



Savannah Historic District Board of Review

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
August 9, 2017 1:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

AUGUST 9, 2017 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

A Pre-Meeting will be held at 12:00 PM in the Jerry Surrency Conference Room, 112 East State Street. Items on the Agenda will be presented by staff, as time permits, and the Board may ask questions. No testimony will be received and no votes will be taken.

Members Present: Stephen Merriman, Jr., Chair
Zena McClain, Esq., Vice-Chair
Debra Caldwell
Jennifer Deacon
Kellie Fletcher
Keith Howington
Mic Matson
Dwayne Stephens

Members Absent: Scott Cook
Becky Lynch
Andy McGarrity

MPC Staff Present: Ellen Harris, Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation
Leah Michalak, Senior Historic Preservation Planner
Sara Farr-Newman, Historic Preservation Planner
Alyson Smith, 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 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, 10 minutes, to comment. The petitioner will be given the opportunity to respond to the public comments.

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

[2. Approval of All Consent Agenda Items](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve August 9, 2017 Consent Agenda Items.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Dwayne Stephens

- Debra Caldwell - Aye
- Jennifer Deacon - Aye
- Kellie Fletcher - Aye
- Keith Howington - Not Present
- Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
- Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain
- Dwayne Stephens - Aye
- Mic Matson - Aye

[3. Petition of Ward Architecture + Preservation | 17-003633-COA | 219 East Charlton Street | Carriage House New Construction Part 2: Design Details](#)

- [Aerial View.pdf](#)
- [Lafayette Ward.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet - Description of Work and Illustrated History 219 East Charlton St. 17-003633-COA.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet - Photos 219 East Charlton Street 17-003633-COA.pdf](#)
- [Drawings.pdf](#)
- [Garage Door Specification.pdf](#)
- [Staff Recommendation .pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby: Approve Part 2: Design Details for new construction of a carriage house at 219 East Charlton Street as proposed because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Dwayne Stephens

- Debra Caldwell - Aye
- Jennifer Deacon - Aye
- Kellie Fletcher - Aye
- Keith Howington - Not Present
- Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
- Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain
- Dwayne Stephens - Aye
- Mic Matson - Aye

[4. Petition of Stephanie Bock | 17-004201-COA | 555 East Broughton Street | Fence](#)

[📎 Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Package.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a fence replacement at 555 East Broughton Street, because the work meets the standards and is visually compatible.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[5. Petition of Ward Architecture + Preservation | 17-004258-COA | 20 West Taylor Street | Alterations](#)

[📎 17-004258-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[📎 Cast stone sample.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition to alter the front stoop for the property located at 20 West Taylor Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the design and preservation standards.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[6. Petition of Mary Anderson | 17-004268-COA | 310 East Jones Street | Fence](#)

[📎 Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Package.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a fence at 310 East Jones Street, because the fence meets the standards and is visually compatible.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[7. Petition of The Fitzroy | 17-004306-COA | 9 Drayton Street | Sign and Color Change](#)

[📎 17-004306-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet - Samples.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet - Existing Conditions Photos.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a principal use projecting sign and color changes for the property located at 9 Drayton Street with the following condition because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the preservation and sign standards.

-Reselect the black building color to be a considerably lighter color and reselect the shutter color to be darker than the building color.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[8. Petition of Homeline Architecture | 17-004333-COA | 221 East Gaston Street | Alterations](#)

- [Stephens Ward.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- [Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- [Aerial View.pdf](#)
- [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet -Material Specifications.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby: Approve the proposed alterations to the non-historic addition and carriage house at 221 East Gaston Street with the following conditions:

- 1.Revise the metal roof’s standing seam so that it does not exceed one inch;
- 2.Ensure the proposed balcony does not extend more than three feet in depth;
- 3.Provide specifications for the replacement garage door for review;

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[9. Petition of Dama LLC | 17-004340-COA | 141 Bull Street | Alterations](#)

- [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for new windows and alterations at 141 Bull Street with the following conditions:

1. Additional evidence is provided confirming the existing façade is not historic;
2. The window opening dimensions are provided;
3. The window inset is a minimum of four inches;
4. A specification is provided for the windows;

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[10. Petition of Barbara Treadwell | 17-004378-COA | 11 Houston Street | Fence](#)

[📎 Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Package.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a fence at 11 Houston Street, because it meets the standards and is visually compatible.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

[11. Adopt the August 9, 2017 Agenda](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby adopt the August 9, 2017 Agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jennifer Deacon

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[12. Approval of July 12, 2017 Briefing Minutes](#)

[July 12, 2017 HBR Briefing Minutes.docx](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve July 12, 2017 Briefing Minutes

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Abstain
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Abstain
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[13. Approval of July 12, 2017 Meeting Minutes](#)

[07-12-2017 Minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District board of Review does hereby approve July 12, 2017 Meeting Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Debra Caldwell

- Debra Caldwell - Aye
- Jennifer Deacon - Abstain
- Kellie Fletcher - Aye
- Keith Howington - Not Present
- Zena McClain, Esq. - Abstain
- Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain
- Dwayne Stephens - Aye
- Mic Matson - Aye

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

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

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue all items to Next Regular Meeting.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Jennifer Deacon

- Debra Caldwell - Aye
- Jennifer Deacon - Aye
- Kellie Fletcher - Aye
- Keith Howington - Not Present
- Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
- Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain
- Dwayne Stephens - Aye
- Mic Matson - Aye

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

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve to continue the petition to the next regular meeting.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[16. Petition of Gary Sanders | 16-003487-COA | 305 West Wayne Street | New Construction Part I: Height and Mass](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve to continue the petition to the next regular meeting.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens
 Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[17. Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 16-006847-COA | 405 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. | New Construction Part I: Height and Mass](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve to continue the petition to the next regular meeting.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens
 Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye

Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[18. Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 16-006851-COA | 620 East River Street \(Hilton Hotel\) | New Construction Part II: Design Details](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve to continue the petition to the next regular meeting.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens
 Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[19. Petition of Gary Sanders | 17-000198-COA | 305 West Wayne Street | Demolition of a Non-Contributing Building](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve to continue the petition to the next regular meeting.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens
 Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[20. Petition of Greenline Architecture | 17-002904-COA | 63 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. | New Construction Part I:](#)

[Height and Mass](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve to continue the petition to the next regular meeting.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[21. Petition of Hansen Architecture | 17-002907-COA | 303-309 Alice Street | New Construction Part II: Design Details](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve to continue the petition to the next regular meeting.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[22. Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 17-003634-COA | 300 and 326 West Bay Street | New Construction Hotel: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve to continue the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass at 300 and 326 West Bay Street.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Jennifer Deacon

- Debra Caldwell - Aye
- Jennifer Deacon - Aye
- Kellie Fletcher - Aye
- Keith Howington - Not Present
- Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
- Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain
- Dwayne Stephens - Aye
- Mic Matson - Aye

[23. Petition of Christian Sottile | 17-003637-COA | 200-500 West River Street | Master Sign Plan](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve to continue the petition to the next regular meeting.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Jennifer Deacon

- Debra Caldwell - Aye
- Jennifer Deacon - Aye
- Kellie Fletcher - Aye
- Keith Howington - Not Present
- Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
- Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain
- Dwayne Stephens - Aye
- Mic Matson - Aye

[24. Petition of Christian Sottile | 17-003638-COA | 447 Bull Street | Carriage House New Construction Part 2: Design Details](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve to continue the petition to the next regular meeting.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[25. Petition of Sharath Guolia | 17-004309-COA | 114 East Broughton Street | Signs and Alterations](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve to continue the petition to the next regular scheduled meeting.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Jennifer Deacon

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

[26. Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, Shay | 17-002122-COA | 620 East River Street \(Hotel Anne\) | New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass](#)

- [📎 2012 COA and Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- [📎 Aerial.pdf](#)
- [📎 New Franklin Ward Wharf Lots MAP B.pdf](#)
- [📎 17-002122-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- [📎 Submittal Packet- Drawings.pdf](#)
- [📎 Submittal Packet- Renderings.pdf](#)
- [📎 Submittal Packet- Model Photos.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction: Part 1, Height and Mass for a two and three story hotel to be located on the vacant parcel at 602 East River Street.

Ms. Harris said to due to the size and significance of this project, it was previously decided (in 2012) by the Review Board that the Part I, Height and Mass review would be considered in two phases. Phase A would consider height, proportion of structure's front façade, rhythm of structures on the street (setbacks and any parking standards that affect setbacks), massing including recesses and scale. Phase B would consider proportion of openings, rhythm of solids to voids, entrances and balcony/porch rhythm, any parking standards that may affect these openings or entrances, walls of continuity, and roof shape. Directional character would be considered by both the building form and openings, and applies to both Part I and II reviews. Because of the revisions to all Part A criteria, this review includes both Part A and Part B.

Ms. Harris stated that the proposed development is in the northeast corner of the Savannah Historic District and consists of three buildings, with bridge connections between them, and two courtyards. The buildings are two stories along River Street to the south, and three stories along the River Walk to the north, due to the grade change. The west building has a rooftop pool and trellis, accessed by elevator and stairs. The central building features an outdoor garden, trellis, terrace and roofed mechanical equipment area. The eastern building features a rooftop garden, outdoor space, trellis, and is accessed by stairs and elevator. The eastern building also features a prominent entry on River Street. The height of the buildings is 37 feet, four inches to the top of the roof. The combined footprint of the buildings is 22,080 square feet. The development features one floor connecting the three buildings which is partially located underground.

Ms. Harris explained that this development first came before the Review Board in 2012 [File No. H-120719-4727-2].

December 2012 Meeting (continued):

General Comments:

1. Lower heights will allow greater views in the spirit of open structures along River Street. Preserve as much of the River view as possible.
2. River Street is an organic element that follows the shape of the river and Factors' Walk is the primary context.
3. Cupolas and rooftop features have a better place at the end or beginning of River Street, as you enter General McIntosh Boulevard, not the centerline of the road.
4. Continue the connections between the pedestrian spaces and the River.

Building Specific Comments:

1. The two-story retail buildings are not compatible. Long, two-story buildings with greater open space is recommended.
2. Extend the gable roof to the south end of the building to be more compatible with buildings in the historic district. The exterior of the building should echo the change in design provided in the broken roof shape which may help break up the massing of the structures.
3. Reduce the overall height of the structures. The second floor should not exceed the height of the first floor.
4. Eliminate the bridges between the structures. If the bridges are determined to be appropriate the roof should be eliminated to be compatible with the bridges in the Factors walk area and to reduce the physical and visual obstructions to the river view.
5. Reduce the height of the center elevator projection as much as possible; consider a flat roof.

January 2013 Meeting (approved with conditions):

1. Parapet heights not exceed four feet, and
2. Verify location and dimensions of stair tower or reduce and reduce height to the greatest extent possible.

January 2017 Meeting (denied):

The previous two building configuration was revised to a one building configuration; and the height increased from two to four stories.

May 2017 Meeting (not heard):

The petitioner requested a continuance prior to being heard by the HDBR, though after the staff recommendation was published. The petitioner provided the following responses to staff's original comments:

1. Eliminate the third story as well as elevator and stair access.

Petitioner's response: The building does not have a third story. There is a rooftop level with outdoor spaces. Proposed enclosed spaces on the roof level are used for stair and elevator access and mechanical equipment. These are allowed in section (N)(2) of the ordinance. Mechanical Equipment and activated roof space are common features of buildings within the Factors Walk Character Area. See images shown on sheet A009.

2. Restudy proportions and rhythm of solids to voids on the south façade of the west building.

Petitioner's response: We have updated the south facade of the west building to include window spacing within the 2:1 solid to void ratio. We have also simplified the end walls and removed the balconies with louvers.

3. Revise the north elevations on all three buildings to incorporate windows that are taller than they are wide (see comments under rhythm of solids to voids).

Petitioner's Response: The north elevation has been revised. Window and door openings are taller than they are wide.

4. On the northern portion of the west elevation of the west building, adjacent to Morrell Park, incorporate additional voids. On the southern portion, incorporate a regular rhythm of punched openings (windows) in the bays.

Petitioner's response: Additional voids have been incorporated on the northern portion of Morrell Park facing elevation and the rhythm of the facade has been updated/simplified.

5. Within the entrance portion of the east elevation of the east building, adjacent to the plaza, incorporate additional voids on the ground floor; on the central portion, incorporate a regular rhythm of punched openings (windows) on the second floor; and on the northern portion incorporate additional voids.

Petitioner's response: Additional voids have been incorporated and the rhythm of the facade has been updated/simplified.

6. On the east and west facades, adjacent to the courtyards, incorporate additional voids in the northern portions, and incorporate a regular rhythm of punched openings (windows) into the southern sections of the buildings.

Petitioner's response: Additional voids have been incorporated and the rhythm of the facades have been updated/simplified. Some areas without windows still remain. We propose keeping these solid walls as they conflict with the exterior stairs. We have also included several photos of buildings in the character area with irregular window spacing and more solid walls. The Olde Harbour Inn, which is the closest historic building on the site has large void spaces on its East facing facade. See sheet A008.

7. Increase the size of the courtyards, align one with the staircase to the north, and remove the fence and gates.

Petitioner's response:

- a. GMS studied the building spacing in the factors walk character area and found that most of the spacing between the historic buildings was less than the spacing provided. See sheet A006. The design intent is for proposed courtyards to have a pedestrian scale with adequate shading during the summer from the adjacent walls and awnings. In addition, the smaller courtyards are consistent with the historic building density and reflect the unique pedestrian nature of Savannah.
- b. The proposed stair to the north does not currently exist; recent petitions have been approved which block the river view of existing historic stairs. Please see the character area photos on sheet A007.

Stair alignment is not a feature of many of the stairs in the character area. We ask that this request be reconsidered.

- c. The proposed fencing provides "walls of continuity" as described in the visual compatibility factors of the ordinance, section (m)(9). Fencing will also comply with the design standards (n)(12).

8. *Eliminate the bridge connecting the buildings.*

Petitioner's Response: There are multiple examples of bridges within the factors walk character area. Images have been added to the latest submission showing examples of these historic structures. We feel that this is a genuine use of historic precedent and ask that the request be reconsidered. Please see added images sheet A005.

9. *Redesign the projecting entrance on the east building to better integrate into the overall building.*

Petitioner's response: The projecting entrance has been redesigned to include window types used at adjacent facades. Additional openings have been added.

10. *Substantially reduce the number of balconies and eliminate the privacy dividers. Integrate any proposed balconies into the form and massing of the buildings.*

Petitioner's response: Balconies on west facade of west building have been eliminated. All remaining balconies are to be terraces.

11. *Eliminate the fire escape staircases within the courtyards.*

Petitioner's response: There are multiple examples of exterior stairs within the factors walk character area. Images have been added to the latest submission showing examples of exterior stairs in the character area. Please see added images sheet A005.

12. *Revise the roof shapes to be more consistent within and integrated design, and integrate the chimneys within the building massing.*

Petitioner's response: All chimneys and pitched roofs have been eliminated. All roofs are either green roofs or flat roofs.

13. *Revise the volumes of the buildings into a more integrated building concept and scale.*

Petitioner's response: The updated design integrates the facades and helps to unify the concept. Elimination of the various roof types into flat roofs simplifies the volumes.

14. *Provide the roof pitch.*

Petitioner's response: Pitched roofs have been removed. Latest roofs are all low slope roofs with approximately ¼" slope per foot.

15. *Ensure a ten-foot pedestrian setback is provided on the north side of River Street.*

Petitioner's response: The requested pedestrian setback is provided and dimensioned on sheet A105.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends a continuance in order for the petitioner to address the following:

1. Reduce the overall height and scale of the buildings by reducing the basement height so that it is not considered a story, reduce the parapet height, and minimize the heights of the trellis and rooftop access.
2. Restudy the interface of the buildings on the north facade where they sit six feet, six inches above

the pedestrian Riverwalk level.

3. Eliminate the voids in the parapets or utilize another material to avoid the appearance of an additional story.
4. Redesign the south façade of the west building which features a very large expanse of glass to incorporate more solids.
5. Increase the size of the courtyards, and remove the fencing and gates.
6. Eliminate the bridges connecting the buildings.
7. Eliminate the fire escape staircases within the courtyards.
8. Eliminate the roofed area over the mechanical equipment and replace with screening.
9. Provide the location of the electric meter.

Ms. Deacon asked staff to explain how the trellis areas on the top of the buildings connect to the overall height.

Ms. Harris explained that a story is defined in the ordinance as "that portion of the building, other than the basement, included between the surface of any floor in the surface of the next floor above it or if there is no floor above it, then the space between the floor and ceiling above the floor of such story." She explained that a basement is entirely underground and is four feet or less, it does not count. Uninhabitable roof top structures such as cupolas, chimneys, tank supports and supports structures shall not count as a story. Therefore, because the trellis is essentially not a roof structure and the others are access structures, they do not count as a story, although they are still within the Board's purview to determine visual compatibility pertaining to height.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay introduced the firm's staff accompanying him at today's meeting. Mr. Shay stated that the height map that is in the ordinance says that the area they are operating in is limited to two stories. But, this means two stories above River Street and this is what they have presented to the Board. The reason that this is so important really has to do with the grounds that are in this area. River Street, itself, bears an elevation that is on an order of about 11 feet mean sea level. The requirement [flood plain elevation] for new construction is 13 feet mean sea level. Their challenge is that the elevation of the River Walk is about 6 foot 6 inches above mean sea level. They have changed the design to basically push down the restaurant and the back of the house in order to meet the standards. Therefore, there is actually no more than four feet out of the ground until it reaches a certain point and then continues to slope down beneath the River Walk. Mr. Shay explained what they are proposing to do today to build up the existing grade along the side of the building to 9 feet mean sea level and wrap it along the River Walk so that the difference between that elevation would be only four feet. He said that this does mitigate some of the staff's concerns about the appearance along River Walk. They are proposing to the Review Board that they step the building back by compressing the footprint. The difference between that and the required floor plan would be no more than 20 feet. As he has pointed out, the ordinance says they are limited to two stories above River Street. Therefore, they are not asking for a variance for this standard. What they are trying to do is their very best to mitigate the factor that the existing elevation to the River Walk is only 6 feet - 6 inches mean sea level.

Mr. Shay said in accordance with the staff's recommendation, they are willing to look at reducing the parapet height and minimize the height of the trellis from the rooftop access structures in Part II. With regards to restudying the interface of the buildings on the north facade where they sit six feet, six inches above the pedestrian Riverwalk level, after hearing the staff's concerns they are willing to look at creating some entries off the Riverwalk where you will actually be able to come into the two courtyards from the north side. They agree with eliminating the voids in the parapets or utilize another material to avoid the appearance of an additional story. Regarding the staff recommendation to redesign the south façade of the west building which features a very large expanse of glass to incorporate more solid, they like the fact that they are breaking the rule, but not the standards in the ordinance, but they came up with their own design along River Street by instead of having a building façade that would be solid masonry with punch windows when they get to the main entrance which is also where River Street curves further out as it moves to join Bay Street, the facade of this area would be more voids than solids. But, they are willing to look at ways to incorporate more balance here and have some more solids in the window wall. He asked

the Board for more discussion on this issue. He said regarding increasing the size of the courtyards and removing the fencing and gates is a tremendous challenge. These are private courtyards. The land is not owned by the City of Savannah. As you go from west to east, you will see that a very large open park area is here. Two small courtyards allow a view in between the buildings because this was an aesthetic concern of the related board in regards to the master plan for this area. A very large open plaza is here also. There are a variety of different width spaces. Mr. Shay stated that he believes it is very unusual for a courtyard not to have some way to secure it, especially at night. Mr. Shay said regarding this, they would like to continue to close the courtyards. The drawings that were shown to the Board, they decided to make them transparent as they want to be able to see through these.

Mr. Shay stated that eliminating the bridges connecting the buildings and eliminating the fire escape staircases within the courtyards are problematic. He stated that this site is located in the Factors Walk Character Area. Therefore, they thought it was perfectly appropriate to look to other defining elements within the Factors Walk Area, including Factors Walk, itself, for some ledger of inspiration. They found that the character area includes a lot of stairways. The other element concerns the width of the courtyards. When they saw this in the staff's report, they did a precise study of all of the widths between buildings that are found in the Factors Walk Character Area. Mr. Shay said they found that they are mostly 23 feet which is approximately what they have proposed. He said regarding the roof area of the mechanical equipment, they have done a lot of work to ensure that they are clearly within the standards as far as visual compatibility. The trellis area will provide shade to the people who are enjoying the view from the top of the building. They are willing to look at reducing the height, but he does not want to over-promise as they want the trellises to function. With regards to the central building, the mechanical area that is presented is exempt from being considered a story. They would like to have the opportunity to move forward in the design details. They do not want to put a roof over anything that is not absolutely necessary.

Ms. Deacon stated that she is aware that bridges are not allowed over a right-of-way. She asked staff if there is anything in the ordinance pertaining to bridges regarding individual property.

Ms. Harris answered no; it really comes to visual compatibility. Streets and lanes are not allowed to be bridged by development, except within Factors Walk.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] stated that this is another challenging site. He believes the petitioner has been somewhat responsive to the changes. Mr. Carey said he believes the staff's recommendation for a continuance is correct. He believes that some fine tuning will make this a successful project. Mr. Carey said he understood the petitioner's argument regarding the mean sea level, etc.. but, you can not deny the results that will come from taking care of this issue. The proximity to the Riverwalk and the narrow little chute that exists here to walk under makes any building feel taller than it is. Mr. Carey said he understood the point regarding the height and the two stories above River Street, but they must go back to what it will look like and how it will act if constructed this way. The petitioner agreed to eliminate the voids. The openings on the south façade of the west building is shown a little different, but it is somewhat reminiscent of the openings experienced on the Hyatt as it spans River Street. When the little extra part was built, glass was on both sides and they used this for balls and other functions. Mr. Carey said they understood the safety aspect, but maybe the size of the courtyard and the fencing could be resolved. The bridges are a little troublesome to him, although he understood what it means to be in the Factors Walk Character Area. He realizes the intention is to open this up for visual access to the water, but he believes this defeats that; it appears contradictory to what it is trying to achieve. As he has stated, the HSF is in agreement for a continuance.

Mr. Shay stated, in response to public comments, that they appreciate the comments from the HSF. The bridges are very important to them, to the character and the scale of the courtyards. They are trying very hard in a respectful way to create places and spaces along the riverfront in an honest and legitimate way. The bridges are there to be a part, to frame and limit the view of the sky, but does not limit or preclude the view of the river. They want these to be intimate spaces; they want them to be places where people feel that they are in a wonderful outdoor room in the tradition of Savannah and they have chosen to draw on the character defining element from within the Factors Walk Character Area. This also makes it convenient to move from one bridge to the other without having to go down two flights of stairs, walk across the courtyard, and then go back up. Is it necessary to have that many fire exits; the answer is

"yes" it is. But, north of River Street the only buildings they can draw reference to that matters historically are the industrial buildings. If he needs to, he will do the research and tell the Board that these industrial buildings were covered with exterior stairways, ironwork, and connectors. But, what they want to do more than anything else is to create intimate, architecture in this area that looks like it belongs in Savannah, GA and not look like it fell out of the sky from somewhere else.

Mr. Shay said he was calling on the Board members to understand that this is not easy. But, if all they ever do is to weed out everything that makes an honest and straightforward attempt to be more of Savannah, then what they are doing is making all the architecture look generic.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board is aware that this is a difficult site. They understood Mr. Shay's responses in trying to minimize the height. Something needs to be done to the soften the exterior next to the waterfront. The renderings make the building appear to be massive and long. More efforts need to be made to reduce this. The bridges appear not to be visually compatible. It is believed that that courtyard would be more successful if the bridges were eliminated. The courtyards are more common to Savannah than the bridges. Other options need to be explored for the fire escapes. The Board agreed with the staff recommendations.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Shay if he was requesting that Board vote on the petition today or asking for a continuance.

Mr. Shay asked for a continuance.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the request for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass in order for the petitioner to consider the following:

1. Reduce the overall height and scale of the buildings by reducing the basement height so that it is not considered a story, reduce the parapet height, and minimize the heights of the trellis and rooftop access.
2. Restudy the interface of the buildings on the north facade where they sit six feet, six inches above the pedestrian Riverwalk level.
3. Eliminate the voids in the parapets or utilize another material to avoid the appearance of an additional story.
4. Redesign the south façade of the west building which features a very large expanse of glass to incorporate more solids.
5. Increase the size of the courtyards, and remove the fencing and gates.
6. Eliminate the bridges connecting the buildings.
7. Eliminate the fire escape staircases within the courtyards.
8. Eliminate the roofed area over the mechanical equipment and replace with screening.
9. Provide the location of the electric meter.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[27. D2 - Petition of Smith Dalia Architects | 17-003644-COA | 701 Montgomery Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

- 📎 [Gaston Ward Map.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Historic Height District Map.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Staff Research.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Photos and Drawings.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Zoning and Height Map.pdf](#)
- 📎 [17-003644-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Mass Standards and Variances.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Site Plan.pdf](#)

Mr. Brian Whitfield was present on behalf of Smith Dalia Architects.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of a 5-story building for the property located at 701 Montgomery Street. The property is an entire city block and faces MLK, Jr. Blvd. to the west, West Hall Street to the north, Montgomery Street to the east, and West Hall Lane to the south with a footprint of 24,719 square feet. The western half of the property lies within a 5-story height zone while the eastern half of the property lies within a 4-story height zone; the entire building is proposed to be 5-stories. Access to a portion of the roof, as a resident amenity, is proposed along the Montgomery Street façade.

Ms. Michalak said the applicant is also requesting variances from the following standards:

1. *The Historic District Height Map allows a maximum of 4-stories on half of the property while 5-stories are proposed.*
2. *Parking within the ground floor of a building shall be setback a minimum of 30 feet from property lines along all public rights-of-way (not including lanes).*
3. *Maximum height shall not exceed two stories within 20 feet of a lane when across the lane from an “R” zoning district.*
4. *A minimum of one (1) primary entrance shall be provided for every 60 feet of street frontage, excluding lanes. Intervals between entrances shall not be less than 15 feet nor exceed 90 feet.*

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends to continue the request for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of a 5-story residential building for the property located at 701 Montgomery Street in order for the applicant to address the following:

1. Redesign the building to fit within the 4-story portion of the Height Map, to be no more than 2-stories within 20 feet of the lane, and to reduce the overall height of the building by reducing the parapet height and the height of the rooftop structures.
2. Further break up the building into multiple volumes to be visually compatible with the smaller footprints of the surrounding contributing buildings.
3. Redesign the building mass to better address MLK; the fenced area is too long and the space

between this building and the historic building to the south along MLK is too great.

4. Redesign the building to meet two massing standards per the Large Scale development requirements in addition to the half-story height change requirement where a façade exceeds 120 linear feet.
5. Redesign the building so that it addresses all three streets with MLK as the primary façade; this includes providing a primary entrance for every 60 feet of street frontage, excluding lanes. Intervals between entrances shall not be less than 15 feet nor exceed 90 feet.
6. Redesign the ground floor so that all parking is setback 30 feet from all street fronting facades.
7. Redesign the roof shapes; where the new roof design has parapets, ensure that they have a string course and coping.
8. Redesign the solids to voids, including: the spacing between windows, the large expanses of void along Hall Street with a direct view into the parking area, lack of windows on the MLK and Hall ground floor facades. The ground floor is to have 55% and upper levels are to have 20% windows and doors.
9. Redesign the first floor of the building as a storefront. Ensure that door frames, window sashes, and storefront glazing are inset a minimum of 4 inches, and that storefront glazing extend from a sill or from an 18 to 24 inch tall base of contrasting material.
10. Redesign the building to have a base, middle, and top. The top story should be distinctive from the stories below and the height of the first story should be visually taller than the height of the top floor.
11. Provide: awning clearance above sidewalk, roof pitches, height of all fences and walls, electric meter locations, and HVAC unit locations with screening information.

Ms. Michalak also reported that staff recommends denial to the Zoning Board of Appeals from the following standards because the variance criteria are not met:

1. *The Historic District Height Map allows a maximum of 4-stories on half of the property while 5-stories are proposed.*
2. *Parking within the ground floor of a building shall be setback a minimum of 30 feet from property lines along all public rights-of-way (not including lanes).*
3. *Maximum height shall not exceed two stories within 20 feet of a lane when across the lane from an "R" zoning district.*
4. *A minimum of one (1) primary entrance shall be provided for every 60 feet of street frontage, excluding lanes. Intervals between entrances shall not be less than 15 feet nor exceed 90 feet.*

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Whitfield thanked the Staff and Board for reviewing their petition. Mr. Whitfield said their clients want to build a residential building in this neighborhood. They looked at the surrounding buildings in this block. They are asking for a variance because the complexity and size being 5-story. Four stories have been consolidated, but they want one contiguous height. The biggest issue for them is it is a long site, but it is narrow. There is a lot of frontage on Hall Street and the lane behind them. They want to park everything on site. They are presently at 75 units and have 76 spaces allocated for their parking lot. The only way to achieve this is to bring the building over and park underneath the structure and then come down on pillars for one of the three frontages, either west Hall, MLK and Montgomery. Mr. Whitfield said they chose to address Montgomery Street because they felt it was a better pedestrian oriented street. A vacant lot to the south on Montgomery Street was an easy development parcel for future residential use on this point. Therefore, once this is developed, the massing would be more contiguous from a standpoint along Montgomery Street. The complexity for them is also they are raising the building for the other two facades along Hall Street and MLK; and then how to they screen this. Mr. Whitfield said they believe that a lot of the comments on the staff report were for more active uses on the frontage.

Therefore, between the 30 foot setback from the property line and where you would park, obviously a building will be there. If they tried to do this because of a three sided lot, they would lose 41% of their property and probably about three quarters of available parking capacity. Therefore, there is no way they can get to a tenth of their density standpoint to get to the four or 5 stories. They would not be able to do more than two-story townhomes. They do not believe that this is the intent of the ordinance. The zoning ordinance was introduced to encourage the higher density for here and for them.

Mr. Whitfield said there are some compromises they had to make just to site the building at a density that the city wants to see and then come back to what warrants from an historic standpoint. They did not want to come in and start putting in false façades and false entrances into their parking lot. From a strategy standpoint, they came up with how could they screen this with a contiguous wall between the buildings. The comments made by staff is that they have open space. He confirmed that they do have open space; but they do not have enough entrances, so they did not see the need to put entries into a parking lot. He said he gets the intent of the zoning code is of the Historic Review Board by trying to create a rhythm of entries and historic contexts, but it does not work for a program that does not have active use in those areas. Therefore, the majority of what they were looking at when they got the staff report had a lot to do with that. One issue concerned the height for the parapet which is manageable for them. The variances that they are asking for are really critical to conditions such as this.

Mr. Whitfield said the building will be L-shaped facing Montgomery Street and wrap around Hall Street which becomes more of a secondary façade. Montgomery Street will be preferred because of the bus stop and a more commercial corner on that side. To do a project this big, even though it is a broad project, it is a thin building. He said that they do not have the room and if they start breaking this down, they go from 76 parking spaces to something in the high 20s. This does not support the residential in height and scale. When looking at the comment on scale and height, the adjacent context of the big box retail across the street from their property is 129,000 square feet floor and they are at 24,719 square feet which makes them smaller.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Monica Letourneau resides at 707 Jefferson Street. She received the notification today from the MPC that the petitioner is requesting five variances. She looked at the drawings last night and is not opposed to contemporary architecture. Her home is on the contemporary side. Ms. Letourneau said she agrees with all of the staff's recommendations. She is concerned about going five feet on Montgomery Street side and has spoken to the property owners that are across the street. These property owners are opposed to having large scale property be built five feet on this side. Ms. Letourneau stated she understands this is a challenge, but she likes it as the city had it one time with going underground to park. She is not familiar with the parking code, but she wonders if this is not being covered because they are required to keep ten percent of the property unbuilt.

Mr. Whitfield stated that they are allowed to build 100% lot coverage.

Ms. Letourneau said this gives the petitioner the opportunity to have the 100% coverage, therefore, they could actually activate some of the storefront along Montgomery Street or along Hall Street and even Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. She said having a small coffee shop at the corner of Montgomery and Hall Streets does not seem to be quite enough as they really do want to activate the community. This community could benefit from having more small business owners.

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said that staff has done a very good report and the HSF agrees with all of their recommendations. Mr. Carey said he appreciates the petitioner's explanation of the challenges of this site, but it does suffer from some fundamental issues; the height, mass, scale, and setbacks are the big four issues. The properties are to be pursued in the context with the rules and guidelines that are pertinent to where they are located. Sometimes, a project just is not right for the site; therefore, you have to look elsewhere. Mr. Carey said he did not have an answer for the developer, but he will say that he thinks the staff's recommendation for a continuance is generous and should be seized upon and focus on height, mass, and setback.

Mr. Whitfield, in response to public comments, said he understood the public comments. He said regarding trying to bring the building down a floor and spread it over the whole lot, they do not have the room to do so. They could potentially put a court yard in the middle, but this would not do anything for

height and scale.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board agreed with the staff's recommendations to deny the variances request, but continue the petition. The petitioner needs to find some way to include a goal to activate the neighborhood. Because the variances are so key to the entire design of this project, they agreed with the HSF that asking for a continuance is generous as this project needs some real reconsiderations in terms of how it is designed. The project is massive and not compatible with the surrounding area.

Mr. Merriman informed Mr. Whitfield that staff has recommended a continuance. He asked him if he was asking for a vote today or asking for the continuance.

Mr. Whitfield asked for the continuance.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve to continue the request for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of a 5-story residential building for the property located at 701 Montgomery Street in order for the applicant to address the following:

1. Redesign the building to fit within the 4-story portion of the Height Map, to be no more than 2-stories within 20 feet of the lane, and to reduce the overall height of the building by reducing the parapet height and the height of the rooftop structures.
2. Further break up the building into multiple volumes to be visually compatible with the smaller footprints of the surrounding contributing buildings.
3. Redesign the building mass to better address MLK; the fenced area is too long and the space between this building and the historic building to the south along MLK is too great.
4. Redesign the building to meet two massing standards per the Large Scale development requirements in addition to the half-story height change requirement where a facade exceeds 120 linear feet.
5. Redesign the building so that it addresses all three streets with MLK as the primary facade; this includes providing a primary entrance for every 60 feet of street frontage, excluding lanes. Intervals between entrances shall not be less than 15 feet nor exceed 90 feet.
6. Redesign the ground floor so that all parking is setback 30 feet from all street fronting facades.
7. Redesign the roof shapes; where the new roof design has parapets, ensure that they have a string course and coping.
8. Redesign the solids to voids, including: the spacing between windows, the large expanses of void along Hall Street with a direct view into the parking area, lack of windows on the MLK and Hall ground floor facades. The ground floor is to have 55% and upper levels are to have 20% windows and doors.
9. Redesign the first floor of the building as a storefront. Ensure that door frames, window sashes, and storefront glazing are inset a minimum of 4 inches, and that storefront glazing extend from a sill or from an 18 to 24 inch tall base of contrasting material.
10. Redesign the building to have a base, middle, and top. The top story should be distinctive from the stories below and the height of the first story should be visually taller than the height of the top floor.
11. Provide: awing clearance above sidewalk, roof pitches, height of all fences and walls, electric meter locations, and HVAC unit locations with screening information.

Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby recommend denial to the Zoning Board of Appeals from the following standards because the variance criteria are not met:

1. The Historic District Height Map allows a maximum of 4-stories on half of the property while 5-stories are

proposed.

2. Parking within the ground floor of a building shall be setback a minimum of 30 feet from property lines along all public rights-of-way (not including lanes).
3. Maximum height shall not exceed two stories within 20 feet of a lane when across the lane from an ";R"; zoning district.
4. A minimum of one (1) primary entrance shall be provided for every 60 feet of street frontage, excluding lanes. Intervals between entrances shall not be less than 15 feet nor exceed 90 feet.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[28. Petition of LS3P and Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 17-004307-COA | 630 Indian Street | New Construction Part I Height and Mass](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation 17-004307-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

📎 [Aerial.pdf](#)

📎 [North Oglethorpe Ward.pdf](#)

📎 [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Jennifer Deacon recused herself from participating in this petition. Her former employer, LS3P, is a partner of this petition.

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for demolition of five non-contributing buildings and New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass of a seven-story apartment building on the site bounded by River Street to the north, Fahm Street to the east, Indian Street to the south, and McGuire Street to the west. The footprint of the building is approximately 63,000 square feet and includes three floors of partially underground parking. The building encompasses the entire block and has amenities within the central core, on level three. The building features recessed corners above the second floors on the northeast, northwest, and southwest corners. The request also includes a bonus story. The building proposes live/work space on the ground floor and residential apartments above.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval to demolish the five existing buildings on the site with the following conditions because the buildings are non-contributing and do not meet the criteria to be considered contributing:

1. Document all five buildings prior to demolition, per the MPC Documentation Policy, and
2. A demolition permit is not issued until a new construction permit is also submitted.

Ms. Harris additionally reported that staff recommends a continuance of Part I: Height and Mass for new construction at 630 Indian Street in order for the petitioner to address the following:

1. Reduce the height, particularly adjacent to the contributing resources, and consider utilizing a variety of heights in the design to further break up the massing. At a minimum, revise the height of the building on all elevations to provide at least one-half story variation for every 120 linear feet of height.
2. Revise the corners at the northeast, northwest, and southwest to be more pronounced and have a stronger visual presence, eliminating or reducing the setbacks on the upper floors.
3. Reduce the building setback on Indian Street to the minimum required and pursue all options for eliminating the setback from the high voltage power lines including exploring the possibility of burying the power lines.
4. Revise the building mass be located within the property lines, while allowing for components such as stoops, awnings, etc. to project forward.
5. Restudy the rhythm of solids to voids on the ground floor of all facades, align the centerlines of the window and door openings with the upper floors, and provide at least 35% glazing on the ground floors of River and McGuire Streets.
6. Address both River Street and Indian Street as primary elevations, particularly in regards to the entrances.
7. Consolidate the individual entrances into several larger scale entrances along the north, River Street elevation, the west, McGuire Street elevation and provide an additional primary entrance on the Fahm Street façade.
8. Revise the scale of the building to better relate to the contributing buildings within the ward. Consider including more void areas on the perimeter walls, rather than the interior to break up the building further.
9. Revise the building massing to meet the large-scale development recess standard selected or select another massing standard to meet.
10. Revise the bay spacing to be between 15 and 20 feet.
11. Revise the building base to be consistent and continuous and eliminate the interruption by the protruding bays and balconies on the upper floors.
12. Consider the industrial character of the area as inspiration for the design and revise the building form follow historic apartment complex building forms, with centralized entrances and often retail on the ground floor.
13. Revise the window size of Type A to meet or exceed a 5:3 ratio.
14. Revise the driveways to ensure the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across in materials, configuration, and height.
15. Revise the transformer location to a less visible location.
16. Provide additional information on the walls along Indian and Fahm Streets, enclosing the proposed setbacks; and the height of the parapets;
17. Ensure the storefront glazing extends from a sill or from an 18-24 inch tall base of contrasting material; that balconies do not extend more than three feet from the face of the building and are supported by brackets or other types of architectural support; and that curb cuts do not exceed 20 feet in width.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay came forward and introduced the individuals accompanying him at today's meeting. He explained that this site has a peculiar and interesting challenge. The Georgia Power lines are extremely

high voltage. This is evident because this was an industrial area and remains so for the moment. It is difficult to relocate. Indian Street and Fahm Street is a challenge also to be able to provide something along that edge that provides continuity to a street that presently lacks it.

Mr. Richard Gowe, the architect of LS3P, thanked the staff and Review Board for hearing their petition. Mr. Gowe explained that a couple of things that are interesting to him is that lines are here that is historical, but you can not see them when you visit the site. What is seen is the wonderful huge bridge and the wonderful large industrial building from a transitional period. Between the space is an opportunity for the city to really change the amount of affordable housing. This could become a new district that is walkable and has a walk score of 70 which most places would die for. Therefore, a lot of housing could be put here and one would be able to walk close to town. If they look at the different sizes of the buildings, Georgia Ports Authority is almost one-quarter mile long. Just the largeness of the properties is very significant and has helped to inspire what they have done. Some of the noncontributing buildings and brewery have large overhangs and space on the ground floor. Outside of this, a few buildings have brick and a few details, but there is really not much to draw from.

Mr. Gowe stated that there was recently an article, in a planning document, the county recommended in February that they have to ensure a sufficient amount of multi-family housing units available to handle the ever growing population. The county needs to see more and more multi-family units come into the market. This is ground zero for another great opportunity. Mr. Carey's article a couple of weeks ago about changing the pendulum swinging back from wasteful suburban sprawl with older closer neighborhoods, this could not be a better location. He said why not explore the edges and the surrounding neighborhoods. Mr. Gowe said this is a huge opportunity to do something fabulous. Therefore, they opted to do a historically, very strong form on the old building. As the Board can see, this building will typically fill almost an entire block. There is a beautiful space on the inside for the community that lives here. This is a form that has existed since ancient times.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion centered around the need for affordable housing in downtown Savannah. This is an industrial area and a warehouse is here. Although the materials and finishes have not been discussed, but simplicity will be lost with all the bays and recesses while all the examples that were shown to the Board were much simpler. The Board realizes this is an effort to meet the ordinance, but sometimes this can hinder the design. In this particular area, it is believed that some of the simplicity of the industrial character is lost in those voids. Bay Street can handle tall buildings, but lower buildings should be towards the river. The petitioner has the right to seek the bonus story, but it comes back to simplicity. All of the materials historically and even in the historical character of the buildings here are basic brick materials, but the petitioners are doing natural Quarried stone close to the river. The Board was in agreement with all of the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Merriman informed the petitioners that staff recommended a continuance. He asked if they were asking for a continuance or wanted a vote.

Mr. Shay stated that their clients would probably prefer an approval for the demolition and a continuance so they could address the staff's recommendations.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the request to demolish the five existing buildings on the site with the following conditions because the buildings are non-contributing and do not meet the criteria to be considered contributing:

1. Document all five buildings prior to demolition, per the MPC Documentation Policy, and

2. A demolition permit is not issued until a new construction permit is also submitted.

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the request for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass in order for the petitioner to consider the following:

1. Reduce the height, particularly adjacent to the contributing resources, and consider utilizing a variety of heights in the design to further break up the massing. At a minimum, revise the height of the building on all elevations to provide at least one-half story variation for every 120 linear feet of height.
2. Revise the corners at the northeast, northwest, and southwest to be more pronounced and have a stronger visual presence, eliminating or reducing the setbacks on the upper floors.
3. Reduce the building setback on Indian Street to the minimum required and pursue all options for eliminating the setback from the high voltage power lines including exploring the possibility of burying the power lines.
4. Revise the building mass be located within the property lines, while allowing for components such as stoops, awnings, etc. to project forward.
5. Restudy the rhythm of solids to voids on the ground floor of all facades, align the centerlines of the window and door openings with the upper floors, and provide at least 35% glazing on the ground floors of River and McGuire Streets.
6. Address both River Street and Indian Streets as primary elevations, particularly in regards to the entrances.
7. Consolidate the individual entrances into several larger scale entrances along the north, River Street elevation, the west, McGuire Street elevation and provide an additional primary entrance on the Fahm Street façade.
8. Revise the scale of the building to better relate to the contributing buildings within the ward. Consider including more void area on the perimeter walls, rather than the interior to break up the building further.
9. Revise the building massing to meet the large-scale development recess standard selected or select another massing standard to meet.
10. Revise the bay spacing to be between 15 and 20 feet.
11. Revise the building base to be consistent and continuous and eliminate the interruption by the protruding bays and balconies on the upper floors.
12. Consider the industrial character of the area as inspiration for the design and revise the building form follow historic apartment complex building forms, with centralized entrances and often retail on the ground floor.
13. Revise the window size of Type A to meet or exceed a 5:3 ratio.
14. Revise the driveways to ensure the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across in materials, configuration, and height.
15. Revise the transformer location to a less visible location.
16. Provide additional information on the walls along Indian and Fahm Streets, enclosing the proposed setbacks; and the height of the parapets;
17. Ensure the storefront glazing extends from a sill or from an 18-24 inch tall base of contrasting material; that balconies do not extend more than three feet from the face of the building and are supported by brackets or other types of architectural support; and that curb cuts do not exceed 20 feet in width.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher	
Second: Debra Caldwell	
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Abstain
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[29. D4 - Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 17-004365-COA | 7 Drayton Steet | Window Replacement](#)

[📎 Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Package.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Sara Farr-Newman gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for new windows at 7 Drayton Street. The historic windows, which are no longer existing and/or deteriorated, are proposed to be replaced with Marvin aluminum clad double-pane windows on floors 2 to 5. The applicant is also requesting a variance to allow for double pane clad windows in a historic building.

Ms. Farr-Newman said City Enforcement was notified on July 8, 2016 that 7 Drayton Street's original windows were removed and boarded up without approval. The windows were later found being sold in a local store. When the windows were located, the owner agreed to store them onsite until they could be repaired and reinstalled. The building was subsequently sold to the current owners, who are unable to locate the historic windows that were removed.

Ms. Farr-Newman stated that the Board reviewed several previous COAs for this property, including a rooftop addition that was approved on January 14, 2015 (14-006079-COA). A request to replace the now missing historic windows with aluminum clad windows was denied on October 8, 2014 (14-004596-COA). The applicant is also applying for state and federal preservation tax credits. The staff confirmed that the State Historic Preservation Office has approved the proposed windows; however, wood windows would also be an acceptable replacement. The National Park Service has yet to approve the window replacement.

Ms. Farr-Newman reported that staff recommends to deny new Marvin aluminum clad windows at 7 Drayton Street, because the windows do not meet the preservation and design standards and are not visually compatible.

Ms. Farr-Newman additionally reported that staff recommends denial to the ZBA, because the variance criteria are not met.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Attorney Phillip McCorkle came forward and introduced himself. He said that the Review Board deals with very complicated issues. This is a one issue petition. But, the issue is important to the owner of this property. Mr. Lynch is the architect. The property is to be renovated for a hotel. This building is known as the American Building. Attorney McCorkle explained that the issue is whether clad windows are acceptable as replacement for wood windows. To be acceptable the wood windows must be consistent with the Secretary's of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. He disagrees with the staff's assessment. The staff cites three different standards which they say are not met. Standard 2 says "historic character shall be retained and the removability of the windows should be avoided." But, these windows have been removed. The windows were not removed by the present owner, but the past owner. The windows are

not there; a few windows are boarded up; a few windows are left, but they are deteriorated to the extent that they must be replaced as well. Therefore, really Standard 2 has nothing to do with the application that they have today. Standard 5 says that "distinctive feature to the windows must be preserved." However, he is saying again that the windows are not there. You cannot preserve a window that has been removed. Standard 6 is an interesting standard; it says "where the severity of deterioration requires replacement [which this does] of a distinctive, which will be the windows, the new feature shall match the old, design, color texture, and other visual qualities." He wants it to look just like what was there before. Then the Standard says "and where possible, material." Not a mandate, but a preference to the materials. Attorney McCorkle said not only does the Department of Interior have standards, but they have illustrated guidelines for implementing those standards. The guidelines for when to replace, he read briefly that "replacing in-kind of windows that are too deteriorated, repair using the same sash, paint and configuration and other design details; if using the same kind of materials that are not technically or economically feasible when replacing windows, deteriorated beyond repair that a compatible substitute material may be considered. For example, on certain types of large buildings, particularly high rises, aluminum windows may be a suitable replacement for historic wooden sashes."

Attorney McCorkle stated that this is a very large contributing building in the Historic District. Besides this building, there are 12 other buildings that are five stories or more. He said this building is tall and large and has 147 windows. He lives in the Historic District and has eight. Of the 12 other buildings, seven have aluminum clad windows. One window has a mixture of clad and wood windows, one has wooden windows covered with aluminum storm shutters on the outside, and three windows are wood. Consequently, three out of 12 tall buildings that are contributing in the Historic District have wood windows. There is no question what the Department of Interior requires is in fact "best practices." The last amendment to the Historic Ordinance was a passing marked 2015 Alderman Sprague asked, "what are these standards from the Department of Interior?" He stated that the response was, "they're best practices." The staff obviously understands that these are best practices. Besides the approval from the State Historical Preservation Officer, as he indicated in a conversation with staff this week Monday, August 2, 2017, the Department of the Interior National Park Service was the one who promulgated these standards has also approved these clad windows. The proposed new clad windows replacing non-existing historic windows appear to be acceptable if you use brick molds or have flat molds, they want the windows to be clear; they want the muntins to have a space between sheets of glass. There are three to four conditions so that the windows will look just like wooden windows. But, the Department of Interior has approved the aluminum windows. The proposed with the adjustments noted is acceptable as a compatible new window on this building. So, the Federal Preservation Department of the Interior from National Park Service has approved these clad windows. The State Historic Preservation Office has approved the clad windows. Besides looking at the standards which obviously are met because the Federal Department of Interior says they are met. They also say that visual compatibility and the design material or design standards should be considered with visual compatibility, his opinion is that if the Department of Interior says the windows are acceptable, they are visually compatible. They look just like the historic windows. In the visual compatibility factors, your ordinance says look at the buildings that are visually related and see how they compare with what you are trying to do. The staff knows the building they are working on. He said in looking down Drayton Street, there is the Chamber of Commerce building which has huge metal grates on the outside. He believes the windows are on the inside and you cannot see them. The parking garage is here also; and the next building down is the Realty Building, 24 Drayton Street is a 10 story high building and has windows just like what they would like to put in this building. The windows are aluminum clad and not wooden windows. Interestingly, the Planters Inn is next door to this building, which he believes was the John Wesley Hotel has wooden windows. Attorney McCorkle said he thought the windows were clad as you could not tell the windows apart; they look the same. He explained that the only reason he knew that Planters Inn had wood windows was because they were sweating just as his window do at his house. There are, of course, three buildings that are contributing all downtown that have wooden windows. Therefore, he believes the windows are visually compatible with the buildings which is visually related and of the same kind.

Attorney McCorkle stated that with regards to the design standards, he believes the wood windows could be approved without having to get a variance as long as the clad windows are not prohibited, which they are not. There is no question that they will perform satisfactorily and they are visually compatible. If in fact the Board does not want to approve them as an alternate material, which he believes the Board has a right to do under Sub-Paragraph N - Design Standards and they also list the conditions for a variance. If the Board believes he needs to go the Zoning Board of Appeals for a decision on the variance, there is a special condition involved for each of the tall buildings. One of the 13

tall buildings in the Historic District, eight of which have similar windows. A literal interpretation would deprive his client of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning districts. In the adjacent ward, there are five buildings. They are the Municipal Building on Broughton Street; the News-Press Building on Bay Street; the Manger Hotel, the Savannah Bank Building, and the Realty Building all have aluminum windows. Therefore, to deny this would be depriving his client of the right to have what other people have. He believes it is consistent with what is in the Historic District where he lives and works and is proud to be a part of.

Mr. Howington asked Attorney McCorkle how long has the current owner owned the building.

Attorney McCorkle answered that the owner has owned the property approximately one year.

Mr. Howington asked did the present owner have any connection with the prior ownership.

Attorney McCorkle answered no. The new owners are a group from New York City.

Mr. Merriman asked staff that his understanding is that the previous owner tried to sell the windows and then they were removed from where they were being sold back to the building to be restored and now at this point nobody knows where they are?

Ms. Farr-Newman answered yes.

Mr. Merriman asked Attorney McCorkle if this was his understanding.

Attorney McCorkle answered frankly he has no understanding what happened to the windows, but they are not there now.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] stated it is good news that they have a capable and a committed new property owner who wants to execute a good rehabilitation and has hired a good architect to do so. First and foremost, the HSF believes this will be a quality hotel. This is very encouraging, but the HSF supports the staff's recommendations with respect to wood windows and not allowing the variance. Mr. Carey explained that it is with quality that the owners would be interested in doing the very best job with respect to preserving and restoring this building. He believes that using wood be the best reflection to that commitment. There has been a lot of talk about the tax credits on this project with SHPO and the National Park Services in Washington, DC has approved this. However, one important element to bear in mind is that if in need these are tax credit projects and whether they used aluminum windows or wood windows, you earn a 20% credit on the amount that you spend on rehabilitation. Therefore, if you spend more money on rehabilitation, using wood windows for example you would earn a larger credit. It is a direct relationship between what you spend and what you earn in terms of the federal credit and state credit. Therefore, Mr. Carey believes that it behooves the owners to ensure the quality by using wood as this is a more true form with the historic building. He believes that a couple of other phrases are important to seize on. They are talking about texture and materials; but he believes the phrase is "where possible" is what to keep in mind. It is possible to use wooden windows here. Now, this may not be preferred nor may not even be practical, but it is "possible." Therefore, if it is possible, then do so. The same with "is it economically feasible." Mr. Carey said it is economically feasible; it may not be economically preferable; may not even be economically practical, but it is "economical feasible." These are very strong arguments which the Board needs to bear in mind because they were raised by the petitioner. With regards to the other tall buildings in this area and the aluminum clad windows and mixed windows, what they do not know is when was the work done on those windows. Was it done before 1973 when we did not have a local ordinance? Was it done under an ordinance with different design standards that we employ now? Mr. Carey said the final point he wants to make is we are a National Historic Landmark District. The Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation really promulgated from national register listed properties. Therefore, it is implied that a NHL which is what we are, is a national registered property, but it is more than that. The credits are high here and the standards are high in Savannah. Mr. Carey said he would not be satisfied living in Savannah saying what is good in Davenport, Iowa as this is not our state. He believes we are above that standard. They have to hold the standard up a little higher here as people would have that expectation. This is why

people choose to live downtown whether they like the inconvenience of having foggy windows or sweating windows, they live here for a very clear reason.

Mr. Carey said it is their job to uphold those standards and remind themselves that this is a NHL; it is possible and it is economically feasible. He believes that staff did a good job making its report and assessing this property.

Attorney McCorkle, in response to public comments, stated that one of standards for the variance recommendation is whether you do it segmentally. The fact is clad windows are 14% more expensive than wood windows. Therefore, certainly, you are not doing it to save money. It is the most expensive alternative. The reason they want to do it is the "best alternative." This is the best alternative for the long run. There is a tremendous amount of maintenance that goes with wood windows. This is a long term benefit to have the clad windows. They cost more than the wood windows. To say that we are going to put in our ordinance that these standards from the Department of the Interior must be satisfied and then say, "well after you have satisfied them, seek approval from the Department of Interior, then you say we are going to require more than that is disingenuous to him. The Department of Interior says these windows work fine, they have to be visually compatible or they would not have approved them; and in a tall large building with 147 windows is the right thing to do.

Mr. Merriman asked Ms. Harris to clarify that in cases where there is a difference in the Secretary's of Interior Standards and their ordinance, does the ordinance supersede?

Ms. Harris explained that the Secretary's of Interior Standards are incorporated by reference into their ordinance. Therefore, they hold the same weight as the other standards. However, the Board is interpreting the Secretary's of Interior Standards because they have been put into their ordinance. Therefore, it is up to the Board's interpretation and it holds equal weight as to the other design standards.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that the character of the building should be maintained. They are in agreement with staff recommendations and as the HSF said this may not be preferred, but it is "possible" to put wood windows here. The other tall buildings in this area such as the Marshall House, River Street Inn, etc. all have wood windows. Whenever the windows need to be replaced, they use wood windows. Therefore, it is possible to have the wood windows.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the petition for new Marvin aluminum clad windows at 7 Drayton Street, because the windows do not meet the preservation and design standards and are not visually compatible.

Recommend denial to the ZBA, because the variance criteria are not met.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION**X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS**[30. Petition of Melissa Hall | 17-004056-COA | 704 Abercorn Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Change](#)

📎 [COA - 704 Abercorn Street 17-004056-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 704 Abercorn Street 17-004056-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[31. Petition of Viet Hoang | 17-004057-COA | 2 North Lincoln Street | Staff Approved - Awning Recover](#)

📎 [COA - 2 North Lincoln Street 17-004057-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 2 North Lincoln Street 17-004057-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[32. Petition of Thomas J. Renfrow, PE | 17-00486-COA | 124 Abercorn Street | Staff Approved - Replace HVAC Equipment](#)

📎 [COA - 124 Abercorn Street 17-004086-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [OTH Permit Set_6-26-17.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[33. Petition of Gary Langevin for Little Italy Abercorn | 17-004197-COA | 606 Abercorn Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Changes](#)

📎 [COA - 606 Abercorn Street 17-004197-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[34. Petition of Gary Langevin for Bella Napoli | 17-004198-COA | 18 East State Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

📎 [COA - 18 East State Street 17-004198-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [bellanapoliawning07182017.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[35. Petition of Yu Zhang | 17-004199-COA | 228 East Huntingdon Street | Staff Approved - Replace Existing Siding](#)

📎 [COA - 228 East Huntingdon Street 17-004199-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Property Photos - 228 Huntington .pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[36. Petition of Sean Custer for Sign Pro Plus | 17-004200 | 205 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Change](#)

📎 [COA - 205 West Broughton Street 17-004200-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 205 W. Broughton Street 17-004200-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. Petition of Ward Architecture + Preservation | 17-004202-COA | 20 West Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Replace Front Door

No action required. Staff approved.

38. Petition of Metalcrafts, A Tecta American Company, LLC | 17-004257-COA | 201 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Replace Existing Roof System

☞ [COA - 201 West Oglethorpe Avenue 17-004257-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 201 W. Oglethorpe Avenue 17-004257-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. Petition of Dennis Murphy | 17-004259-COA | 245 Lincoln Street | Staff Approval - Windows

☞ [COA - 245 Lincoln Street 17-004259-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. Petition of Dennis Murphy | 17-004260-COA | 245 Lincoln Street | Staff Approved - Color Change

☞ [COA - 245 Lincoln Street 17-004260-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. Amended Petition of Cassie Beckwith for Hansen Architects | 17-004267-COA | 120 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Stucco Repairs and Color Changes

☞ [COA - 120 Bull Street 17-004267-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 120 Bull Street 17-004267-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. Petition of Sean Custer for Sign Pro Plus | 17-004285-COA | 221 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning

☞ [COA - 221 West Broughton Street 17-004285-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [GameChangers AWNING.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. Petition of Rachael Jackson-Wynder | 17-004305-COA | 223 West Broughton Lane | Staff Approved - Bollard

☞ [COA - 223 West Broughton Lane 17-004305-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. Petition of Kyle Jordan | 17-004308-COA | 501 East St. Julian Street | Staff Approved - Fence

☞ [COA - 501 East St. Julian Street 17-004308-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Revised Fence Line 7.31.2017.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

45. Amended Petition of Amy Lee Copeland | 17-004342-COA | 602 Montgomery Street | Staff Approved - Color Change and New Roof

☞ [COA - 602 Montgomery Street 17-004342-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

46. Petition of T. Baribault for Coatings Application & Water Proofing of GA LLC | 17-004380-COA | 15 East Liberty Street | Staff Approved - Roof

📎 [COA - 15 East Liberty Street 17-004380-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Photo of Property.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

47. Petition of Samantha S. Sunkins for Beth Eden Baptist Church | 17-004430-COA | 302 East Gordon Street | Staff Approved - Windows

📎 [COA - 302 East Gordon Street 17-004430-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 302 East Gordon Street 17-004430-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

48. Petition of Austin Hill | 17-004431-COA | 417 Whitaker Street | Staff Approved - Color Change

📎 [COA - 417 Whitaker Street 17-004431-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 417 Whtaker Street 17-004431-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

49. Petition of Richard Shinhoster | 17-004434-COA | 510 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard | Staff Approved - Awning

📎 [COA - 510 MLK Jr. Blvd 17-004434-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 510 MLK Jr. Blvd 17-004434-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

50. Petition of Bryanna Robinson for Ellsworth Hallett Home Professional | 231 Houston Street | Staff Approved - Front Stoop

📎 [COA - 231 Houston Street 17-004568-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

51. Petition of Brian Fenster for Commonwealth Construction of GA LLC | 17-004593-COA | 402-404 East Hall Street and 612-616 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Color Change

📎 [COA - 402-404 East Hall Street and 612-616 Habersham Street 17-004593-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 402-404 East Hall, 612-616 Habersham Street 17-004593-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

52. Petition of Tony Hensley | 17-004671-COA | 201 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Trellis Structure and Four Permanent Umbrellas

📎 [COA - 201 West Oglethorpe Avenue 17-004671-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 201 West Oglethorpe Avenue 17-004671-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

53. Amended Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | 17-004672-COA | 23 West Perry Lane | Staff Approved - Alterations Carriage House

📎 [COA - 23 West Perry Lane 17-004672-COA.pdf](#)

[☺ 23 West Perry CH - Amended Drawing Set.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[54. Petition of Ray Hoover for Tech Roof Pros | 17-004683-COA | 308 East President Street | Staff Approved - Roof Replacement](#)

[☺ COA - 308 East President Street 17-004683-COA.pdf](#)

[☺ Submittal Packet - 308 East President Street 17-004683-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[55. Petition of Charles Degenhardt | 17-004713-COA | 226 East Hall Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

[☺ COA - 226 East Hall Street 17-004713-COA.pdf](#)

[☺ Submittal Packet - 226 East Hall Street 17-004713-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[56. Petition of Charles Owens | 17-004740-COA | 48 East Broad Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

[☺ COA - 48 East Broad Street 17-004740-COA.pdf](#)

[☺ Submittal Packet - 48 East Broad Street 17-004740-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

[57. Report on Work Performed Without a Certificate of Appropriateness for the August 9, 2017 HDBR Meeting](#)

[☺ 8-9-17 HDBR Report on Work Without a COA.pdf](#)

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

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

[58. Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, August 17, 2017 at 3:30 p.m. in the Meyer Conference Room, MPC 110 East State Street](#)

[59. Next Pre-Meeting - Wednesday, September 13, 2017 at 12:00 p.m. in the Jerry Surrency Room, MPC, 112 East State Street](#)

[60. Next Regular Meeting - Wednesday, September 13, 2017 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 East State Street](#)

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

[61. HDBR Sample Panel Policy](#)

[☺ HDBR Sample Panel Policy.pdf](#)

[☺ Sample Panel Guidelines 120309.pdf](#)

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the report on the HDBR Sample Policy. The sample panel guidelines were developed by the HDBR in 2009 after the Large Scale Development Standards requiring sample panels for larger projects. The guidelines were never called a policy and were not officially adopted by the Board. Staff has rewritten the guidelines and the language in the policy is almost identical. The Board needs to adopt the policy.

Ms. McClain asked if the Board has reviewed this policy before. If so, there is no content change, but only a few of the words have changed.

Ms. Michalak answered yes.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby adopt the HDBR Sample Panel Policy.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Mic Matson

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[62. Review Proposed Revisions to the Savannah Historic District Ordinance 8-3030](#)

📎 [08-2017 DRAFT HDBR Ordinance Revisions.pdf](#)

📎 [Bonus Story Expansion Policies.pdf](#)

Ms. Harris gave the report on the proposed revisions to the Savannah Historic District Ordinance 8-3030. The Board has been working on the revisions for approximately 18 months. They have reviewed the awnings and canopy standards. Today, she wanted to refresh the old members memory and inform the new members.

Ms. Harris requested feedback from the Board as to what they would like to do with moving forward with the bonus story criteria which has been a point of contention.

Ms. Matson said she would like for the Board to get rid of the bonus story provision.

Mr. Stephens said sometimes the bonus story enhances not only the character of the structure, but also promotes the growth in different types of development. However, he believes it has become a breeding ground for manipulation.

Ms. Caldwell said she does not believe it is feasible or necessary to have a bonus story in the Historic District. If more stories are needed, then build outside the Historic District. She is against bonus stories.

Mr. Howington stated he is in favor of all the ordinance changes the Board talked about last year. He is in favor of the bonus story as sometimes it is needed. There are some sections in the Historic District that can support the bonus story. But, the bonus story section needs strengthening. The bonus story gives the developer more flexibility to design something useful.

Ms. Matson said if a developer needs six floors, then why not say so.

Mr. Howington said he believes the intent of the ordinance was to create more commercial and street walkability by giving the developer a floor above. Therefore, all of these things are advantageous. Unless that was made as a part of the ordinance that you have to have the street liability and interaction, then as a developer, they would never do that; they would close everything and then it would become hotel windows and you could have a 120 feet stretch of nothing but hotel. There are benefits to having the bonus story, but

as he has said, it needs strengthening.

Ms. Fletcher said she is torn as well. She remembers last year when they talked about the bonus story there are certain things that the developers would not do if there was not some type or carat for them to think about it. she is aware that affordable housing is one of those things that if you are trying to make money and can make more money without doing this, you would not do so unless you are just a nice individual. Public art and all the other things that make Savannah unique. If there is nothing to make people consider it [unless it is a part of the ordinance] then you have a gray area. However, it makes the Review Board's job easier if you say this is how it is and there is no negotiating. Ms. Fletcher agreed that a lot of people have taken advantage of the bonus story by trying to figure out a way to make it work. They call it public active use when actually people living downtown may never use it.

Ms. McClain said when you get close to the downtown district, the housing is not going to be affordable based on the livable wage of the working class.

Mr. Merriman asked according to the changes they want to make, what determines whether or not something is affordable?

Ms. Harris said that the affordability aspect would not be put in the ordinance. She explained that under the housing policy, no more than 30% of the gross household income should be used to rent or purchase a dwelling.

Ms. Harris explained that another option that the Board can look at if they are inclined to eliminate the bonus story [she personally still has concerns about the lack of retail space on the ground floor] they could say the developer does not get a bonus story, but you would still have to have retail.

Mr. Stephens said he believes that in certain areas, they should have already placed a percentage of the area that has to be dedicated to retail. This will promote a community environment where people can go and shop.

Ms. Harris asked the Board to think more about the bonus story criteria and at the next meeting they will discuss it further.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

63. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Review Board, Chairman Merriman adjourned the meeting approximately 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen I. Harris
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem

The Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission provides meeting minutes which are adopted by the respective Board. Verbatim transcripts of minutes are the responsibility of the interested party.