval for a carriage house, New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for the property located at 20 West Jones Street as requested because the proposed work is other visually compatible and meets the standards.

Dr. Dominguez asked if there is an issue with lot coverage for the carriage house.

Ms. Michalak explained that the standard is met. The Development Standards existing lot coverage is 34%, the proposed lot coverage is 61% and 75% is permitted.

Ms. Deacon asked if the Board would have two separate votes on this issue.

Mr. Merriman explained that he would be okay with voting on Part I Height and Mass if the motion states that hearing Part II is contingent upon the mass model coming back. If it does not come back, the Board will not hear Part II without the model.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Deering entertained questions from the Board.

Ms. Deacon asked Mr. Deering if he was in agreement with the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Deering stated that they are okay with 1.a; 1.b; and 1.c. He said 1.d, they understand the enclosing of the side porch is not allowed in the ordinance, but they would like to have permission to put the louvers in the end bay of the porch which is actually a common feature in the Historic District for houses of this period and style.

Mr. Merriman asked staff if the louvers enclosure is not permitted in the ordinance. He is sure he has seen this.

Ms. Michalak explained that the ordinance permits historic porches to be enclosed with shutters, but not windows. Staff did not believe that just the upper floor enclosure was compatible as it makes the side porch top heavy. Technically, however, per a design standard, shutters can be done.

Ms. Lynch asked would it be an option to add operable louvers to both floors.

Mr. Deering said they would be in agreement of having operable louvers to both floors. They have done this on other projects.

Ms. Deacon asked the petitioner if he is willing to not have windows on the other portion of the porch.

Mr. Deering said they wanted the Board to hear this so they could get their feedback. However, they understand that glass side porches are not looked upon favorably.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mrs. Staci Donnagen said she, her husband and children live on Jones Street. They are in agreement with this proposal. Mrs. Donnagen asked the Board to give the petition their careful consideration.

Mr. Bill Hale encouraged the Board to approve the petition.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The mass model must be presented in Part II - Design Details. Mr. Deering agreed to putting operable shutters on both floors of the front façade.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

1. Approve alterations and additions to the main

building for the property located at 20 West Jones 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. Incorporate some kind of break between the corner of the historic building and the new elevator addition.
- b. Retain windows (and other architectural features) on site that are proposed to be removed on the rear façade for possible future reversal of the work.
- c. Provide a stucco color selection and finish texture, clarify paint color locations and provide physical samples, and provide a metal roof color sample.
- d. Remove the glass enclosure from the 3rd floor porch and add shutters to the front of the 2nd floor porch.

- PASS

2. Approval for a carriage house, New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for the property located at 20 West Jones Street with the following condition because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:
 - a. Provide a mass model with Part II, Design Details.

Vote Results

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

27. [Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 16-002982-COA | 301 West Congress Street | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Becky Lynch recused from participation in this request. She is an employee of Lynch Associates Architects.

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

Ms. Farr gave the staff presentation. The applicant is requesting approval for alterations to 301 West Congress Street. The alterations include changes to the design of the Congress Street Entrance and various façade alterations including new windows.

Conditions and changes from the previous approval (15-006606-COA) have also been addressed including the following:

1. Provide specifications, material samples, and color samples for the metal railing along the roof, windows, composite elements, doors, decorative metal railing, metal canopy, louvers, shutters, and the outdoor fireplace on the addition for staff approval.

This information has not been provided.

2. Provide all window dimensions.

All window dimensions are provided on the plans.

3. Ensure that the muntins are not wider than 7/8 inch.

This information was not provided for all windows.

4. Provide screening details for staff approval.

The rooftop equipment will be screened by a new parapet added to the match the north and east elevations.

5. Provide the inset for the storefront windows and overhead doors on the addition.

Insets for the storefront windows and overhead doors were not provided.

6. Redesign the entrance on Congress Street so that it does not read as enclosed porch and is visually compatible.

The Congress Street entry has been redesigned. It will have a flat roof, wood and glass double door with transoms and sidelights, and wood paneling.

7. Restudy the “porch” proposed along Jefferson Street to be more commercial in nature.

The originally proposed two story “porch” on the Jefferson Street façade was modified to be an enclosed space with windows and doors. The fixed louvers have been removed. The second story has four aluminum clad pairs of French doors

with railings. The first floor louvers and entry door have been replaced with wood and glass double doors.

Ms. Farr said the following alterations are also proposed:

- The tower element has a flat roof. It was previously rounded;
- The south façade now includes only two windows on the upper level. They will be aluminum clad casement windows sized 6 feet by 5 feet located at each end of the façade. The previously proposed fixed louvers have been replaced by an aluminum clad fixed window with a fixed transom window above;
- The louvers have been extended slightly on the addition, and the design of the window on the east façade modified to match the new casement windows with transoms. There also appears to be a door proposed on the east façade, but the remaining elements are the same as previously approved;
- On the east façade, the three windows on the first floor are now aluminum clad casement windows with a transom style fixed window above. One of the windows is also proposed for the side of the Congress Street entrance with a wood panel under it.

Ms. Farr reported that staff recommends approval of the alterations and the rooftop addition at 301 West Congress Street with the following conditions to be submitted for staff approval:

1. Provide specifications, material samples, and color samples for the metal railing along the roof, windows, composite elements, doors, decorative metal railing, metal canopy, louvers, shutters, new door on the addition, downspouts, and the outdoor fireplace on the addition;
2. Ensure that the muntins are not wider than 7/8 inch;
3. Provide the inset for the storefront windows and overhead doors on the addition;
4. Incorporate a string course on the new parapet;
5. Restudy the design of the windows with a fixed transom style window and shutters on the first floor;
6. Redesign the entrance on Congress Street so it does not project or read as an enclosed porch and is visually compatible;

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

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lynch stated that he wanted to clarify item 1 as it appears that several of the items relates to the approval they received in December 2015. He knows they need to provide the staff some cut-sheets, but he does not want to open up the discussion for the items that they have already gotten approval for. Mr. Lynch said items 2 and 3, they will address the notes on their drawings to ensure that they meet the 7/8 muntins and storefront. He said they will provide the stringcourse as stated in item 4. He believes their biggest issues are with item 5 and 6.

Mr. Lynch said they looked at quite a number of window configurations and the reason they changed from the configuration they previously submitted was due to their having trouble finding a casement window large enough to met the impact requirements. They looked at

other options and took precedence from across the street from their building which has a double hung window with a fixed casement. It is setback from the street and a porch is here. This is the exactly the same configuration they want with a larger casement fixed window with a transom above. Mr. Lynch said they found multiple examples of this configuration throughout the district. Therefore, they would like for the Board to reconsider this issue.

Mr. Lynch said the greater issue for them is the entry vestibule. This is an odd property as the rest of all the other properties along the street are set up at the property line, zero lot line. This is a newer building that was built in 1972 and is setback from the street. A porch is here now and they were not really looking at it as an enclosed porch as they were looking at it as an entry vestibule. They looked at a couple of examples throughout the Historic District. There is a one-story entry vestibule building on the square. Across the lane is a two-story building with a similar concept. He said around the corner the Planter's Inn entry is a one-story entry vestibule. All of these buildings had matching materials. Therefore, they could consider their project converting from a composite material to probably stucco. Their recollection from the previous meeting, the issue was for the Review Board and HSF were that the doors were opening to the side instead of the street. Therefore, modified this so there were front entry doors and they lowered the roof to be a flat roof. Originally, they had a vaulted roof that they thought would differentiate it so that instead of looking like a porch, it would look like a vestibule. Mr. Lynch said they believe this is an important element and will actually bring the property to the street where they think it should be.

Mr. McGarrity asked what is the projection (depth) off the face of the building to the face of the door.

Mr. Lynch said is approximately 6 feet. He said essentially they did not want any windows overlooking into the lane, but they could alter the layout and put a fixed louver or something else with a window recess if the staff and Board find this more acceptable. They did not want to add a lot of windows here that would be overlooking into the service lane.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the conditions considering the fact that the building is not historic and is an unusual design. They found the window design, including the fixed transom, to be visually compatible and meeting the intent of the standards due to these factors. They also found the redesigned Congress Street entrance to be visually compatible.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations and the rooftop addition at 301 West Congress Street with the following conditions to be submitted for staff approval:

1. Provide specifications, material samples, and color samples for the metal railing along the roof, windows, composite elements, doors,

decorative metal railing, metal canopy, louvers, shutters, new door on the addition, downspouts, and the outdoor fireplace on the addition; - PASS

2. Ensure that the muntins are not wider than 7/8 inch;
3. Provide the inset for the storefront windows and overhead doors on the addition;
4. Incorporate a string course on the new parapet;

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

Vote Results

Motion: Dr. Betsy Dominguez
Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Nay
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

28. [Petition of Sottile & Sottile | 14-005099-COA | 215 West Broughton Street | New Construction One Year Extension](#)

- Attachment: [Staff Recommendation - Extension.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Request for one year extension.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [COA - 215 West Broughton Street 14-005099-COA Approved With Conditions.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet- reduced size.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. McGarrity abstained from participation in this request as he is involved in the project.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic Board of Review Does hereby approve 12 months extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) issued on July 8, 2015 for new construction at 215 West Broughton Street [File No. 14-005099-COA]. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington
Second: Jennifer Deacon
Debra Caldwell - Aye
Jennifer Deacon - Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye
Kellie Fletcher - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Becky Lynch - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Andy McGarrity - Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

29. [Petition of Grant Tallon | 16-002591-COA | 428 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Solar Panels](#)

Attachment: [COA - 428 Bull Street 16-002591-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 428 Bull Street 16-002591-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Laura Potts-Wirht | 16-002666-COA | 543 and 547 East Perry Street](#)

Attachment: [COA - 543 and 547 East Perry Street 16-002666-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 543 and 547 East Perry Street 16-002666-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Amended Petition of Luis Burgos for Hansen Architects, P.C. | 16-002685-COA | 25 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Alterations and Rehabilitation](#)

Attachment: [COA - 25 East Broughton Street 16-002685-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 25 East Broughton Street 16-002685-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Paul Miller | 16-002688-COA | 224 Houston Street | Staff Approved - Stucco Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 224 Houston Street 16-002688-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 224 Houston Street 16-002688-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of David "Luke" Gabelman | 16-002714-COA | 518-520 Blair Street | Staff Approved - Roof, New Door, Remove Planter](#)

Attachment: [COA - 518-520 Blair Street 16-002714-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 518-520 Blair Street 16-002714-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Glenn Wood for Coastal Canvas Products | 16-002723-COA | 404 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 404 West Broughton Street 16-002723-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 404 West Broughton Street 16-002723-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Rebecca Fenick for Lominack Kolman Smith Architects | 16-002748-COA | 660 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Wall Modification](#)

Attachment: [COA - 660 East Broughton Street 16-002748-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 660 East Broughton Street 16-002748-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Edell Parker III | 16-002751-COA | 201 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Stucco Repairs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 201 East Broughton Street 16-002751-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 East Broughton Street 16-002751-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Shell Solomon | 16-002808-COA | 32 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 32 Bull Street 16-002808-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 32 Bull Street 16-002808-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Amended Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 16-002811-COA | 214 Drayton Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 214 Drayton Street 16-002811-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 214 Drayton Street 16-002811-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of Debra Caldwell | 16-002839-COA | 223 East Jones Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 223 East Jones Street 16-002839-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 223 East Jones Street 16-002839-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Petition of Todd Mayo for Pioneer Construction, Inc. | 16-002904-COA | 22 West Harris Street | Staff Approved - Existing Brick Privacy Wall](#)

Attachment: [COA - 22 West Harris Street 16-002904-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 22 West Harris Street 16-002904-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. [Petition of Gene Leagon | 16-002905-COA | 124 Abercorn Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repairs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 124 Abercorn Street 16-002905-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 124 Abercorn Street 16-002905-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. [Petition of Paul Conroy for Coastal Canvas Products | 16-003120-COA | 124 Abercorn Street | Staff Approved - Awnings](#)

Attachment: [COA - 124 Abercorn Street 16-003120-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 124 Abercorn Street 16-003120-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. [Petition of D. Rushing for Coastal Canvas Products | 16-003124-COA | 605 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Awnings](#)

Attachment: [COA - 605 West Oglethorpe Avenue 16-003124-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 605 West Oglethorpe Avenue 16-003124-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. [Petition of Gregg Turner for Cornerstone Minerals, LLC | 16-003169-COA | 31 West Congress Street | Staff Approved - Storefront Changes](#)

Attachment: [COA - 31 West Congress Street 16-003169-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 31 West Congress Street 16-003169-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

45. [Petition of Martin Smith for SCAD | 16-003177-COA | 201 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Color Changes and Light Fixtures](#)

Attachment: [COA - 201 West Oglethorpe Avenue 16-003177-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 West Oglethorpe Avenue 16-003177-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 6-8-16.pdf](#)

Mr. Merriman reported that staff has given the Board a report on the work performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

47. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, June 16, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

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

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

49. [Election of Vice-Chair](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the nomination of Justin Gunther as Vice-Chair. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Debra Caldwell

Second: Keith Howington

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Andy McGarrity - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

50. [Review Proposed Revisions to the Historic District Ordinance](#)

Attachment: [SHD Large Scale Development Archaeology Policy - DRAFT 5-9-16.pdf](#)

Attachment: [SHD Large Scale Development Public Art Policy - DRAFT 5-9-](#)

[16.pdf](#)

Attachment: [5-11-16 HDBR Version- for discussion.pdf](#)

Mr. Merriman reminded the Board members to give a donation towards the purchase of a gift for the outgoing Board members.

Ms. McClain informed the Board that she will not be present at the July 13, 2016 Board meeting due to business travel.

The Board unanimously agreed to continue the discussion of the review proposed revisions to the Historic District Ordinance to a future date.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

51. [Adjournment](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, Mr. Merriman adjourned the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen Harris
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem