



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
May 11, 2016 1:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

MAY 11, 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
Justin Gunther
Keith Howington
Becky Lynch
Tess Scheer

HDRB Member Not Present: Andy McGarrity

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 1:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. He outlined the role of the Historic District Board of Review and explained the process for hearing the various petitions. Staff will present each application with a recommendation. The petitioner will have the opportunity to respond to the recommendation. The petitioners are asked to limit their presentation to 10 minutes or less and only address the items identified as inconsistent with the ordinance and questions raised by the Board. The public will have the same allotted time, ten minutes, to comment.

The petitioner will be given the opportunity to respond to the public comments. The Board will then go into Board discussion at which no further testimony is received specifically requested by the Chairman. Each Board member will be given two minutes twice to provide comments, if they so desire.

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

2. [Approval of Consent Agenda May 11, 2016](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the consent agenda for May 11, 2016. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.
Second: Keith Howington

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

3. [Petition of LS3P Dawson | 16-002207-COA | 12 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Context.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Photographs and Fire Escape Examples.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Preservation Brief 32 - Making Historic Properties Accessible.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations to the property located at 12 West Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards.

1. Ensure that the attachment of the new balconies to the rear masonry façade uses the gentlest means possible and/or the existing bolt holes wherever possible. - PASS
2. Ensure that the balconies receive and encroachment license as they are located over the lane which is a public right-of-way.

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

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

4. [Petition of Lowcountry Signs | 16-002195-COA | 135 West Bay Street | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the principal use fascia sign, the supplemental ID sign, and the window sign for 135 West Bay Street with the condition that the supplemental ID sign is not illuminated, because otherwise the signs meet the standards and are visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Debra Caldwell	- Aye

5. [Petition of Hansen Architects | 16-002161-COA | 216 West Broughton 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 the installation of a new storefront at 216 West Broughton Street with the following conditions:

1. All doors are inset a minimum of 3 inches;
 2. Color samples are provided for staff approval;
- PASS

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
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

6. [Adoption of Agenda for May 11, 2016 Meeting](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review

does hereby adopt the May 11, 2016 Meeting Agenda. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Keith Howington

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

7. [Approve April 13, 2016 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [04-13-2016 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve April 13, 2016 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

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

8. [Petition of Lynch Architects | 16-002203-COA | 9 Lincoln Street | Allterations and Additions](#)

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

9. [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 as requested. - PASS

Vote Results

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

10. [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 as requested. - PASS

Vote Results

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

11. [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 as requested. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

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

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition as requested. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

13. [Petition of LS3P Dawson | 15-006113-COA | 321 Montgomery Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

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

NOTE: Ms. Jennifer Deacon recused from participation in this petition. She is an employee of LS3P Dawson.

Mr. Dave Moore and Mr. Neil Dawson were present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff of the report. The petitioner is requesting approval of New Construction Part II: Design Details of a new six story building at West Harris and Montgomery Streets. The building is oriented to face West Harris Street and features a symmetrical façade with flanking bays and recessed center bays.

Ms. Harris stated that Part I: Height and Mass was approved by the HDBR on December 9, 2015 with the following conditions to be submitted with Part 2: Design Details; notations below include the revisions made to address the conditions:

1. *Incorporate additional voids in the west elevation which will be very visible from MLK Jr. Blvd;*

The petitioner has revised the west elevation to include additional voids on the portion of the building set back from the property line. On the portion of the building at the property line, the petitioner has incorporated recessed stucco banding to provide visual interest.

2. *Restudy the drop off area to provide a consistent wall of continuity;*

The drop off area has been revised to include aluminum grills above the entrance and planters in the center bay of the drop off area.

3. *Provide the height of the storefront base;*

The storefront has been revised to incorporate a cast stone sill rather than a base.

4. *Ensure the wall heights do not exceed 11 feet.*

No wall heights along the property line exceed 11 feet.

5. *Ensure that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway the driveway. The sidewalk should be maintained on the public right-of-way;*

It's not clear if the condition has been met.

6. *Restudy the electric meter location;*

The petitioner is continuing to coordinate with Georgia Power to find an alternate location.

7. *Provide additional direct access to the coffee shop from Montgomery Street, such as removing the gate and providing an additional break in the wall.*

The gates along Montgomery Street have been removed to provide more direct access to the coffee shop.

Additionally, the HDBR recommended approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals of the variance to allow bays of less than 15 feet wide, which was subsequently granted.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval for Part II: Design Details of a new six story building at 321 Montgomery Street with the following conditions:

1. Ensure that the stucco has a smooth finish:
2. Ensure that the storefront, doors and windows are inset a minimum of four inches from the face of the building;
3. Ensure that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway. The sidewalk should be maintained on the public right-of-way;
4. Provide the electric meter location.

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

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Moore stated the only question that came up was related to the pedestrian path in front of the driveway as to whether it would be continuous. He explained that the intent is that it be a continuous level sidewalk all the way across. The brick paving will also be continuously across the entire area. He entertained questions from the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that they agree with staff's comments, particularly to ensure that the sidewalk serve as a continuous uninterrupted path across the driveway. She said that additionally while the added articulation on the west and south walls and no windows are there is an improvement. The HSF believes that more articulation could be added to breakup the large amount of solid on these facades.

Mr. Moore said, in response to the public comments, in regards to the additional

fenestration on the sides, they are not allowed by code to add windows at these locations because they are on the property line. The building is setback in several areas, especially where they have the rooms and the stair towers to add the fenestration on those facades and ensure that they have as much fenestration as possible. But, they cannot do this on the facades that are directly on the property line.

Ms. Meunier clarified that the HSF was not suggesting windows, but possibly adding green screen or some other architectural articulation.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board believed that this project is improved and that the inset panels activate the blank wall. They agreed with the staff's recommendation.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for Part II: Design Details of a new six story building at 321 Montgomery Street with the following conditions:

1. Ensure that the stucco has a smooth finish;
2. Ensure that the storefronts, doors and windows are inset a minimum of four inches from the face of the building;
3. Ensure that the sidewalk serves as a - PASS continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway. The sidewalk should be maintained on the public right-of-way;
4. Provide the electric meter location.

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

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Abstain
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Charlton Ward.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Scope of Work, Photographs, and Renderings.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Visually Related 3-Story Contributing Buildings.pdf](#)

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for Part 1, Height and Mass 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 Tattnall Street. Parking will be accessed from Gwinnett Lane. All buildings are proposed to be 3-stories high and are contemporary in design.

Ms. Michalak said that according to Sanborn Map research, the entire site was vacant in 1888. By 1898, a two-story residence had been built on the east parcel, while the west parcel remained vacant. In 1909, a four unit, two story multi-family building had been constructed, primarily facing Tattnall, but also addressing Gwinnett Street at the corner. Both buildings still existed in 1973. The west building still existed in 1984 when the HDBR approved its rehabilitation (H-19840301-1215-2). In 1988 a fire destroyed the building. Several new construction projects for these two parcels have come before the HDBR. The most recent was the denial of an L-Shaped 7 unit building [File No. 15-004371-COA]. Another project, in 2007 (H-20070125-3747), was for two condo buildings facing Gwinnett Street with a total of 12 units.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for Part 1, Height and Mass 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 for review by the Board with Part II, Design Details because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Remove the taller parapet from the 6 unit building.
2. Redesign each unit's front entry door to be a pair of doors, a central door with two sidelites, or one single wider door.
3. 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.
4. Provide exact window sizes.
5. Reconfigure or add more windows to the south façade of the 6 unit building facing Gwinnett Street.
6. Provide fence height.
7. 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.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Barnard stated that they were in agreement with all of staff's recommendations with the exception of number 1. He said the staff is recommending that the taller parapet from the 6 unit building be removed. However, they believe the box is too boxy. Tattnall is a unique street. One block of Tattnall Street has a median in it with three live oak trees and it is beautiful. The way it intersects Gwinnett Street is an important corner. Therefore, they believe this corner deserved some attention. Mr. Barnard said this is not contemporary architectural, but what he would call "simplified Victorian." It is clean, simple in its details, sizes and portions. In essence this signifies this corner. There are a lot of Victorian buildings that have interesting, unique roof features in a soft way. This is what they want to do with this corner. They want to respect the heritage and the importance of the corner.

Mr. Barnard showed the Board a photograph looking at their lot from Gwinnett Street. The streets are wonderful and he was not sure that the diversity of the architecture on the opposite side and the variety of the Victorian structures are visible. This is why they suggested adding the simple element on the corner.

Ms. McClain asked Mr. Barnard to show the windows on the south façade. She asked the three windows at the bottom should align vertically. She said it appears that the third window should come over a little.

Mr. Barnard stated that if they looked at other Victorian examples, a lot of times they have open spaces. They have tried to respect the frontage on Gwinnett Street, but also there is function on the inside. This is the one of the beauties of Victorian architectural; it had anomalies and allowed itself to have a window here and a window there.

Ms. Lynch asked if the porches on the first and second floors are enclosed.

Mr. Barnard said the porches are louvered.

Ms. Lynch asked the petitioner if he would consider moving the windows to the left. The portions need to be compatible with the porch structure, but not duplicate it. The top floor does not have that same porch articulation on the street.

Mr. Barnard said if the Board feels this is important, they will look at this.

Ms. Deacon asked if the corner unit is the same layout as the other row units, or if its difference is planned to respond to the corner condition.

Mr. Barnard answered that it is different. It is an end wall, it has windows, which created different functional aspects and opportunities.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Attorney Joseph Sasseen (retired) came forward and spoke in favor of the project. He

likes to see change and a little flair to a building. He believes this building looks good.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Savannah Foundation (HSF) acknowledged that the petitioners have meet with them throughout the design process. The HSF holds an easement on this property. Ms. Meunier said they are in agreement with staff's recommendation for approval of Part I Height and Mass with the conditions as outlined. They agree with the proposed revised doors that do not have sidelites. She said the design that they saw included the parapet. The HSF believes that there are some elements that will be improvements by keeping the parapet. Ms. Meunier said the HSF believes this is a contemporary expression of the deign. Therefore, they believe that removing the parapet decreases some of the distinction from the building.

Ms. Meunier said they feel that the buildings need to address Gwinnett Street, especially the buildings on Tattall Street. She said having the parapet on this corner brings more attention to this; therefore, they believe it helps in this regard. They prefer to have the porch wrap around, but adding the windows does a good job also. The HSF further believes that the end unit needs to address Gwinnett Street a little more.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that the front façade needs to face Gwinnett Street more. The parapet helps to defines the corner, but it needs to go a littler further to give the appearance that Gwinnett Street is the primary façade. They discussed the windows and the porch. The Board agreed with all of the staff's recommendations with the exception of not removing the parapet. The window treatments on the rear façade and the windows alignment on Gwinnett Street need to be redesigned.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for Part 1, Height and Mass 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 for review by the Board with Part II, Design Details because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Redesign the 6-unit building by rotating two units to face Gwinnett Street so that the Gwinnett Street façade becomes the primary façade.
2. Redesign fenestration alignment on the rear facades of both buildings.
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.
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. PASS

5. Provide exact window sizes.
6. Reconfigure or add more windows to the south façade of the 6 unit building facing Gwinnett Street.
7. Provide fence height.
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.

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Justin Gunther

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

15. [Petition of Hansen Architects | 16-002194-COA | 220 East Bryan Street | Demolition of a Non-Contributing Building](#)

Attachment: [16-002194-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 220 East Bryan Street 16-002194-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [MPC Policy for Documenting Buildings Prior to Demolition.pdf](#)

Attachment: [HBDR_5-11-16_PRESENTATION_220EBRYAN.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Howington recused from participation in this petition. The owner is a client of Greenline Architecture.

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting demolition approval of 220 East Bryan Street, a non-contributing, four story brick building within Reynolds Ward. Because the building is close to the 50-year threshold to be considered for historic status, staff recommends that the building be documented per the MPC's Documentation Policy. Additionally, staff recommends that a building permit for the demolition not be issued until the new construction has received approval from the HDBR.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the demolition of 220 East Bryan Street because the building is non-contributing, less than 50 years old, and not of "Exceptional Significance," with the following conditions:

1. The building is documented per the MPC's Documentation Policy (attached); and
2. A building permit for the demolition is not issued until the new construction has received approval from the HDBR.

Mr. Gunther asked Ms. Harris to explain the present level integrity of the building.

Ms. Harris explained that her understanding of the building is relatively intact in terms of its original construct. She has not been in the interior and, therefore, perhaps the petitioner may be able to address this. But, as far as the exterior design, Ms. Harris said it is fairly consistent with the original design.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Phelps gave the history of the site. In 1970, this site was cleared, the building was built and since that time subsequent renovations have been done. Subsequently, the interiors have been updated many times since construction. The building currently does not meet the large scale requirements. They are preparing for Part I Height and Mass for the new building. It is important that they activate the street and they will ask for a bonus story. This is a six story district and with the bonus story it will be seven stories. Through the bonus story will allow multiple uses on the ground story including restaurant, bar, and a public gallery. They will use a setback so they will be able to create bays along the streetscape. The sidewalks are very narrow, so they believe that at the same time of aligning to the street, but use the setback to allow more pedestrian breathing room at the entryway.

Mr. Phelps said they also want to step-back the upper floors approximately 14 to 16 feet which will create terraces on the lower levels of the setback towers, but also reduce the streetscape scale down to four stories and keep it at a more residential and pedestrian level.

Ms. Deacon asked the petitioner if they did studies of the existing building to try to use it for a similar or same use.

Mr. Phelps answered that they have done studies of the existing building. He explained that they were contracted by the previous owner to do a full analysis of the building. This is in process as they are documenting this for the Historic District Board of Review requirements for demolition. The floor-to-floor heights at 12 feet are limiting. The structure is very limited for future use and mechanical systems. The building does not meet the requirements for modern use. Structurally, if they were able to add onto the

building, it would require a lot of work all the way to the foundation.

Mr. Mark Smith said this will be the third hotel that they have built in this immediate vicinity. They own the Hampton Inn across from this project as well as the Holiday Inn Express at the corner of Bay and Abercorn Streets. They previously owned the Mulberry Inn that they developed when they were affiliated Days Inn of America as well as the Days Inn at Barnard and Bay Streets. Mr. Smith believes they were the cutting edge of hotels on Bay Street in 1980 with the demolition, renovation, demolition, and reconstruction on the Bargain Corner building. They opened the Hampton Inn in 1997, the Holiday Inn Express in 2007. Consequently, he believes they are good for a project every 10 years. He said they are committed to the getting the project built and will monitor it through completion.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Attorney Joseph Sasseen (retired) stated that going back in history, when the building was being constructed, he tried to stop it as it was not appropriate then and it is not appropriate now. Because a building is 50 years old today does not mean that mistakes were not made 50 years ago. Mr. Sasseen was in favor of this building being demolished. He believes that the building that will be built here will be a credit to Savannah. He asked the Board to approve the request for the demolition of this non-contributing building.

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that they agree with staff. The HSF has no objection to the demolition of this building based on the conditions that have been outlined. He pointed out that buildings of this vintage may become rare. It is a reminder for them to be vigilant in their survey and inventory of buildings. Mr. Carey said rather they like the buildings are not, they are representative of periods in history and architecture. Resources are needed to get a head of some of these actions. It is not that every building will be worthy of inventory and preservation. Nevertheless, they must be careful not to demolition entire decades of buildings.

Mr. Carey said the HSF appreciate the fortunate of meeting with the petitioners. They look forward to continued meeting with them as they go through Parts I and II. The HSF just wanted to offer their support for the other buildings in this site. There can be a complimentary relationship between a new, contemporary and historic buildings. Mr. Carey said the HSF looks forward to an ongoing dialogue with the petitioner not only about the proposed building, but also the other two buildings.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Gunther said maybe four years from now, they might not feel the same way about this building after it meets the 50 year threshold. After the building is evaluated, it might be considered a contributing building to the Historic District and not just disregard a structure because it may not be a style that they are fond of. The building does have high integrity as a late modern building and it appears to him that all the original features still survives on the front façade. Mr. Gunther said he believes that a building with high integrity with more responsible change for the building would be adaptive use. Mr. Gunther opposed the demolition. Ms. Deacon said she likes this building, too. She does not want the to see the building demolished. However, she does not believe that what the petitioner is asking is beyond what is required by the ordinance. Therefore, she agreed with the staff decision. The other Board members were in agreement with the staff's recommendations.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the demolition of 220 East Bryan Street because the building is non-contributing, less than 50 years old, and not of “Exceptional Significance,” with the following conditions:

1. The building is documented per the MPC’s Documentation Policy (attached); and
 2. A building permit for the demolition is not issued until the new construction has received approval from the HDBR.
- PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Kellie Fletcher

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

16. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 16-002196-COA | 607 Drayton Street | New Construction: Part 1 Height and Mass](#)

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

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Forsyth Ward.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Photos.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [West Elm Hotel Letter - Savannah Law School.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of Part 1: Height and Mass of a new six 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 stated 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. She said that petitioner is also requesting a one story variance from the Height Map to allow the sixth floor.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends continuance of Part I: Height and Mass in order for the petitioner to restudy the following:

1. Eliminate the sixth story to be consistent with the Height Map and visually compatible in terms of height and scale;
2. Reduce the height of the tower element to be visually compatible in terms of height and scale;
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;
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;
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;
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;
7. Increase the height of the second story to 12 feet to meet the standard;
8. Ensure that the parapet has a string course to meet the standard;
9. Ensure that the height of the wall on the east (Goodwin) elevation does not exceed 11 feet;
10. Incorporate an additional massing standard to meet the requirement that a minimum of two massing elements be utilized;
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;
12. Incorporate additional height variation to meet the standard requiring roofline variation if continuous rooflines are greater than 120 linear feet;
13. Locate the elevator overrun within the bonus story to meet the standard;
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;
15. Redesign the window groupings to form bays of not less than 15 feet nor more than 20 feet wide to meet the standard.

Ms. Harris reported additionally that staff recommends denial of the request for a one-story variance from the Height Map to allow the sixth story because the variance criteria have not been met.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay introduced Ms. Meredith Stone who was accompanying him at today's meeting. He said he would address three conceptual issues before discussion of the staff report. Mr. Shay stated that they deliberately chose to show a great deal of respect to the mid-century modern building that are located within the ward. This is the first time has had the opportunity in 35 years to have more than one example of the mid-century modern architecture to relate to. He believes that the mid-century modern buildings that are in the ward are obvious. The Chatham Apartments with the 15 story tower with the two story penthouse on it and also the addition to the original Candler Hospital which is now a part of the Savannah Law School. He stated that the Law School has submitted a letter of support for the project. They have chosen to submit a design that is representative of its own time. Mr. Shay said that they, at the same time, are trying to submit a contemporary and compatible piece of architecture at the same time. This is difficult because the standards were written before mid-century modern architecture became mainstream historical architecture and intends to be describing ways to make a compatibility with a 19-century or a very early 20-century building.

Mr. Shay explained that the second point is penthouses are actually a part of their neighborhood and the mid-century modern expression of them. He said the two big examples are Chatham Apartments which also has a two-story inhabitant penthouse on the roof. On the roof of the other is a single-story inhabitant penthouse for the Savannah Law School. Therefore, in choosing to relate to the mid-century modern that is in the area, they thought it was perfectly consistent to also utilize the idea of a penthouse. However, unlike the two penthouses in the area, they have chosen to set their penthouse back deeply from all the facades so that it is inconspicuous.

Mr. Shay explained that he is aware that height is always controversial, but height is always relative. He showed the Board some photographs that he believes are relative. Across from their project is a six-story building called the "Forsyth Condominiums." Mr. Shay clarified that they are not asking for entire six-story. The trees in this area are on the order of 45 to 60 feet high which greatly obscure the ability of anybody in the park or on the other side of the park from seeing it. He realizes the building is being described to the Board as an anomaly and it is different than the other buildings in the ward, but it is also the most dominant and prominent building within the ward. Therefore, it is an anomaly, but it is an anomaly that is the most highly visible building from around the park that you can see. This makes it a special case.

Mr. Shay said he does not believe that live oak tree canopy is modeled at the right scale on the model. The trees are a bit small and they reach across Drayton Street over into the point where they share the sidewalk on the eastern side of the street. The trees are also elements that change the scale in a big way.

Mr. Shay said of the many photographs that they have taken in this area, his favorite shows how three different architectures can come together in one place and adjust the position that works well. He said the dominant architecture element within their context immediately adjacent to their building favors Abercorn Street, but it is highly visible from the other sides. It is a 15-story building with a two-story penthouse. They are not present today asking for a 15-story building, but a five-story building with unobtrusive penthouse. Mr. Shay said they agree with almost all of the staff's recommendations with one minor exception. The first is their 15 to 20 foot base. If the Board tell them that they have to squeeze everything so that it is 20 feet from pilaster to pilaster instead of 21 feet, they will do it; but it would be inconsistent with the mid-century modern building in the immediate vicinity. They take exception to the penthouse and are desirous to have it as proposed.

Mr. Shay stated, therefore, they are asking to amend their petition to request that the Board recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) the penthouse and the base spacing and request conditional approved based on the staff's report so that they can study the other things more deeply in Part II.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Shay to explain the tower and his inspiration of why the tower is placed where it is and what it is. When he looks at it, it does not relate to the street or the corner. The copula on the Savannah Law School relates to the end of Goodwin Street.

Mr. Shay explained that the area Ms. Harris referred to as being the elevator tower at the end is not really that. Further, they have not settled on their mechanical system. He pointed out that they labeled the tower as being 108 feet tall, but it is fair to point out that the 30 feet at the top of this is actually a flag pole. It is actually approximately 80 feet tall which is similar in height to the tower on the Savannah Law School.

Ms. Caldwell stated that staff has 15 recommendations in their report for this petition. She asked Mr. Shay to address the recommendations they agree with and not agree with.

Mr. Shay said they agree and disagree as follows:

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

Disagree

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

Agree

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;

They are willing to add more fenestration.

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;

Agree

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;

Agree

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;

Agree.

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

Agree

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

Agree. This is Part II Design Detail.

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

Agree.

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

Agree

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;

Agree

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

Agree

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

Will restudy.

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;

Agree

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

Agree

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Harris reported that staff received a letter of support for the project from the president of the Savannah Law School. A copy of the letter is attached to today's agenda.

Dr. Roland Summers stated he is a member of the Georgia Medical Society Board of Trustees.

They own the building that is adjacent to this property. They are concerned about the building close to their property.

Ms. Karen Jenkins, Director of Savannah Tree Foundation, said they would like to see this design include tree lawns, street trees, and landscaping along Drayton Street and East Huntingdon Street.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that they agree with staff's recommendations. They agree that the sixth story should be eliminated and the variance not be recommended to the ZBA. The HSF asks that clarification be given on the glazing and the relationship for the first floor. The HSF believes that Drayton Street should be the primary façade.

Ms. Ardis Wood said the flagpole is overwhelming. They would love to see some trees here as they would help to soften the look of building.

Mr. Dicky Mopper was in agreement for a variance to provide a little more height. This building will backup to a 14 feet story building.

Mr. David Wasserman said this is their second commitment to Savannah. They are currently under construction with the building at 214 Drayton Street. They are sensitive to the design and the nature of the City of Savannah. They look forward to working with the Board.

Mr. Shay, in response to the public comments, said they have chosen to stay a way from the Georgia Medical Society's building by three feet. He said regarding the trees, they will get to the landscape and see what they can do. They will look to see what can be done on Huntingdon and Goodwin Streets in terms of adding tree lawns here. This would be the public right-of-way and they will get with the City of Savannah to see what they can do. Mr. Shay said they would like for the building to be glazed on the first floor and they have ideas as to how they can do this. As far as Drayton Street being the primary entrance, they need to be mindful that Drayton Street is a highly traffic street. They think that the appropriate entrance is on the corner of Huntingdon Street. He said regarding the flagpole, they can work around this.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the penthouse. The height does not appear to be the issue, but the number of floors. The Board agreed with the staff's recommendations. There are too many conditions in Part I.

Mr. Shay asked for a continuance.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition for Part I: Height and Mass of a new six story building at 607 Drayton Street, including the variance request for one-story above the Height Map, at the request of the petitioner, in order to consider the following:

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

2. Reduce the height of the tower element to be visually compatible in terms of height and scale;
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;
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;
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;
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;
7. Increase the height of the second story to 12 feet to meet the standard; - PASS
8. Ensure that the parapet has a string course to meet the standard;
9. Ensure that the height of the wall on the east (Goodwin) elevation does not exceed 11 feet;
10. Incorporate an additional massing standard to meet the requirement that a minimum of two massing elements be utilized;
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;
12. Incorporate additional height variation to meet the standard requiring roofline variation if continuous rooflines are greater than 120 linear feet;
13. Locate the elevator overrun within the bonus story to meet the standard;

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;
15. Redesign the window groupings to form bays of not less than 15 feet nor more than 20 feet wide to meet the standard.
16. Consider opportunities to better address Drayton Street.

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Tess Scheer

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

17. [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 - Window Specifications.pdf](#)

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner 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 side-gable roof of the main building is proposed to be altered to extend over the whole depth of the new addition.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends to continue the request for a two-story addition to the rear of the property located at 526 East Jones Street in order for the petitioner to address the following:

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

- proposed concrete block.
3. Provide the materials for the pair of doors on the addition.
 4. Provide the window muntin profile and width.

Mr. James Reardon said they are looking at the rear elevation and not the front. The owners want more light in the building. This is why they are requesting larger windows on the first floor. The doors are similar to the existing doors. He said the four conditions appear to be minor and asked the Board to approve for them to work with the staff to get the conditions resolved at the staff level.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Daniel Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they believe that the design does not meet the Secretary of Interior's Design Standards or the Preservation Briefs. They are concerned about the roofline.

Mr. Reardon, in response to the public comments, said the narrowness of the building is why they matched from side to side.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the roofline. They would like to see the existing roofline preserved. They agree with the staff's recommendation. The project needs to come back to the Board.

Mr. Reardon requested a continuance.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition for a two-story addition to the rear of the property located at 526 East Jones Street in order for the petitioner to address the following:

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. PASS
2. Revise the addition's foundation piers to be either brick or add true stucco over the proposed concrete block.
3. Provide the materials for the pair of doors on the addition.
4. Provide the window muntin profile and width.

Vote Results

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

18. [Petition of Homeline Architecture | 16-002205-COA | 110 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Rehabilitation](#)

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

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

Mr. Gunther recused also from participating in this petition as he serves as the tax credit consultant for this project.

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations and an addition to the property located at 110 East Oglethorpe Avenue. The building is currently internally configured as an office and is proposed to return to a single-family residence.

Ms. Michalak stated that all 3rd floor elements of the rear portion of the building are proposed to be removed; this includes an elevator shaft, closets, the roof between the second and third floors, and all equipment. A full 3rd floor, designed to look like an enclosed porch, will be added. At the 2nd floor, the exterior will remain unchanged. At the parlor level, the infill within two of the masonry bays will be removed and reconfigured; the westernmost bay will remain open with a new stair visible inside of the opening and the center bay will receive windows with louvers below. The infill will be removed from all three bays of the basement level and will be infilled with hogpenning. The lot coverage is not proposed to change from the current 38 percent. For the remainder of the building, the front façade basement windows are proposed to be replaced, new shutters will be added, the whole building will be repainted, and screened equipment will be located on the roof.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends to continue the petition for alterations and an addition to the property located at 110 East Oglethorpe Avenue in order for the applicant to consider redesigning the rear 3rd floor addition and the rear parlor level infill within the center masonry bay to address the following:

1. The design of the parlor level infill creates a false sense of historical development. Both the

- design and the materials need to reflect the fact that this is an historic façade dating from 1876.
2. The removal of the entire second floor structure to add the 3rd floor addition does not retain as much historic material as possible and is not reversible. Redesign the addition to retain more of the roof structure and roof elements.
 3. Further differentiated between the addition and the main building.
 4. Differentiate between the addition and the parlor level infill.
 5. Ensure that the new windows on the rear parlor level are inset a minimum of 3 inches from the face of the historic masonry piers.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Deering explained that the parlor level infill construction and the third floor infill were designed to bring cohesion to the rear façade. He believes that it was a little broken up. The house presently has a tower and a hallway on the third floor. A third floor addition was added in 1876 and built over the masonry piers. The rear of the house will remain visible from the public right-of-way from the lane because the owner does not wish to screen it with a gate, carriage house or anything. Therefore, they want to make the house look good, but respect the history of the house. This is a very important house in Georgia history. The first Georgia legislation met in this building in 1783.

Mr. Deering explained that the first floor bay between the two center piers was altered. In 1960 - 1961, an elevator was added. A portion of the second floor roof has been removed. In order to make the house viable for the next 50 years, Mr. Deering said he believes that new entry stairs must be added. They do not want to add to the footprint of this house. They designed the porch to go across and they believe that it is compatible and does not project a false sense of historical development because the details are modern. The design corresponds and is compatible with the historic architecture because they have maintained the baselines in the rear elevation. They kept the same window pattern on this floor and the louvered balusters were repeated below to bring some cohesion to the entire façade.

Mr. Deering stated that they can maintain the roof cornice which is all the public can see of the second roof that is presently here. They believe that the cornice line would let one know that at some point a roof was there at some point, but they would add an open porch and a partially enclosed porch to the third floor. The windows will be inset three inches from the masonry piers.

Ms. Deacon asked that at the second floor roof, are they replacing the existing historic framing to create the new roof terrace.

Mr. Deering explained that the roof is a few inches above the finished floor. Consequently, they needed to remove that section to get the porch to function properly. He stated that this is a tax credit project and will go to the Georgia State Preservation Office and the Department of Interior.

Ms. Lynch asked if the four windows that are on the rear façade are placement windows or are they the existing windows.

Mr. Deering stated that these are 1876 windows. An old window is here, but he believes it was moved from one area of the house and put here. The window behind the stairs that they can barely see will be replaced; but they will put a wood, true-divided light window here. To meet the ordinance, they are in agreement to put wood, true-divided light windows in the bay.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that they agree with staff comments. The main areas of concern are primarily the second floor roof. Ms. Meunier said she understood Mr. Deering's comment about maintaining the cornice. They believe this is a good idea. However, they have some concerns just as staff pointed out about retaining as much of the historic material as possible. They recognize that this may create a design challenge, but as much of the historic material that can be kept, should be done. It will also be interesting to know how this would be

affected by the tax credit. Ms. Meunier said they are concerned about the central bay of the parlor level ground floor. She said the HSF is interested in inviting the petitioner to meet with their architecture review committee to see whether they could find a design solution.

Mr. Deering, in response to public comments, stated that if SHPO has some comments on this and if they change it, they will bring it back to the Review Board. But, they are asking for the Board's consideration to their petition today.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Caldwell stated that she is glad this is a tax credit project. Some of the things that the petitioner wants to do may not be approved by SHPO. If the petitioners are committed to this project, they will adjust their design. Ms. Lynch said the infill on the back is consistent with anything that is being changed. Therefore, she does not believe that it is creating a false sense of history. Ms. McClain agrees with the staff's recommendations. Dr. Dominguez agreed with the petitioner. She believes it is visually compatible and does not create a false sense of historical development. Ms. Deacon agrees with the petitioner. The details are more contemporary than the historic building. Ms. Scheer asked if this petition was premature for the Review Board to look at this due to it could possible change upon going to SHPO. Mr. Merriman did not believe it is premature. He stated that Review Board should make its decision on what has been given to them. If it is necessary for the petition to come back before the Board, it will. Then the Board would make another determination at that time. Ms. Scheer is in agreement with the petitioner. Ms. Fletcher is in favor of the design.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations and an addition to the property located at 110 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that the new windows on the rear- PASS
parlor level are inset a minimum of 3 inches
from the face of the historic masonry piers.
2. Retain the cornice/roof line of the original
second floor roof on the exterior of the
building.

Vote Results

Motion: Becky Lynch

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye

Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Abstain
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Nay
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

19. [Petition of Gary Radke | 16-002265-COA | 21 Houston Street | Appeal of Staff Decision](#)

- Attachment: [16-002265-COA staff report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- supplementary info 10-25-06.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal packet- Before photograph.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal packet- During photograph.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Radke- Letter of Appeal.pdf](#)
Attachment: [After photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [1968 Historic Savannah Foundation Book Photograph.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Initial work completed.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Green Meldrim House documentation.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Independent Presbyterian Church documentation.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Lovett- letter of support for approval.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Gunther left the meeting at 5:12 p.m.

Mr. Gary Radke was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioners, Gary and Nancy Radke, are appealing a staff decision which approved porch alterations at 11 Houston Street (16-002125-COA). The petitioners are nearby property owners.

Ms. Harris explained that staff was contacted in April 2016 by the owner of 11 Houston Street, Barbara Treadwell, regarding some proposed alterations to rear of the property and a color change. During the course of the conversation, Ms. Treadwell noted that she had begun porch renovations based on a Certificate of Appropriateness that had been issued by the Historic Review Board in 2006 (H-06-3707-2). Staff informed Ms. Treadwell that the 2006 COA had expired and she would need to apply for a new COA, in addition to any new work proposed, which she promptly did.

Ms. Harris said that at the time of application, the work was already completed included adding flagstone to the porch base and floor, removing the column bases, adding wooden stairs to both the north and south sides of porch, and, due to the additional height of the flagstone, the bottom rail of the porch was flush with the flooring (see initial work completed attachment). While the work was not consistent with the 2006 COA issued, Ms. Treadwell contended that it was her belief that it was, and that she had approval. She also provided documentation regarding the use of flagstone within the Historic District on the US Customs House, the Greene Meldrim House, and the Independent Presbyterian Church as precedence for its use.

Ms. Harris stated that staff worked with Ms. Treadwell to bring the project into closer compliance with the ordinance. Staff requested that the wooden stairs on the south porch façade be removed, and railing installed. Staff requested that the wooden stairs on the north porch façade be removed and replaced with new stairs which match the porch base. Staff requested that the bases be added to the columns and that the bottom railing on the porch be raised above the porch floor to be visually

compatible. Ms. Treadwell agreed to all of staff's conditions, and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the porch, as well as color change was issued. A nearby property owner, Gary and Nancy Radke, contacted staff regarding the work and filed an appeal, contending that the work is not visually compatible (see letter of appeal).

Ms. Harris explained that staff does not have a formal recommendation for the Board as they do on a typical petition because this was a staff's approval previously. Therefore, it is left to the Board to make a determination whether the staff's decision should be reversed. Yesterday staff received a letter of support for the approval from a nearby neighbor. The letter is attached to today's agenda.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Radke came forward and thanked the Board for hearing their petition. He lives at 21 Houston Street. He and many neighbors are disturbed about the visual incompatible of this project. The materials or colors are not compatible. Mr. Radke said he appreciates the work that the staff has done and he understands the complexities of what staff does, but he disagrees with what has been done regarding his neighbor's petition. A variety of insufficient stones were used.

Mr. Radke said he walked around the city, looked and found a limited variety of colors. They are mostly grey when there is color. They are tawny; always smooth and never rough cut. He has found that when nearly always when sandstones are used, they are used in rectangular panels and not in the form as used here. Although, he does have a home that was restored by Jim Williams that has some irregular patchwork slate, but it is trimmed in brick so that from the street it looks like a brick stoop.

Mr. Radke said in terms of the 2006 petition and the approval that was made of this property, the proposal was specifically for brick steps, balusters and columns made of wood, and painting the existing concrete structure. It did not in any way give approval to the owners to make the kind of changes that were made.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Barbara Treadwell, owner of 11 Houston Street, said she asked her designer to talk with the Board about how the design decision was made. Ms. Treadwell said she has been living in the Historic District for 16 years in a home on East Gaston Street. She is very excited about the project at 11 Houston Street. The project is not complete and in looking at the stoop now the entire context of paint and landscaping is not seen. They did not start the project without being mindful of the historic value. She asked Mark to come forward and describe the process that they went through along with the change orders that were made by the planning commission.

Mr. Mark Gazaway, commercial and residential interior designer and set designer, stated that Ms. Treadwell contacted him for a color consult. He said in looking at the exterior colors of the home and the 1970's battleship grey concrete slab, they said what materials they could put here. Mr. Gazaway said not being familiar with the MPC, they pulled up the site and looked at the historical overview from the Secretary of Interior Standards. The standard talks about building exterior materials, which states that "stone is the most common and most lasting masonry building material used throughout history in American building construction. The kinds of stones most commonly used on historic buildings in the U.S. vary from sandstone, marble granite, and slate field stone." Therefore, they believed that stone was applicably a good option. Also, they wanted something to go with the color changes that they were proposing. He said further looking into the MPC information, and he believes the staff touched on this, "stoop pieces and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street." As the Board saw, the foundation walls are covered with metal siding all the way to the ground. So, it was hard for them to match the foundation in this instance.

Mr. Gazaway stated just as Ms. Treadwell said, every staff recommendation for changes on this stoop were done. Factually, they like the idea of having one-sided steps; adding the pickets and doing the

stairs that were originally done in wood in the same existing stone and material. In essence this required that Ms. Treadwell spend more money and more investment into the project as newly built wood stones had to be removed and put in the flagstones. If the Board looks at the Green Meldrim House, it may not be cut in the same manner, but the actual color throughout the house is more vivid than what is installed at 11 Houston Street.

Mr. Michael Powers stated that his son and he started an extensive limited liability corporation for the exclusive use of finding endangered historic properties that they could save. Under the tutelage of Mr. Carey, they won an award. He said he has known Ms. Treadwell for the entire 16 years that she has been in Savannah. Mr. Powers said he is not involved in this project. Ms. Treadwell has done a magnificent job at great expense on the interior; now, she is on the exterior. Mr. Powers said for those of them who pay attention to the regulations and what to do a job correctly, the stone is a permitted material. In this sense, he believes that Ms. Treadwell and her designer, Mark, along with the staff, to deny her the use of the materials that she has used follows into a subjective area of what compatibility means. This would not only be unfair to her from a financial standpoint, but also lose something that means a great deal to her. He respectfully asked the Board to deny Mr. Radke's petition.

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they met with Ms. Treadwell and Mr. Gaserway trying to resolve this situation as best as possible. This is a difficult set of circumstances and a difficult situation. Mr. Carey said Ms. Treadwell is a good Steward of property and a good neighborhood to this area. He is sympathetic to their plight and these are unusual circumstances.

Mr. Carey said they share the petitioner's concern and position that this is not the right material for this building. In accordance with the standards, the relationship of materials, texture and color, they do not believe that they meet the standards. This is a rather modest, vernacular building and introducing flagstone to this property in this day and age, does not seem compatible. Also the balcony, stairs, stoop, porticos and porches shall be the same material. It appears to be brick and minimally visible. But more importantly, they do not need to act like a design review board; they are a historic district review board. Aesthetically it may all pull together and be successful, but the HSF wants to assist in trying to help reach a resolution in this situation. If the HSF can assist in technical assistance and even assist in financial assistance, they are willing to do so. In another similar situation, the HSF assisted that petitioner.

Mr. Carey said the HSF does not believe the materials the standards are visually compatible. Therefore, they support the petitioner.

Mr. Radke, in response to public comments, said he is pleased that they may find a way to get the material historically appropriate.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The majority of the Board members do not believe that the materials are visually compatible. The flagstone does not meet the ordinance or the Secretary of Interior's Standards. While some examples were stated using the U.S. Custom House, the Meldrim House and the Presbyterian Church as precedence, these are monumental buildings and the use of the stones on these buildings are more refined and cut. In this area, the stoops are lighter with rails and decorative. The materials are heavy and not compatible. Dr. Dominguez agreed with staff's approval. She believes that the homeowner has attempted to be visually compatible and the end results are visually compatible. Ms. McClain stated that she is appreciative that the HSF is willing to assist the petitioners in this situation.

Mr. Merriman said this is not an "after-the-fact" approval that the Board is reviewing. This is not something that has been on the consent agenda that they would have had the right to put on the regular agenda. This is a staff approval that was made fully within the authority of the staff to make the

approval. The homeowner has been a COA according to all the laws and the ordinances. The petitioner has gone forward with the project that they were approved for and now, this is an after-the-fact removal of the COA. To him it seems unfair to the homeowner; regardless of whether this was approved had it come to the Historic District Review Board, they are being asked to tell the petitioner to start over, he does not believe that there is a precedence to go along with doing this.

Mr. Howington, for clarity, asked staff if the 2006 petition was an after-the-fact approval.

Ms. Harris explained that the 2006 COA was approved for brick, but Ms. Treadwell believed that she had the approval for the flagstone.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the appeal of the staff approval of porch alterations at 11 Houston Street (16-002125-COA) because the proposed alterations are not visually compatible and the design standards are not met. This decision reverses the issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness for 16-002125-COA which is hereby denied. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Nay
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Not Present
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Nay
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

20. [Petition of Kenneth Roundy | 16-000721-COA | 510 East McDonough Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 510 East McDonough Street 16-000721-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 510 McDonough Street 16-000721-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

21. [Petition of Barbara Treadwell | 16-002125-COA | 11 Houston Street | Staff Approved - After-the-Fact Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 11 Houston Street 16-002125-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Information - 11 Houston Street 16-002125-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of Barbara Treadwell | 16-002123-COA | 11 Houston Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 11 Houston Street 16-002123-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 11 Houston Street 16-002123-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Jacqueline Mason | 16-002192-COA | 440 Lincoln Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 440 Lincoln Street 16-002192-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 440 Lincoln Street 16-002192-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Richard H. Ellis | 16-002266-COA | 415 East Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Repairs, Gutters](#)

Attachment: [COA - 415 East Taylor Street 16-002266-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 415 East Taylor Street 16-002266-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of Ralph Anderson for Savannah Restoration, Inc. | 16-002315-COA | 209 West Jones Street | Staff Approved - Shutters](#)

Attachment: [COA - 209 West Jones Street 16-002315-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 209 West Jones Street 16-002315-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Scotty Snipes for SHC - Snipes Properties | 16-002337-COA | 321 East Liberty Street | Staff Approved - Repairs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 321 East Liberty Street 16-002337-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 321 East Liberty Street 16-002337-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of John Post for Commonwealth Construction | 16-002354-COA | 401 East Hall Street |](#)

Staff Approved - Gate

Attachment: [COA - 401 East Hall Street 16-2354-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 401 East Hall Street 16-002354-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. Petition of Patrick T. O'Connor for Oliver Maner LLP | 16-002413-COA | 110 Jefferson Street | Staff Approved - Replace Roof

Attachment: [COA - 110 Jefferson Street 16-002413-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 110 Jefferson Street 16-002413-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. Petition of Patrick T. O'Connor for Oliver Maner LLP | 16-002414-COA | 218 West State Street | Staff Approved - Replace Roof

Attachment: [COA - 218 West State Street 16-002414-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 218 West State Street 16-002414-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. Petition of Eric Organski for Neon Design & Sign, LLC | 16-002427-COA | 222 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Repairs and Restoration

Attachment: [COA - 222 Bull Street 16-002427-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 222 Bull Street 16-002427-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. Petition of Ashley Hodges for Lowcountry BAsement Systems | 16-002448-COA | 26 Houston Street | Staff Approved - Foundation Repair

Attachment: [COA - 26 Houston Street 16-002448-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Contract 26 Houston Street 16-002448-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. Petition of Paul Conroy for Coastal Canvas Products | 16-002517-COA | 36 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awnings

Attachment: [COA - 36 West Broughton Street 16-002517-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 36 West Broughton Steet 16-002517-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. Petition of Ray Hoover | 16-002544-COA | 510 East McDonough Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair

Attachment: [COA - 510 East McDonough Street 16-002544-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 510 East McDinough Street 16-002544-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 5-11-16.pdf](#)

Mr. Merriman stated 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

35. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, May 12, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

36. [Next Regular Meeting - Wednesday, June 8, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

37. [Nominating Committee Report](#)

Ms. Scheer reported that the Nominating Committee met and nominated Justin Gunther to serve as the Vice-Chair. The Board will vote on the nomination at the June 8, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Merriman stated that Dr. Williams, Dr. Henry, Ms. Simpson and Ms. Wiebe-Reed are no longer on the Historic District Board of Review. In order to give these past members a gift, he asked the Board to please give \$10.00 to purchase the gift.

38. [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](#)

The Board unanimously agreed to continue the discussion of the Proposed Revisions to the Historic District Ordinance at the June 8, 2016 meeting.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

39. [Adjournment](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, Mr. Merriman adjourned the meeting at approximately 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen Harris
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem