



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
January 13, 2016 1:00 P.M.  
Meeting Minutes

**January 13, 2016 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING**

**HDRB Members Present:** Stephen Merriman, Jr., Chair  
Debra Caldwell  
Justin Gunther  
Dr. Nicholas Henry  
Keith Howington  
Zena McClain, Esq.  
Tess Scheer  
Dr. Robin Williams

**HDRB Members Not Present:** Marjorie Wiebe-Reed, Vice -Chair  
Andy McGarrity  
Ebony Simpson

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

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

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

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

**II. SIGN POSTING**

### III. CONSENT AGENDA

2. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 15-006490-COA | 417 Whitaker Street | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 417 Whitaker Street.pdf](#)

#### Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the projecting principal use sign at 417 Whitaker Street with the condition that it is installed into the mortar, because otherwise it meets the standards and is - PASS visually compatible.

#### Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Keith Howington

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

3. [Petition of Spartina 449 | 15-006598-COA | 317 West Broughton Street | Signs and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

#### Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations and signs for the property located at 317 West Broughton Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

#### Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams  
Second: Keith Howington  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Aye  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain  
Tess Scheer - Aye  
Robin Williams - Aye

4. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 15-006600-COA | 611 East Bay Street | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 611 East Bay Street.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the projecting principal use sign at 611 East Bay Street, because it meets the standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams  
Second: Keith Howington  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Aye  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain  
Tess Scheer - Aye  
Robin Williams - Aye

5. [Petition of Hansen Architects | 15-006714-COA | 25 East Broughton Street | Amendment to Alterations](#)

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

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review

does hereby approve the petition to amend a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations and rehabilitation of the building located at 25 East Broughton Street as requested because the proposed changes are visually - PASS compatible and meet the standards.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Keith Howington

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

**IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

6. [Approval Adoption of the Agenda January 13, 2016](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review hereby approve the Adoption of January 13, 2016 Agenda. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Justin Gunther

Debra Caldwell - Not Present

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

**V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

7. [Approve December 9, 2015 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [12-09-2015 Minutes.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

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

**Vote Results**

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

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

**VII. CONTINUED AGENDA**

8. [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 request. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington  
Second: Tess Scheer  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Aye  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain  
Tess Scheer - Aye  
Robin Williams - Aye

9. [Petition of Dawson Architects | 15-006113-COA | 321 Montgomery Street | New Construction Part 2: 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: Keith Howington

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

10. [Petition of Lawrence Raymond Daiss III | 15-006543-COA | 317B West Broughton 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: Keith Howington

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

**VIII. REGULAR AGENDA**

11. [Petition of Homeline Architecture | 14-005945-COA | 9-15 East Macon Street | Request for Board Clarification- Brick Selection](#)

Attachment: [14-005945-COA Request for Board Clarification- Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Original proposed brick.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Newly proposed brick.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Petitioner's Presentation.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Revised submittal packet- drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [COA - 9 - 15 East Macon Street 14-0005945-COA 2-11-15.pdf](#)

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

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

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting Board clarification on a condition of approval for Part 2: Design Details for new construction of four, four-story townhomes with raised stoops located between Macon and Charlton Streets, and between Bull and Drayton Streets. The original brick proposed was Cherokee's "Old Savannah Brick." A condition of the February 11, 2015 approval stated, "revise the brick to one with a more refined texture." The petitioner provided a sample of the revised brick, which is the same brick with a more refined edge, to staff for review and approval. Staff did not feel that it met the condition of the approval and suggested the Board provide further clarification.

**Ms. Harris** stated that on January 14, 2015 the Board approved Part 1: Height and Mass with conditions and on February 11, 2015 the Board approved Part 2: Design Details with conditions. The Board also recommended approval of the variance from the 75% lot coverage requirement to allow 100% coverage and the variance from the 30 foot structured parking setback from Charlton Street to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends that the Board provide additional clarification as to whether or not the revised brick meets the standards for "a more refined brick."

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Deering** stated that they believed that the simulated (new) Savannah Grey brick was still the right model for the row houses. The bricks blend well with the neighborhood. There are many existing historic structures within this ward that has this particular brick. He said in their search, as Dr. Williams stated during the last presentation of this project for something more refined, they did not feel that this was the right direction when other projects in this area was done with the new Savannah Grey brick. Consequently, they felt the bricks were appropriate.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Deering if the bricks were manufactured by the same vendor.

**Mr. Deering** answered yes. The vendor is doing a more refined run of the bricks.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the bricks will be made especially for this request.

**Mr. Deering** answered yes. They will construct a 4 x 4 sample wall for staff to review.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed that the selected bricks were of an appropriate design and more contemporary in nature. They were pleased that the petitioner responded to their concern.

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the revised brick sample for the four new row houses at 9-15 East Macon Street. **PASS** because it meets the condition of a “more refined brick” and is visually compatible.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Nicholas Henry

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

12. [Petition of Hansen Architects | 15-002710-COA | 256 East Perry Street | New Construction, Part II: Design Details \(North Building\)](#)

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

Attachment: [Model Photographs.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Petitioners Presentation.pdf](#)

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

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

**Ms. Harris** stated that Part 1: Height and Mass was reviewed by the Historic District Board of Review on June 10, 2015 and was continued at the request of the petitioner. The Zoning Board of Appeals granted a variance for the mechanical and access structures to be contained within the additional story on July 23, 2015 with the condition that the structures not be visible from the immediately adjacent streets, though not from the public right-of-



way generally (15-003565-ZBA).

**Ms. Harris** explained that Part 1: Height and Mass was reviewed again and approved by the HDBR on August 12, 2015 with conditions. She said that revisions to Part I: Height and Mass and Part II: Design Details were reviewed by the HDBR on December 9, 2015 and was continued at the request of the petitioner in order to address the following:

1. This building is part of a larger development with the parcel to the south, and both buildings contain very similar detailing and design. Incorporate additional differentiation in detailing and design between the two buildings, as per the condition of the Part 1: Height and Mass approval on August 12, 2015. [The Board noted that varying the materials and other design elements may be sufficient to meet the condition.]

*The condition has been met. The design has been revised to provide alternate window detailing incorporated at the jambs, sills and heads of the windows. The petitioner intends to provide additional differences through signage, lighting, etc. at a future HDBR submittal.*

2. Reduce the overall height of the building from 77'6" to 72'10" (four feet, four inches total) on the rooftop structures. The height of the tallest rooftop structure will be 16'6" above the top of the parapet. Staff does not believe the height of the rooftop structure is visually compatible. Additionally, staff does not believe that the intent of the Zoning Board of Appeals condition has been met.

*The intent of the condition has been met. The overall height of the building has been reduced from 77'6" to 74'4." The height of the elevator penthouse has been reduced from 16'6" to 14'4."*

3. Increase the number of entrances on the north and east elevations to be both visually compatible and meet the standards which require one entrance per 60 linear feet of frontage and at intervals not to exceed 90 feet.

*The condition has been met. The number of entrances on the north elevation has increased from two to three. The number on entrances on the east elevation has increased from one to three.*

4. Change the two hanging swings along the south, Perry Street, façade, into benches.

*The condition has been met. The hanging swings on the south façade have been eliminated.*

5. Increase the height of the base on the rectangular storefronts to at least 18 inches to meet the standard. [This concern was resolved based on the petitioner's presentation that, due to the site's elevation change, the average height of the storefront will be 18 inches.]

*This was addressed and resolved at the December meeting.*

6. Revise the arched storefronts to extend from a sill or base to meet the standard. [This concern was resolved based on the petitioner's presentation that, due to the site's elevation change, the average height of the storefront will be 18 inches.]

*The condition has been met. The arched storefronts extend from a base.*

7. Revise both the ground floor plan uses and add additional exterior entrances to ensure that all street fronting elevations have active uses with individual primary exterior entrances to qualify for a bonus story.

*The condition has been met. An additional entrance has been added to the McDonough Street façade into the kitchen. Additional entrances have also been added to the east façade, providing access to the meeting rooms and library.*

8. Provide the following information:
  - a. A sample of the translucent acrylic panels and aluminum louvers;

*The condition has been met. Glass is proposed instead of acrylic and a sample will be provided to staff when finalized. A sample of the aluminum louvers has been provided.*

- b. A section through the arched storefronts;

*The condition has been met. A section has been provided.*

- c. The height of the proposed trellis.

*The condition has been met. The height of the proposed trellis has been provided.*

9. Revise the model to reflect the revised design.

*The condition has been met. The model has been revised to reflect the current design.*

10. Reconsider the color and material change on floors 2-5 at the pilasters.

*The condition has been met. The horizontal band of cast stone has been incorporated between the first and second floor, dividing the pilasters. Additionally, a feathering treatment in the masonry reduces the taper from the first floor to the second floor and the fourth floor to the parapet.*

11. Consider revising the design of the window surrounds so as to not invoke shutters.

*The petitioner has stated, "the reduction of the masonry feathering has lessened the overly rusticated feel of the upper stories, which was of concern to the board."*

**Ms. Harris** stated that other elements of the project have been revised as follows:

- The two entrances on the west, Drayton Street façade, have been revised to three;
- The design of the awning on the south, McDonough Street façade, has been simplified;
- The pilasters on floors three and four are smooth.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the revisions to Part I: Height and Mass and Part II: Design Details of the project at 256 East Perry Street with the condition that a sample of the translucent acrylic panels or glass, when finalized, is provided to staff for review and approval, because the project is visually compatible and meets the standards.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Phelps** stated that with the staff's recommendation of approval, he would respond to

questions from the Board.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**None.**

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the revisions to Part I: Height and Mass and Part II: Design Details of the project at 256 East McDonough Street with the condition that a sample of the translucent acrylic panels or glass, when finalized, is provided to staff for review and approval, because the project is visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Keith Howington

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

13. [Petition of Hansen Architects | 15-002751-COA | 255 East Perry Street | New Construction, Part II: Design Details \(South Building\)](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 15-002751-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Model Photographs.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Petitioner's presentation.pdf](#)

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

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

share similar detailing and design, but will be reviewed separately.

**Ms. Harris** stated that Part 1: Height and Mass was reviewed by the Historic District Board of Review on June 10, 2015 and was continued at the request of the petitioner. The Zoning Board of Appeals granted a variance for one story above the Height Map on July 23, 2015 with the condition that the sixth floor not be visible from the immediately adjacent streets, though not from the public right-of-way generally (15-003574-ZBA).

**Ms. Harris** said that Part 1: Height and Mass was reviewed again and approved by the HDBR on August 12, 2015 with conditions. She stated that revisions to Part I: Height and Mass and Part II: Design Details were reviewed by the HDBR on December 9, 2015 and was continued at the request of the petitioner in order to address the following:

1. This building is part of a larger development with the parcel to the north, and both buildings contain very similar detailing and design. Incorporate additional differentiation in detailing and design between the two buildings, as per the condition of the Part 1: Height and Mass approval on August 12, 2015. [The Board noted that varying the materials and other design elements may be sufficient to meet the condition.]

*The condition has been met. The design has been revised to provide alternate window detailing incorporated at the jambs, sills and heads of the windows. The petitioner intends to provide additional differences through signage, lighting, etc. at a future HDBR submittal.*

2. Contain the mechanical equipment within the sixth story and eliminate the screening to reduce the structure to the previously approved height, to meet the intent of and be consistent with the Zoning Board of Appeals condition and the requirement that mechanical systems be contained within the bonus story.

*The condition has been met. The mechanical equipment has been contained within the sixth story and the screening eliminated.*

3. Increase the number of entrances on the east elevation to be both visually compatible and meet the standards which require one entrance per 60 linear feet of frontage.

*The condition has been meet. Two additional entrances have been added to the east, Floyd Street, façade.*

4. Change the two hanging swings along the north, Perry Street, façade, into benches.

*The condition has been met. The hanging swings on the south façade have been eliminated.*

5. Increase the height of the base on the rectangular storefronts to at least 18 inches to meet the standard. [This concern was resolved based on the petitioner's presentation that, due to the site's elevation change, the average height of the storefront will be 18 inches.]

*This was addressed and resolved at the December meeting.*

6. Revise the arched storefront to extend from a sill or base to meet the standard. [This concern was resolved based on the petitioner's presentation that, due to the site's elevation change, the average height of the storefront will be 18 inches.]

*The condition has been met. The arched storefronts extend from a base.*

7. Revise both the ground floor plan uses and add additional exterior entrances to ensure that all street fronting elevations have active uses with individual primary exterior entrances to qualify for a bonus story.

*The condition has been met. Additional entrances have been added to the east façade, providing access to the meeting room.*

8. Provide the following information:
  - a. A sample of the translucent acrylic panels and aluminum louvers;

*The condition has been met. Glass is proposed instead of acrylic and a sample will be provided to staff when finalized. A sample of the aluminum louvers has been provided.*

- b. A section through the arched storefronts;

*The condition has been met. A section has been provided.*

- c. The total heights of all rooftop structures;

*The condition has been met. The height of the rooftop structures has been provided.*

- d. The width of the curb cut;

*The condition has been met. The width of the curb cuts are 14 feet wide.*

- e. The driveway material.

*The condition has been met. The driveway material is concrete.*

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

*The condition has not been met. The sidewalk does not serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway in configuration and height.*

10. Revise the model to reflect the revised design.

*The condition has been met. The model has been revised to reflect the current design.*

11. Reconsider the color and material change on floors 2-5 at the pilasters.

*The condition has been met. The horizontal band of cast stone has been incorporated between the first and second floor, dividing the pilasters. Additionally, a feathering treatment in the masonry reduces the taper from the first floor to the second floor and the fourth floor to the parapet.*

12. Consider revising the design of the window surrounds so as to not invoke shutters.

*The condition has been met. The masonry feathering at the window jambs has been removed.*

**Ms. Harris** explained that other elements of the project have been revised as follows:

- The design of the awning on the south, McDonough Street façade, has been simplified;
- The pilasters on floors three and four are smooth.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the revisions to Part I: Height and Mass and Part II: Design Details of the project at 255 East Perry Street with the condition that the site plan is revised to ensure that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveways in materials, configuration and height; and provide a sample of the translucent acrylic panels or glass, when finalized, is provided to staff for review and approval, because the project is visually compatible and meets the standards.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Phelps** said they will meet with Traffic Engineering and the staff about the sidewalk and come to a resolution. The Ordinance states that the driveway that crosses the sidewalk has to be equal in height and material and configuration in height. The sidewalk ramps down to the level of the entry drive; the sidewalk and the driveway are concrete. The sidewalk is actually at the lower level of the driveway. The transition is level and will be continuous with concrete across the entire drive entry. Mr. Phelps said that Traffic Engineering has an issue with tailoring and they reverse this and have the drive ramp up onto the sidewalk. There is a safety issue with traffic entering onto the sidewalk. However, a determination needs to be made. They are looking at a granite block, but not cobblestone that you would see on River Street.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**None.**

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board's discussion centered around their support of the staff's recommendation.

#### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the revisions to Part I: Height and Mass and Part II: Design Details of the project at 255 East McDonough Street with the following conditions:

1. Revise the site plan to ensure that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveways in materials, configuration and height; - PASS
2. Provide a sample of the translucent acrylic panels or glass, when finalized;

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

**Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 15-005563-COA.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Monterey Ward.pdf](#)

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

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

**Mr. Jon Leonard** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for Part 1: Height and Mass for new construction of a carriage house, a third story addition to an existing two-story addition at the rear the main house, and a two-story hyphen connecting the main house to the carriage house. This application was reviewed by the Historic District Board of Review on November 12, 2015. The Board approved rehabilitation of the main house and demolition of the non-contributing buildings at the lane. The Board continued the request for the additions and carriage house at the petitioner's request in order to address the following:

1. Provide the following information:
  - a. All setbacks on site plan,
  - b. Overall height of the second floor addition,
  - c. Overall height of the hyphen addition,
  - d. The heights and widths of all windows and doors,
  - e. The roof pitches,
  - f. The width of the garage openings,
  - g. Locations of electrical meters, HVAC units, or refuse storage areas.

*The condition has been met. The information has been provided.*

2. On the addition to the second floor of the main house, retain the west window in place,

retain the center window on site, and retain the east window in place;

*The condition has been met. The windows will be retained as recommended.*

3. On the west façade of the carriage house, reduce the second story windows to the same height as the windows on the second floor of the south façade;

*The condition has been met. The second story windows have been reduced in height.*

4. On the west façade of the carriage house, the first floor windows appear to be false windows in the floor plan. Either eliminate, cover with shutters, or establish true openings;

*The condition has been met. The first floor windows have been replaced with recessed infilled openings.*

5. Restudy the proportions and configurations of the windows on the upper portions of the east façade of the addition and the north facade of the carriage house which will be visible above the fence from East Gordon Street;

*The condition has been met. The window openings have been revised.*

6. Where the proposed carriage house is divided to read as two structures by the eastern portion stepping back from the western portion; either break the roofline as well or accommodate a massing break on the same plane;

*The condition has been met. The massing break in the carriage house is also incorporated into the roofline.*

7. Restudy the roof configuration on the north façade of the carriage house which features a flat roof addition to the side gable roof which will be visible from Gordon Street;

*The condition has been met. The roof shape has been revised.*

8. Reduce the carriage house chimney in size and scale.

*The condition has been met. The carriage house chimney has been eliminated.*

Additional revisions include reducing the number of garage doors from five to four, and revising the roof shape of the second story addition and the carriage house to flat with parapet.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval for Part 1: Height and Mass for new construction of a carriage house and two additions with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II: Design Details:

1. Revise the window configuration on the east façade of the addition, second floor, to meet the 5:3 horizontal ratio;
2. Revise the picture window on the east façade of the addition to be one of the window types allowed;
3. Revise the relationship between the string course and lintels on the north façade of



the carriage house avoid the string course intersecting with the lintels.

4. Should the HVAC units be visible, provide additional screening.
5. Revise the refuse storage area to be located within the building or screened from the public right-of-way.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Leonard** stated that they do not have an issue with revising the window in the kitchen area to multi windows instead of just one large window. This would create the same affect. He agreed that the string course that goes across the back of the carriage house is conflicting. They do not have an issue with either raising the string course or eliminating it. The intent was to create a horizontal line completely around the house. He said they do not believe that the HVAC units will be seen from Gordon Street or Gordon Lane. But, they are not opposed to putting notes in the drawing packets that if there is a condition they will provide a detail to cover the units up so that they will not be seen.

**Mr. Leonard** agreed that the refuse containers do not meet the criteria; however, if you look up and down the lane, you will see that they are on an adjacent lane and are no different than anybody else. They want to maintain what is already existing in the neighborhood. He entertained questions from the Board.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they agree with the staff's recommendations, particularly, to revise the window as the petitioner has addressed. They feel that the design of the carriage house is improved. But, they have a concern with the proposed hyphen. The HSF feels that the design obstructs the traditional configuration of the main house, courtyard, and carriage house. They have stated this in previous petitions, but in this case particularly it is directly on the Whitaker Street side as opposed to the interior of the lot. Consequently, you lose the distinction between the main house and the carriage house. Therefore, the HSF prefers to see at a minimum that the hyphen is restudied so that there is a clear distinction between the main house and the carriage house.

**Ms. Meunier** said the HSF suggests the planting of vegetation or something in front of the hyphen. They suggest further making the design of the hyphen a bit more obvious as a new addition. The hyphen connects the house and the carriage house and, therefore, is not a historic configuration.

**Mr. Leonard**, in response to the public comments, said they tried to step the hyphen back and this is why it is not completely parallel between the main house and the carriage house. The hyphen is setback less than two feet. He explained that to help create the differentiation, the main house will retain the same brick and they will use opposing material which will be stucco. They will use a similar brick on the carriage house with a more cleaner, fine line. The intent is to really differentiate the main house from the carriage house. The hyphen between the two will become the main void. Mr. Leonard said that the planting question is something that they are looking at and if there is space it will help cover up the lower space hyphen. He said on the interior space, they have made it look more historic as this is where the homeowner will see it.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board's discussion centered around the windows and the hyphen. The Board believes that this design of the carriage house is better than the last design. The false windows on the west carriage façade should be removed. The hyphen needs to be redesigned. They discussed the trash receptacles.

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for Part I: Height and Mass for new construction of a carriage house and the addition to the second story of the main house with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II: Design Details:

1. Revise the window configuration on the east façade of the addition, second floor, to meet the 5:3 horizontal ratio;
2. Revise the picture window on the east façade of the addition to be one of the window types allowed;
3. Revise the relationship between the string course and lintels on the north façade of the carriage house avoid the string course intersecting with the lintels; - PASS
4. Should the HVAC units be visible, provide additional screening;
5. Revise the refuse storage area to be located within the building or screened from the public right-of-way;
6. Remove the two blind windows (or incorporate real windows) on the west façade of the carriage house;
7. Redesign the hyphen;

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

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Keith Howington	
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

15. [Petition of the Condominiums at the Y | 15-006581-COA | 101 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Alteration- Paint Brick](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 15-006581-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [1954 Sanborn.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [GHS Historic Photographs- 1924-1930.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Application.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Photographs.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Project Description.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- proposed paint color.pdf](#)

**Mr. David Turner** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to paint the exterior of 101 West Oglethorpe Avenue, also known as the YWCA Building, Sherwin Williams 6119 Antique White. The proposal is to paint all brick, trim, etc. The current red brick is unpainted.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends denial of the request to paint the unpainted brick exterior of 101 West Oglethorpe Avenue, also known as the YWCA Building, Sherwin Williams 6119 Antique White, because painted unpainted historic brick does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation by damaging the historic integrity and character of the building.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Turner** stated that it is too expensive for them to repoint the brick. At this time, they just want to make the building attractive. There is some graffiti on the back of the building. They believe that even white wash would help the building. They want to make improvements to the building and not damage the aesthetics. They suggested the Sherwin Williams 6119 Antique White because it is visually compatible to the other buildings in this area.

**Dr. Williams** stated that the historic photos show that currently flat ironwork is here. The porches originally had wooden columns and railings. He asked Mr. Turner if they had any plans to restore these.

**Mr. Turner** said it would be great to get them sandblasted and painted black.

**Mr. Merriman** cautioned that the questions and comments be maintained to what is in the

petition today which is to paint the brick.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they certainly understand and appreciate the petitioner's intentions to improve the aesthetics of the building. However, the Secretary of Interior's Standards states that unpainted bricks cannot be painted. Therefore, they are in agreement with staff that the bricks on this building cannot be painted.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Meunier if the HSF would be in a position to advise the petitioner with other options for addressing their situation.

**Ms. Meunier** answered that the HSF would be glad to meet with the petitioner on site, look at the building, and determine what further advice, information or assistance the HSF maybe able to provide.

**Mr. Turner**, in response to public comments, said they are only trying to improve the looks of their building. As he said, maybe they could use white wash which has been around for many years.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** said Mr. Turner stated that their goal is for their building to blend in with the other buildings. In this area there are many buildings with soft greys, red brick, and different shades of stucco, since the petitioner's building is red brick he believes it provides some relief from all the pervasive greys in this immediate intersection. However, the Secretary of Interior's Standards prohibit the petitioner from doing what he proposes to do.

**Ms. Scheer** stated that she appreciates the fact that the petitioner wants to improve their building, but even if the building could be painted, would not suffice as the building is in need of rehabilitation.

#### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the request to paint the unpainted brick exterior of 101 West Oglethorpe Avenue, also known as the YWCA Building, Sherwin Williams 6119 Antique White, because painting unpainted historic brick does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation by damaging the historic integrity and character of the building. **PASS**

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

16. [Petition of Gavin Macrae-Gibson | 15-006591-COA | 31 East Jones Street | Carriage House Rehabilitation](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 15-006591-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Application - 31 East Jones Street 15-006591-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Structural Evaluation.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [August 12, 2015 Approved Design.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Petitioner's Presentation.pdf](#)

**Mr. Gavin Macrae-Gibson** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting an amendment to a previously approved petition (14-003508-COA) to rehabilitate the carriage house located at 31 East Jones Street. The project has been revised several times, although the most recent approved design from August 12, 2015 included the following alterations to the carriage house:

- North (courtyard) façade:
  - The existing fire escape stair and awning will be removed and a spiral staircase added;
  - Additional alterations to the ground floor of the carriage house will not be visible from the public right-of-way;
- South (lane) façade:
  - All electrical boxes and conduit will be removed;
  - The existing paired windows on the ground floor will be replaced with two cedar plank garage doors;
  - Cable railing will be added to the rooftop.

**Ms. Harris** stated that subsequent to this approval, the petitioner discovered that there were significant structural concerns with the building, and a structural evaluation performed. The petitioner applied for demolition and reconstruction of the carriage house (15-005547-COA), which was continued by the Board on November 12, 2015 to allow for further study. The petitioner has subsequently withdrawn that petition.

**Ms. Harris** explained that the structural engineering report provides documentation that the roof decking, floor decking, roof framing and wall framing are deteriorated and need replacement. The report also states that the north, south and east walls have moved one to two and one-half inches. The report states that, "Much of the cause of deteriorated walls is

an improper initial footing. The existing footing is a non-grouted brick placed on the flat projecting 4 inches from the face of the wall. Repair requires new footings be provided under the existing wall. It is my opinion the installation of the new footing, even done in 24 inch segments, will crumble the deteriorated walls. The walls are so deteriorated that they need to be rebuilt.” The report is substantiated through selective stucco removal as well as several test holes around the foundation.

**Ms. Harris** stated that the current proposal includes all alterations previously approved, as well as removing the north and south walls of the carriage house, while saving the bricks and existing windows for reuse, installing an appropriate foundation and structural steel posts and beams, rebuilding the walls in the same location, and salvaging bricks and windows. The walls will be restuccoed to match the existing. The west wall, a party wall between this building and the adjacent carriage house, is structurally sound and will remain in place. The east wall will also remain in place and will be stabilized through its connection to the steel posts and beams.

**Ms. Harris** said the petitioner has further agreed to monitor the west party wall by:

1. Provide strain gages on all existing cracks prior to commencing work.
2. Gages to be inspected every day prior to starting work and at the end of the day.
3. Any gages showing movement to be reported to the owner and design engineer and work to halt until stress is evaluated by the engineer.
4. Provide a vibration meter at the center of the wall on the first floor that records readings continuously. Results to be reviewed by engineer on a daily basis. Any motion that exceeds state and federal standards will cause to institute a stop work order and all construction process to be reworked to keep vibrations less than state and federal standards.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the alterations to the carriage house, amending 14-003508-COA, with the condition that the stucco mix formula be provided to staff for review and approval in order to ensure its compatibility with historic brick, because the project is otherwise consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Macrae-Gibson** stated that as Ms. Harris reported, in August, 2015 they received approval from the Board to work on the carriage house, including the restoration of the main house, and garage doors. When they started working on the carriage house, it was discovered that it was in worse shape than was imagined. A structural engineering firm was hired and it was determined that the roof decking, floor decking, roof framing and wall framing are deteriorated and need replacement. The report also states that the north, south and east walls have moved one to two and one-half inches.

**Mr. Macrae-Gibson** said at the last meeting, the Board asked that they do some more testing. He informed the Board that they did three testing. All the testing revealed that the building was badly deteriorated. He said at the onset of getting into the rehabilitation project, he contacted the Historic Savannah Foundation. Mr. Macrae-Gibson said that Daniel Carey has been extremely helpful in assisting him with trying to deal with this condition. In their first meeting, Mr. Carey brought with him an engineer that he has worked with for many years. In December they met with Mr. Carey and another engineer and a contractor.

**Mr. Macrae-Gibson** said at the meeting, Mr. Carey directed their attention to a similar carriage house at 22 West Harris Street. This carriage house had some of the same conditions as his carriage. They are deconstructing three of the walls and will reconstruction the walls. He said he pointed this out to the Board because there is really a good precedent for a building that has the same issues as his. Therefore, they would like to follow this carriage house as a guide of how to deal with their problems. He then explained to the Board the work that would be done on the carriage house.

**Mr. John Kern** said that he will be monitoring the rehabilitation on a daily basis. He showed the Board an avongard screen gage that he uses to monitor cracks. Mr. Kern said not only will he be monitoring this, but he will also take pictures. They will install a vibration meter in the middle wall.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** stated that the HSF really wanted to lend their support for this petition. They had some concerned and worked with the petitioner and his engineer who were really great to work with. Everyone brought some good ideas to the table. This truly has been gratifying in many respects.

**Mr. Carey** said there maybe a need to close the lane and the sidewalk during the construction process. He said if the HSF can be of help in contacting the City with this, they would be happy to do so. Mr. Carey said the HSF supports the petition as presented.

**Mr. Macrae-Gibson**, in response to the public comments, reiterated "thanks" to Mr. Carey and the HSF. They were very helpful.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board's discussion centered around their appreciation and demonstration of collaboration that ruled out the demolition of the carriage house.

#### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations to the carriage house, amending 14-003508-COA, with the condition that the stucco mix formula be provided to staff for review and approval in order to ensure its compatibility with historic brick, because the project is otherwise consistent with the - PASS Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams	
Second: Zena McClain, Esq.	
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

17. [Petition of Homestead Architecture LLC | 15-006602-COA | 409 and 411 West Wayne Street | New Construction Two Buildings: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Berrien Ward Map.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Mr. Pete Callejas** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for two, three-story, single-family residences on the vacant parcels located at 409 and 411 West Wayne Street. The sites are landlocked by new construction to the east, a contributing building to the west, a non-contributing building and a parking lot to the north. The parcels do not have lane or other rear access.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval of the New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for two, three-story, single-family residences on the vacant parcels located at 409 and 411 West Wayne Street with the following conditions to be submitted for Board review with Part II, Design Details because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Reduce the raised basement (first floor) floor-to-floor height to a maximum of 9 feet-6 inches.
2. Ensure that the baluster spacing does not exceed 4 inches.
3. Ensure that an encroachment license is obtained for the front stoops.
4. Remove the slope from the driveways; this is not permitted on the public right-of-way.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Callejas** explained that he was not aware that the ordinance changed. Originally, he was going to request that the Review Board recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for a variance. However, if he does not need to do this, he will withdraw his application from ZBA.

**Mr. Callejas** stated that the garage slab elevation according to the ordinance has to be at least six inches above the crown of the street. He actually has eight inches above and the living space is seven inches above that. Therefore, it is probably 16 inches above grade.



The contributing building to the left is 24 inches above grade. He is still maintaining a 9 feet 6 inches between the ground floor and the finished floor. Therefore, he is only asking for a little variance mainly because it makes sense from a construction standpoint. It is actually closer to the contributing building to the left. But, it is not terribly different than the building on the right. Mr. Callejas said, therefore, his building is probably just three or four inches above the building on the right which is existing, although noncontributing, is a part of the context of the area.

**Mr. Callejas** explained that the ramp to the garage is minimal. It is only to get from the existing sidewalk up to the garage which is contained within the same distance out from the property line as the front portico. The sidewalk and the curb cut are existing.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said in reviewing this it is somewhat difficult to tell the proportions of the windows versus the door below. She believes they actually line up, but visually looking at it, it appears that some of the windows particularly on the second floor are a little wider than the door. The HSF suggests that the petitioner look at the proportions and make them a little smaller. Ms. Meunier said the HSF also suggests making the garage opening wider so that the exterior lines up with the windows to create some more vertical lines.

**Ms. Meunier** said regarding the ground floor, an HSF member has been adamant about maintaining the 9 feet 6 inches requirement. However, in this case, it is obvious that it is a little different. The entrance is on the ground floor as opposed to a traditional raised basement with a stoop above. Therefore, the HSF feels that as designed, the proportions work and if it was lowered that maybe it would be squat.

**Ms. Meunier** asked which ramps will be included to get into the garage. She realizes that there is a requirement in the ordinance that the ramp may need to be on the interior, but the way it addresses the sidewalk, which ramp will be involved here? The HSF would like to reduce or avoid as many ramps as possible from the public sidewalk.

**Mr. Callejas**, in response to the public comments, said the doors are three feet and the windows are three feet. The garage door is 10 feet wide, but they can make it wider. It might align more with the windows. They are willing to take a look at this and bring this back in Part 2. He explained that the existing curb cut has a low slope; the sidewalk is also existing and has less than a two percent slope. The ramp is from the existing sidewalk up to the garage is less than a ten percent slope which is in accordance with the federal standard for a ramp. Therefore, this is very minimal. He does not see this as a huge issue; they are minimizing it and are trying to make it as less noticeable as possible. The ramp is not steep nor is it very long.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board thinks that the building design should be contemporary. They concur with the HSF that the garage door should be a little wider. The petitioner agreed to looking into possibly making the garage door wider. The Board believes the ground floor is fine as presented. The staff asked the Board to make a variance recommendation to the ZBA pertaining to the raised basement (first floor) floor-to-floor maximum height.

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

1. Approve New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for two, three-story, single-family residences on the vacant parcels located at 409 and 411 West Wayne Street with the following conditions to be submitted for Board review with Part II, Design Details because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:
  - a. Ensure that the baluster spacing does not exceed 4 inches.
  - b. Ensure that an encroachment license is obtained for the front stoops.
  - c. Remove the slope from the driveways; this is not permitted on the public right-of-way. - PASS
  
2. Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the following standard:

*The exterior expression of the height of raised basements shall be not less than 6'-6" and not higher than 9'-6".*

To permit a ground floor/raised basement height of up to 11 feet in height, depending on the final grading conditions, because the surrounding context has higher ground floor heights and the proportions of the building as proposed are compatible.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Nicholas Henry

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Nay
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

18. Petition of Felder & Associates | 15-006604-COA | 207 West Broughton Street | Amendment:  
Alterations

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

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

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

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

**Ms. Sara Farr** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations to the storefront at 207 West Broughton Street. This is an amendment to a previously approved COA (14-006058-COA). At the March 11, 2015 meeting the Board approved alterations and awnings at 207 West Broughton Street with the conditions that the awning material be submitted and maintaining the terrazzo. The new submittal includes a redesigned storefront and the removal of the terrazzo. The storefront will be constructed of wood and cast iron. It will include recessed wood panels on the bottom and fixed transom windows on the top. The entry door is the same design with wood, glazing, and a transom as previously approved. The storefront windows will be custom built wood casement windows. The storefront will follow the line of the original storefront, visible in the basement, and restore the light wells in front of the entrance.

**Ms. Farr** stated that on September 9, 2014 staff approved a COA (14-004489-COA) for selective demolition for the removal of the non-historic metal panels on the front façade in order to assess the remaining historic fabric. Another application for a new storefront and removal of the terrazzo (14-006058-COA) was continued at the January 14, 2015 meeting in order to address the following issues: the recessed entrance and seating area design, removal of the terrazzo, the repointing of the brick, the awning material and the entrance location. It was approved, including retaining the terrazzo, on March 11, 2015.

**Ms. Farr** explained that the project is now seeking historic preservation tax incentives. The State Historic Preservation Office found that since the terrazzo and storefront that is being removed were likely installed around the same time period, it would create a false sense of history to only maintain the terrazzo. Both the existing storefront and the terrazzo are outside the period of significance. They recommended restoring the storefront to the period of significance by using nearby storefronts as reference, if pictures are not available, as well as removing the terrazzo.

**Ms. Farr** reported that staff recommend approval of the amendments to 14-006058-COA, which include a new storefront and removal of the terrazzo at 207 West Broughton Street, because the work meets the standards and is visually compatible.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Callejas** explained that the drawings that were approved by the Board were sent to the State Historic Preservation Office. The owner has hired Mr. Bob Ciucevich do the tax credit process and he is present today to answer questions.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Callejas that since the terrazzo is presently covering the light well, if they know what it looks like. He believes the plan now is to preserve what is seen in the photo on the other side.

**Ms. Callejas** answered that originally they were to do the light wells that were in the sidewalk so they could preserve the "Moskin" wording at 207. But as they are under there now, the light wells here are in bad shape.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the tax credits would be compromised if they were in a more modern location.

**Mr. Ciucevich** explained that he believes this would be possible. But, basically the questions that they have already sent let them know how to proceed unofficially. However, he does not believe that this would endanger the tax credit.

**Dr. Williams** said the original ones are not salvageable. He was only thinking as the Board has reviewed other projects on Broughton Street that are restoring the glass on the sidewalks.

**Mr. Ciucevich** said his understanding is that ones on the side are in a deteriorated condition. The ones in the recessed area are salvageable.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the terrazzo. They do not want to send a message that they endorse the removal of terrazzo.

#### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for amendments to 14-006058-COA, which include a new storefront and removal of the terrazzo at 207 West Broughton Street, because the work meets the standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer  
Second: Keith Howington  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Aye  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain  
Tess Scheer - Aye  
Robin Williams - Aye

19. [Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 15-006606-COA | 301 West Congress Street | Alterations and Additions](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

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

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

**Mr. Josh Ward** 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 301 West Congress Street. The work includes removing the front porch and building a new entrance. The existing first floor windows will be removed on the north and east façades, larger openings created, and new aluminum clad high performance casement windows by Marvin installed.

**Ms. Farr** stated that the addition will be located on the roof. It will be located on the north half of the building.

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

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;
2. Provide all window dimensions;
3. Ensure that the muntins are not wider than 7/8 inch;
4. Provide screening details for staff approval;
5. Provide the inset for the storefront windows and overhead doors on the addition;
6. Redesign the entrance on Congress Street so that it does not read as enclosed porch and is visually compatible;
7. Restudy the “porch” proposed along Jefferson Street to be more commercial in nature;

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

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ward** stated they agree with the staff's recommendations on conditions 1 through 5, they will work with staff on all these items. He said regarding the staff's recommendation on condition 6, they prefer the enclosed entry vestibule. They like it as a designed element sort of a solid mass pulling away from the building. Another thing they were working with is the element ties in with the new piece on the rooftop above the entry on Jefferson Street. These two have a similar shaped roof and the detailing around the windows are similar also. They are trying to create two entry elements on either side. However, if the Board sees otherwise, they will look at other solutions as far as whether the entry vestibule needs to be open or not. Mr. Ward stated that regarding the side doors into the vestibule on Congress Street, in keeping with the porch that is presently here and because the existing building is pulled back six feet from the property line, they have the area to walk on the side and

then onto the porch. With the proposed use and the outside seating they thought the two doors would be an appropriate use.

**Mr. Ward** stated regarding condition 7, the idea is that these grand openings on the long façade along Jefferson Street would be activated with people seating there. This would, therefore, activate the façade without having just windows here.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Ward that since this is a noncontributing building, did he consider actually reworking the entire façade that restores the street line?

**Mr. Ward** answered that this was not considered. They appreciate the setback because it allows a potential user, such as a restaurant, to occupy the space with seating which will add value. Because it is here, they are working with it and agree that it would be an asset.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they agree with staff on restudying the enclosed porch, the Congress Street entrance. They do not believe that the solution presented is an appropriate one. It appears to be a mix of a non-true colonial, non-historic building. The HSF does not believe that contemporary uses that are being done between mismatches are successful. Ms. Meunier said the HSF suggests that the rooftop, where it is a little more of a departure from what is existing on the building, be made similar in design and details. She said in this case, it is a non-historic building and does not need such a grand departure to differentiate itself. They believe that it should be more similar and not be so obvious that it is an appendix to this building.

**Ms. Meunier** said that on the Congress Street entrance with the enclosed porch, they believe a hip roof would be better. This would enable the building to be more in keeping with a contemporary design.

**Mr. Ward**, in response to the public comments, said they are not opposed to studying the roof. They were trying to keep what was already here.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION:**

The Board was concerned with the visual compatibility of the entrance on Congress Street as well as some elements of the addition. They determined that the details on the addition could be worked through with staff, with which the petitioner was in agreement. The Board determined that the redesigned entrance on Congress Street should return to the Board for evaluation. They encouraged the petitioner to consider making the entire building more contemporary since it is not a contributing structure. They commended the petitioner for the rear porch's contemporary nature.

### **Board Action:**

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

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;
2. Provide all window dimensions;
3. Ensure that the muntins are not wider than 7/8 inch;
4. Provide screening details for staff approval;
5. Provide the inset for the storefront windows and overhead doors on the addition - PASS
6. Restudy the round roof and tower design on the addition;

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

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the petition for the redesigned entrance on Congress street because rhythm of the entrance is not visually compatible. Additionally, the entrance reads as an enclosed front porch which does not meet the intent of the design standards.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Justin Gunther

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

#### **IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION**

20. [Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects | 14-006035-COA | 660 East Broughton Street | Addition and Rehabilitation One Year Extension](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation- extension.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [COA - 660 East Broughton Street 14-006035-COA.pdf](#)

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

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a 12 month extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) issued on January 14, 2015 for rehabilitation and addition to 660 East Broughton - PASS Street [File No. 14-006035-COA].

**Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

**X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS**

21. [Petition of Nathan Pollard for Raymond Engineering | 15-006344-COA | 618 Montgomery Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 618 Montgomery Street 15-006344-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [MPC-DEMO-NEW-618 Montgomery.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Amended Petition of Alexander Zilberman | 15-006397-COA | 109 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 109 West Broughton Street 15-006397-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [doc00248120151208082243.pdf](#)

Attachment: [doc00248220151208082258.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Sonja Wallen | 15-006402-COA | 121 Barnard Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 121 Barnard Street 15-006402-COA.pdf](#)



Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 121 Barnard Street 15-006402-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Amended Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 15-006438-COA | 570 East York Street | Staff Approved - Color Changes and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [2015-12-03\\_570 E. York Street - Revised Plans Elevations \(new egress door\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [COA - 570 East York Street 15-006438-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Alexis AuBuchon for Hansen Architects | 15-006489-COA | 108 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Change and Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 108 West Broughton Street 15-006489-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 108 West Broughton Street 15-006489-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Amended Petition of Christian Sottile for Sottile & Sottile | 15-006491-COA | 25 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Gate](#)

Attachment: [COA - 25 West Oglethorpe Avenue 15006491-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 25 West Oglethorpe Avenue 15-006491-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Fawn Smiley | 15-006538-COA | 134 Houston Street | Staff Approved - Stucco Fence](#)

Attachment: [COA - 134 Houston Street 15-006538-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 134 Houston Street 15-006538-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of John Post for Commonwealth Construction | 15-006540-COA | 410 East Jones Street | Staff Approved - Windows](#)

Attachment: [COA - 410 East Jones Street 15-006540-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 410 East Jones Street 15-006540-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Amended Petition of Josh Ward for Ward Architecture | 15-006574-COA | 711 Price Street | Staff Approved - Addition](#)

Attachment: [COA - 711 Price Street 15-006574-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Patrick Phelps | 15-006577-COA | 208 West Hall Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 208 West Hall Street 15-006577-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 208 West Hall Street 15-006577-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Ellsworth-Hallett Home Professionals | 15-006589-COA | 548 East Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Demolition of Screen Porch](#)

Attachment: [COA - 548 East Taylor Street 15-006589-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 548 East Taylor Street 15-006589-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Jack Dibrell | 15-006692-COA | 414 East Liberty Street | Staff Approved - Alterations and Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 414 East Liberty Street 15-006692-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 414 East Liberty Street 15-006692-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Amended Petition of Neil Dawson | 15-006694-COA | 118 West Hall Street | Staff Approved - Fence](#)

Attachment: [COA - 118 West Hall Street 15-006694-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 118 West Hall Street 15-006694-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Eldon Kennedy | 15-006715-COA | 518 East Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 518 East Gaston Street 15-006715-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 518 East Gaston Street 15-006715-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Alexis AuBuchon | 15-006720-COA | 110 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 110 West Broughton Street 15-006720-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 110 West Broughton Street 15-006720-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Vann-Ellison Seales | 15-006737-COA | 116 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved -](#)

Sign Face Change

Attachment: [COA - 116 East Broughton Street 15-006737-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 116 East Broughton Street 15-006737-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. Petition of Joshua Beckler for Coastal Canvas Products | 15-006740-COA | 317 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awnings

Attachment: [COA - 317 West Broughton Street 15-006740-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 317 West Broughton Street 15-006740-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. Amended Petition of David "Luke" Gabelman | 15-006742-COA | 518-520 Blair Street | Staff Approved - Alterations and Color Change

Attachment: [COA - 518-520 Blair Street 15-006742-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 518-520 Blair Street 15-006742-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 2- 518-520 Blair Street 15-006742-COA.pdf](#)

39. Petition of Shannon Murphy for Ram Jack of South Carolina, Inc. | 15-006746-COA | 322 Price Street | Staff Approved - Foundation Repair

Attachment: [COA - 322 Price Street 15-006746-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 322 Price Street 15-009746-COA BITTSON S2.0 \(00000003\).pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. Petition of Danielle Jarvis | 16-000058-COA | 507 East McDonough Street | Staff Approved - Color Change

Attachment: [COA - 507 East McDonough Street 16-000058-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

**XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

**XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF**

41. Report on Work Performed Without a Certificate of Appropriateness

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 1-13-16.pdf](#)

**Mr. Merriman** said that staff has provided a report to the Board on the work performed without a certificate.

**XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

## Notices

42. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, January 14, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)
43. [Next Regular Meeting - Wednesday, February 10, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

## XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

### New Business

44. [Appoint Parliamentarian](#)

**Mr. Merriman** reported that he appointed Ms. McClain to serve as the Parliamentarian for 2016. He spoke with her earlier and she agreed to serve.

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

Attachment: [1-13-16 HDBR Version- for discussion.pdf](#)

**Ms. Harris** reported that at the Historic District Board of Review retreat, they discussed some proposed changes to the Historic District ordinance. With the upturn of the economy, they have started to see large projects and hotels being built utilizing the new standards. Therefore, it is prudent to evaluate these and see how they are working. The Board asked the staff to come up with the proposed revisions at the end of each meeting.

**Ms. Harris** explained that the item she selected as the first topic deals with the concept of getting a bonus story for the active uses on the ground floor. The definitions will be covered. She believes that they have seen a misuse of this criterion where the active uses are truly not active uses. They also have issues with enforcement of exterior doors being kept locked, etc. They do not have jurisdiction as to how this is enforced; they only make suggestions. Ms. Harris said, therefore, staff has only tried to come up with some revisions that potentially help with the enforcement by making it clear to the applicant what are the expectations.

**Ms. Harris** informed the Board that she has copied the entire ordinance so that they could reference the other sections if they want to. However, there are only a few sections where staff has made revisions. This is the first opportunity that the Board has seen this. It is only for discussion and not to be voted on.

The Board discussed the changes and made some suggestions.

## XV. ADJOURNMENT

46. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Merriman adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen I. Harris  
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem