



Savannah Historic District Board of Review

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
July 12, 2017 1:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

JULY 12, 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
Debra Caldwell
Scott Cook
Kellie Fletcher
Keith Howington
Becky Lynch
Mic Matson
Dwayne Stephens

Members Absent: Zena McClain, Esq., Vice-Chair
Jennifer Deacon
Andy McGarrity

MPC Staff Present: Ellen Harris, Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation
Leah Michalak, Historic Preservation Planner
Sara Farr-Newman
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 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. C1 - Approval of All Consent Agenda Items](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve all the Consent Agenda Items.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Becky Lynch

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[3. C2 - Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 17-002128-COA | 300 and 326 West Bay Street | Demolition](#)

[Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

[CollectingPolicy-NonCityArchitecturalCollections_2015-06-26.pdf](#)

[Staff Research.pdf](#)

[Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

[17-002128-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition to demolish the three buildings located on the site at 300 and 326 West Bay Street with the following conditions because the buildings do not meet the criteria for historic designation but do attach to two historic buildings:

- 1.Ensure that the demolition of the existing buildings, which directly attach to and abut both historic buildings, uses the gentlest physical means possible and does not cause damage to the historic buildings.
- 2.Document all three buildings prior to demolition and submit to the City of Savannah Research Library and Municipal Archives per their "Collecting Policy." This documentation shall comply with the "MPC Policy for Documenting Buildings Prior to Demolition."
- 3.Demolition permit drawings not be stamped by preservation staff and a permit not be issued for demolition until a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new building(s) to replace them is issued by the Board.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion:

Second:

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[4. C3 - Petition of Carlstedt's LLC | 17-002813-COA | 515 Barnard Street | Signs and Color Change](#)

[☞ Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Package.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for signage and color changes at 515 Barnard Street with the condition HSMC approves the murals, because otherwise the work meets the standards and is visually compatible.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Becky Lynch

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[5. C4 - Petition of Michael Savidge | 17-002861-COA | 510 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Carriage House New Construction: Part 2 Design Details](#)

[☞ Aerial Map.pdf](#)

[☞ Geene Ward.pdf](#)

[☞ Part 1 - Drawings.pdf](#)

[☞ Part 2 - Drawings.pdf](#)

[☞ Specifications.pdf](#)

[☞ Staff Photos.pdf](#)

[☞ Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for Part 2: Design Details for new construction of a carriage house at 510 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions:

- 1.Ensure that the window muntins are no wider than 7/8 inch;
- 2.Revise the spacing or size of the windows at the lane so that the distance between the windows is not more than two times the width of the windows;

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Becky Lynch

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[6. C5 - Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 17-003608-COA | 144 Lincoln Street | Sign](#)

[📎 Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet - 144 Lincoln Street.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a principal use fascia sign and a supplemental ID sign at 144 Lincoln Street, because the signs meet the standards and are visually compatible.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Becky Lynch

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[7. C6 - Petition of Shah Architecture | 17-003639-COA | 423 East River Street | Alterations](#)

[17-003639-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for roof, window, and door replacement as well as the installation of skylights for the property located at 423 East River Street with the condition that new window and door insets are not less than 3 inches or match the inset of the existing doors and windows because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Becky Lynch

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[8. C7 - Petition of LS3P Associates Architects | 17-003678-COA | 215 West Broughton Street | Alterations](#)

[17-003678-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[Submittal Package.pdf](#)

[Previous submittal- beam information.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition to remove the remaining brick wall on the east, brick chimney on the west, and metal beam and columns at the north, on the otherwise vacant lot at 215 West Broughton Street with the following conditions:

- 1.The columns and metal beam are retained and stored for future re-installation on the proposed new construction.
- 2.The brick wall and chimney are documented per the MPC’s documentation policy.

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Becky Lynch

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[9. C8 - Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects | 17-003685-COA | 211 West Gordon Street | Addition](#)

[Chatham Ward.pdf](#)

[Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a rooftop addition as proposed at 211 West Gordon Street because the addition meets the standards and is visually compatible.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Becky Lynch

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

[10. Adopt the July 12, 2017 Agenda](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby adopt the Agenda for July 12, 2017.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Becky Lynch

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[11. Approval of June 14, 2017 Briefing Minutes](#)

[June 14, 2017 HBR Briefing Minutes.docx](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve June 14, 2017 Briefing Minutes

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Becky Lynch

Second:

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[12. Approval of June 14, 2017 Meeting Minutes](#)

[06-14-2017 Minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve June 14, 2017 Meeting Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Mic Matson

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
----------------	-------

Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

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

[13. Petition of Lynch Architects | 17-003635-COA | 7 Drayton Street | Windows](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby consent to the withdrawn application by the petitioner.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher
 Second: Mic Matson

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

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

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue all items to the next regular meeting.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Debra Caldwell
 Second: Kellie Fletcher

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

Scott Cook	- Aye
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 continue the petition as requested by the petitioner.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Mic Matson

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
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 continue the petition to the next regular agenda as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Mic Matson

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
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 continue the petition to the next meeting as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Mic Matson

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[18. 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 continue the petition to the next regular agenda as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Mic Matson

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[19. Petition of Patrick McNamara | 17-002109-COA | 348 Jefferson Street | Signs](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition to the next regular agenda as requested due to incomplete application.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Mic Matson

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

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

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition to the next regular agenda as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Mic Matson

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[21. 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 continue the petition to the next regular agenda as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Mic Matson

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

[22. D1 - Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 16-006849-COA | 607 Drayton Street | New Construction Part II: Design Details](#)

- 📎 [Forsyth Ward.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Aerial.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Photos.pdf](#)
- 📎 [16-006849-COA Staff Recommendation2.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Revised Renderings.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet revised.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Part 1 West elevation.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of revisions to Part I: Height and Mass and Part 2: Design Details of a new four story building on a vacant lot with Drayton Street to the west, Huntingdon Street to the north, and Goodwin Street to the east. The building forms a “U” shape, with a courtyard along Goodwin Street. Entrances face both Forsyth Park and Huntingdon Street. Parking is provided underneath with access from Goodwin Street.

Lighting and signage will be submitted for review at a later date.

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

The HDBR approved Part I: Height and Mass for the proposal on 1/11/17 with the following conditions:

1. Reduce the height of the taller parapets and consider utilizing other massing elements to meet the large scale development standards such as the recess standard.

Petitioner response: The height of the taller parapets has been converted into architectural massing elements whose volume is included within the top story.

2. Redesign the roofline variations to incorporate other variations besides a change in the parapet height. Restudy the configuration and materiality of the lower parapet walls.

Petitioner response: The rooflines have been made to incorporate other variations besides a change in parapet height. The lower parapet walls have been restudied and converted to ornamental metal railings, adding more variation.

3. Redesign the fenestration of the rounded corners to extend to the ground floor at the southwest, northwest, and northeast corners.

Petitioner response: The fenestration at the round corners have been modified to extend to the ground floor at the southwest, northwest, and northeast corners.

4. Incorporate voids into the blank spaces on the ground floor flanking the central entrances on the north and west facades.

Petitioner response: Voids have been incorporated into the formerly blank spaces on the ground floor flanking the central entrances on the north and west facades.

5. Add additional fenestration to the blank wall adjacent to the service entrance on the Goodwin Street elevation.

Petitioner response: Additional fenestration has been added to the blank wall adjacent to the service entrance on the Goodwin Street elevation.

6. Revise the front yard setback to match the adjacent contributing buildings to the south.

Petitioner response: The front yard setback has been increased to more closely align with the adjacent contributing buildings. Additionally, the rounded corner has been added to soften the slight difference.

7. Reduce the depth of the canopy on the Huntingdon Street elevation.

Petitioner response: The canopy on the Huntingdon Street side has been reduced in depth.

8. Restudy the benches along Drayton Street, particularly at the corner of Drayton and Huntingdon, to better provide a wall of continuity.

Petitioner response: A better defined wall of continuity has been added along the Drayton Street frontage, consisting of a low masonry wall of the same material as the lower story.

9. Redesign the bay spacing to meet the requirement of bays which are larger than 20 feet and less than 15 feet.

Petitioner response: The bay spacing of the central bay on the Drayton Street side has been altered to meet the bay spacing requirement of between 15 and 20 feet in width, bringing the building into compliance with this standard.

Additional revisions include:

- West (Drayton Street) façade: revising the entrances from three with wide central entrance, to four; consistent parapet height; storefront within parapet;
- North (Huntingdon Street) façade: additional balconies; consistent parapet height; storefront within parapet;
- East (Goodwin Street) façade: additional variation in parapet height; less fenestration on inner courtyard east façade.

-

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of Part II: Design Details with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Revise the design of the roofline architectural elements to remove the storefront system, so that it

does not “read” as an additional story and replace with an alternative material.

2. Revise the central bay on the Drayton Street façade to feature a central window configuration similar to the adjacent windows; and a prominent central entrance, rather than two, more similar to the design proposed in Part I: Height and Mass.
 3. Add additional voids to the east elevation in the courtyard area on the Goodwin Street façade.
 4. Simplify the stucco colors to two colors, rather than three.
 5. Revise the height of the fourth story (17 feet tall) so that it is not taller than the first story (15 feet).
 6. Revise the fixed windows to an approved window type.
 7. Revise all storefronts to extend from a 18-24” base of contrasting material which meets the storefront standards.
 8. Revise the low brick wall configuration along Drayton Street to remove the two enclosed spaces which accommodate the water meter and a transformer so that these spaces are open and contiguous with the adjacent walled spaces.
 9. Inset all windows, doors and storefronts a minimum of four inches.
 10. Provide additional information on the height of rooftop equipment, canopy depth, the sidewalk at the driveway, glazing percentages, and refuse storage location.
 11. Install a Sample Panel onsite per the Sample Panel Policy.
- Because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay came forward and introduced the firm's staff members attending today's meeting with him. They have carefully reviewed the staff's recommendations. He said regarding item #5 recommending to revise the height of the fourth story (17 feet tall) so that it is not taller than the first story (15 feet), they will think of another way to do this where it will no longer read as a too tall story. They would like to keep the parapet line where it is, They do not want to crush down the rooftop variation any more. They will revise the storefront to create the 18 to 24 inch base. Essentially, they agree with all of the staff's recommendations and are requesting that they be allowed to move forward. They will bring back the colors and brick to staff. They want to have the stucco color match the color of the brick base. Mr. Shay explained that glazed brick will be on the base and a smooth, but not glazed brick on the buff.

Ms. Caldwell asked how many colors will be on the hotel.

Mr. Shay answered that there will be three colors. The two brick colors will be matched by two predominant colors. The third color will be the contrasting color that is around the windows, which is mostly the trim.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with the staff recommendations. He pointed out that the petitioner has successfully worked within the height. This is a momentous occasion when they can show how something does work under the intended and written guideline. This is the first in a long time that no variance or some other addition bonus story is not being requested. Mr. Carey said the HSF is commending the petitioner and the Review Board for holding this line and keeping up with precedence. He said he had a couple of questions. The top floor is reading too tall of the story and the petitioner suggested that the opening may be glazed or opaque. Mr. Carey stated that he is not sure if this is the answer. He understands the staff's point, but he is concerned that the answer may not give the solution they want. He said he does not have a design to share with the petitioner, but he would not jump to quickly with the opaque treatment as he thinks it will still read a little tall. May be it is not so bad as it is now. However, he understands the issue and may be the petitioner needs to take his time and work through this as it is an important element on this building.

Mr. Carey said he heard the discussion about the number of colors. He is a little sensitive as he just returned from Seattle, WA a couple of weeks ago [he is not comparing Savannah and Seattle], but he will

say that they are hyperactive in terms of polychromatic finishes. There were at least six to ten colors on these buildings. They need to be careful with too many colors as they may be sliding down a slippery slope. Mr. Carey said he appreciates that staff has pointed out that addition rooftop detail is needed. Nevertheless, he believes this is a successful application and a successful review. Again, he cautioned the petitioner to put some attention on the top floor so that it does not look top heavy.

Mr. Shay, responding to public comments, said they are trying to stay with warm grayish colors. They appreciate Mr. Carey's comments. He said it is a bit of a catch 22 in a sense that if they reduce the height, they will not technically meet the standard for a half story variance with the roofline. So, they will bring back to staff a solution whereby they may not be in that exact area, but they will subtract glass and put something else there. They are confident that when they come back it will neither read as a super high story nor will it fail to meet the standard of a half story in minimum variation of the roofline.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Review Board is appreciative that the petitioner is in agreement with the staff comments. They were in agreement with the HSF comments regarding the roofline and they were in agreement with the staff working with the petitioner on the roofline issue. They discussed the colors. The Board discussed the rooftop equipment. Mr. Cook stated that he believes the generator will be visible from Forsyth Park. The staff needs to really take note of this. The Board agreed with the staff recommendations and the HSF comments. Ms. Caldwell said she is still a little concerned about the height, but as long as the staff is willing to work with the petitioner, everything should be okay. Ms. Lynch did not have an issue with the colors. She was particularly in agreement with the staff's comments about the equipment that is currently housed on street front. If this is relocated, she believes it will be fine. Ms. Lynch said, however, due to the narrow proportion at the two flanking side center towers, she recommends that they be kept as short as possible to meet the half-story as they do appear taller because of their width. She believes that treating them without the fenestration will help. They need to be kept as low as possible.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve Part II: Design Details with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Revise the design of the roofline architectural elements to remove the storefront system, so that it does not "read" as an additional story and replace with an alternative material.
2. Revise the central bay on the Drayton Street façade to feature a central window configuration similar to the adjacent windows; and a prominent central entrance, rather than two, more similar to the design proposed in Part I: Height and Mass.
3. Add additional voids to the east elevation in the courtyard area on the Goodwin Street façade.
4. Revise the height of the fourth story (17 feet tall) so that it is not taller than the first story (15 feet).
5. Revise the fixed windows to an approved window type.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

📎 [16-006851-COA Staff recommendation.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

📎 [2012 COA and Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

📎 [Aerial.pdf](#)

📎 [New Franklin Ward Wharf Lots MAP B.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet- perspectives.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Howington recused himself from participating in this petition. He is an employee of Greenline Architecture; Northpoint Hospitality is a client of Greenline.

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part 1, Height and Mass for an eight-story hotel building to be located on the vacant parcel at 620 East River Street. 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 reviews.

Because of the revisions to all aspects of the Part I criteria, this review includes both Part A and Part B.

Ms. Harris stated that this building is in the northeast corner of the property and the Savannah Historic District. It is, roughly, rectangular-shaped and features a plaza area to the west where the main entrance will be located. A two-story portion of the building is located on the west and north facades, as well as within the "U". The remainder of the building is eight stories in a "U" shape. The building features roof top amenities on the two-story portion, and a green roof within the "U".

Ms. Harris said two architectural volumes at the roofline provide roofline variation. The total height, including the architectural volumes 94 feet, six inches above grade (107 feet, six inches above MSL). The height of the two-story portion is approximately 28 feet to the top of the parapet. The building spans 208 feet along the river front, east-to-west, and is 194 deep from north-to-south for a footprint of approximately 41,000 square feet. This development first came before the Review Board in 2012 [File No. H-120719-4727-2] after the applicant petitioned City Council for a change to the Historic District Height Map in this area of the Savannah Historic District. The Height Map was subsequently changed, in June 2012, to permit 3-stories or 45 feet above Bay Street in this building's location, (measured at the datum of City Hall which is 42 feet above MSL, allowing 87 feet above MSL).

Ms. Harris stated that now known as Hotel 1, or the Hilton Hotel, in the previous COA it was known as Hotel 2. The conditions of the approval are as follows: 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. Break up the massing of the two-story segment along the river front. Reconsider the vertical element

[tower] at the far western end of the structure.

2. Increase the north setback of the western half of the hotel segment along the waterfront to be consistent with the line of continuity established by the proposed development along the waterfront.
3. The height should not exceed two-stories forward of the adjacent Marriot Hotel in order to be compatible with neighboring structures to which it is visually related and to continue the one- and two-story character of new development adjacent to the river walk.
4. The height on the north blocks view from Emmett Park.

January 2013 Meeting (approved with conditions):

1. Parapet heights not exceed four feet, and
2. Approval of the additional story provided that the ground floor active use standard is met and verified through submittal of entrances and openings with the Part I, Phase B application for the Certificate of Appropriateness.

2017 COMMENTS

January 2017 Meeting (continued):

1. The portion of the building along the River Walk which is greater than two stories, is setback to the same depth as the adjacent Marriot, to be compatible with the height, rhythm, and scale of adjacent building and similar historic buildings and to retain the one- and two-story character of the river front.
2. Reduce the height of the tower element significantly or eliminate entirely.
3. Further break down the width of the west façade.
4. Revise the square windows to be vertical in character and have a 5:3 ratio.
5. Restudy the relationship of the very tall first story with the shorter, second story, on the west, two-story portion of the building.
6. Revise the 12 foot wide bay spacing.
7. Reduce the width and depth of the porte-cochere significantly.
8. While a Part II Design Detail, redesign the formal decorative, Art Deco parapet towers and other elements to be more visually compatible with the industrial nature of the surrounding historic context.
9. Ensure that a minimum of 10 feet is provided along the river's edge to meet the standard.
10. Contain the mechanical and access structures within the additional story.
11. Redesign all parapets to not exceed four feet high.
12. Reduce all curb cuts to a maximum of 20 feet wide.
13. Where intersected by a new driveway, ensure the sidewalk shall serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.
14. Provide information regarding the visibility of the roof HVAC units from Trustees' Garden.

May 10, 2017 Meeting (continued):

1. Reduce the height and scale of the domes and integrate into the massing of the building, or eliminate entirely.

Petitioner's response: The domes that previously screened the mechanical equipment have been completely eliminated.

2. Incorporate a regular rhythm of punched openings (windows) into the bays rather than the larger expanses of storefront or curtainwall system.

Petitioner's response: The facades now have a regular rhythm of punched openings, rather than large visible expanses of storefront or curtainwall system.

3. Restudy the 12-foot wide bay spacing on the first and second floors.

Petitioner's response: The 12-foot wide bay spacing on the first and second floors have been eliminated, and a varied array of wider bays utilized instead.

4. Incorporate voids within the six and seven-foot wide spaces between the bays.

Petitioner's response: The six and seven foot wide spaces between the bays have been reduced to three feet, eliminating the need for additional voids.

5. Incorporate regular voids on the northern two bays of the third floor, west façade; the western bay of the third floor, north façade; and one bay on the first floor, north façade.

Petitioner's response: Regular voids have been added to the northern two bays of the third floor west façade, the western bay of the third floor north façade, and one bay on the first floor north façade.

6. Increase the setback of the eight-story portion of the building on the north façade to be more similar to the 60-foot setback from the west façade, in order to maintain the one and two story character and context of the River Walk, and preserve views to the river.

Petitioner's response: The setback of the eight story building remains essentially aligned with the north façade of the adjacent Marriott, and from the lower two story façade by 36 feet. This is consistent with the approved Part One A master plan, and sufficient to clearly differentiate the lower two story mass along the river walk and open plaza.

7. Reduce the depth of the porte-cochere significantly.

Petitioner's response: The covered entrance canopy remains as previously submitted, which was substantially reduced from the depth and width originally proposed. Since no Board member identified this as a priority, and the canopy projects above private property and not a public right-of-way, we believe that this is not a visual compatibility requirement.

8. Substantially reduce the number of balconies, and where balconies are incorporated, eliminate the privacy dividers.

Petitioner's response: The number of balconies have been substantially reduced, and visible privacy dividers have been eliminated.

9. While a Part II Design Detail, restudy the architectural detailing, which appears to be a high-style classical interpretation with elements of New Formalism, to be more in keeping with the industrial character of the historic context.

Petitioner's response: The high-style classically interpreted architectural detailing has been eliminated, and an architectural vocabulary derived from simpler industrial buildings utilized instead.

10. Redesign the architectural features which appear to be parapet walls throughout the building's design.

Petitioner's response: The parapets have been completely redesigned to be not more than four feet high, simpler, more consistent, and with copings and string courses.

11. Revise the sidewalk adjacent to the street to be a continuous uninterrupted pathway in materials, configuration and height.

Petitioner's response: The sidewalk adjacent to the street will be a continuous uninterrupted pathway in materials, configuration and height.

12. Provide the location of the electric meter.

Petitioner's response: The electric meters will be located in the basement level.

13. Incorporate a primary exterior entrance to the ballroom.

Petitioner's response: The ballrooms now have exterior entrances.

14. Incorporate the mechanical equipment into the bonus story.

Petitioner's response: The mechanical equipment previously hidden within the domes has been moved to the lower roof at Level 3 and will be screened from view.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the request for New Construction: Part 1, Height and Mass for an eight-story hotel building to be located on the vacant parcel at 620 East River Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II: Design Details:

1. Reduce the height of the proposed "architectural elements" on the rooftop and change the voids to an alternative material.
2. Reduce the depth of the porte-cochere significantly.
3. Either reduce the overall building mass to the 2012 volume or increase the setback from River Street further, more similar to the 60-foot setback from the west façade, to maintain the one and two story character and context of the River Walk, and preserve views to the river.
4. Provide additional details on the sidewalks at the curb cuts and the elevator and stair on the rooftop.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay introduced the firm's staff that was accompanying him today. He said that Attorney Harold Yellin was present also representing Northpoint Hospital. He said they will work on the roofline variations. Mr. Shay said from his notes the Review Board has seen the porte-cochere twice and did not state this as a priority. A lot of people will be arriving at this hotel. The driveway is on private property and they would like to get three cars under cover, at least on the passenger side. They are desirous to keep the porte-cochere as specified. They look forward to the opportunity to provide details for the sidewalk and curb-cuts later.

Mr. Shay stated that he will use is remaining time to talk about the hotel setback. He pointed out that this area is high enough to be three stories above Bay Street is measured in front of City Hall. This is all the way to riverfront. The two story area is north of River Street. The master plan that was previously approved, showed that the tower would be approximately aligned with the face of the Marriott Hotel. This was 39 feet further back. However, in actuality, the distance is 36 feet and the distance down here on this side is 54 feet. This is not a big difference, but it is not 30 feet and 60 feet. The Marriott is parallel to their building and it is not exactly able to be aligned. Mr. Shay also pointed out that the Marriott is not in the Historic District and does not have a two-story setback. He said that some of their earlier concerns were about being able to view the river from the public rights-of-way. From their site past the Marriott because the river curves to the north, there is no part of the edge of the riverfront further to the east that will be obscured or block the view. Therefore, they believe that this an element of its compatibility. The idea that there are only two two-story buildings north of River Street is not actually consistent with the historical aspect. There were a lot of temporary buildings along the riverfront north of River Street that existed back then. River Street was created by the City by Meyerhoff about 45 years ago. The permanent buildings were taller than two-stories. They recognize that visual compatibility is suppose to be with contributing historic buildings. This kind of building still exists on the riverfront and is currently being rehabilitated. It is the Plant Riverside. A tall building is close to the riverfront at the other end of the river. New construction is shown on that end with tall buildings. The precedence for having tall buildings has actually been maintained by the Kessler Development.

Mr. Shay said the two-story portion along the riverfront is clearly distinct and setback a sufficient distance from the riverfront east of the towers as they have proposed. They will setback the façade to differentiate the three businesses with their setbacks. They recognize that some people would like for their buildings to have a different design, but they ask that the Review Board consider that they fully meet the standards. The Height Map allows them to have the height all the way to the riverfront. The only other criteria is visual compatibility with the historic buildings that are contributing within the ward and the adjacent ward. Mr. Shay said they want to advance to Part II - Design Details. This is a handsome hotel the way that it is designed and meets the comments that they have heard; particularly from the Review Board. However, he wanted to point out that if approval today is conditionally and that is making the setback creates from the riverfront they will have to try to

appeal that somewhere else as it would be crippling to this overall development

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Savannah Historic Foundation (HSF) stated that they see a much improved design from the previous designs. But, the HSF agrees with staff. They have made some good observations and good suggestions with respect to improving this project, especially in the context of visual compatibility. He said he was glad to hear that the petitioner will follow architectural elements. He understands the concerns about the porte-cochere from an operational standpoint. However, this is a large covering and has a significant depth. Therefore, he believes some compromising is needed here. Mr. Carey said he wanted to focus on the eight-story tower. He understands the height and so forth concerning River Street. However, he wanted to made a distinction and bring attention to is the other end of River Street - the Kessler project. Staff has offered a reasonable solution, reduce it or push it back. The points of reference for this building (Kessler) is immediate. Mr. Carey believes that making reference to the existing power plant or other buildings that existed previously that are no longer here is a little trickery. He does not know how they could treat those, but the new buildings that are being constructed immediately east of the Power Plant, they were not in agreement with the additional height. They were ultimately approved over much objections and vigorous objection on their part. Just because those are taller, a false precedent should not be used because somebody else got a variance; therefore, I should get a variance. This is not a perfect comparison, but in terms of the situation and conditions here, they need to be careful with what is being used as points of reference.

Mr. Carey stated again that he believes this is a more successful and much improved design. He believes that the sheer design of the building [the primary tower] is problematic because there really isn't anything of this scale here. The Power Station is on the other end of River Street which is a historic building and it does not look like this in anyway. The Review Board concern is visual compatibility. He believes the building design is close, but today it not there.

Mr. Shay said, responding to public comments, no variance is requested. The only reason he referenced the old Power Plant was to show that there is no setback here at the tall portion of the building. This is consistent with the pattern and the historic large scale buildings at both ends of the river. The Kessler project falls within the National Historic Landmark District. But, their project does not, as staff has pointed out is not in the historic area, but he believes it falls in the industrial periphery of the downtown Oglethorpe Planned area. As far as the points of reference for compatibility to the Marriott and the Homewood Suites, he does not know exactly how tall the Marriott is nor what's the volume, but he is confident that it is taller and much larger in volume than the hotel that they are proposing. The other building that was a point of reference in Mr. Carey's remarks was the existing Homewood Suites building. He said that this building is exactly the same height as the Homewood Suites. He does not want to be accused of being tricky, but wants to be accused of being accurate with the information that he has provided to the Review Board. He said his understanding of visual compatibility is that it is supposed to be compatible with the contributing historic buildings that are in the ward and the adjacent ward. Unfortunately, the buildings that were once here with the size and character of their building have been demolished.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the massing. They believe the building is more successful now; but, it reads as a large massive building. This project was approved as a master plan that is not just this one building. The Board realizes this is a "U" shape tower, but reads as a blocky

tower. A significant amount of design is needed on the east story. Overall, the mass feels out of scale. As more buildings will be coming in this area, they need to be careful how they handle this building. More study is needed. They agree with the staff recommendations.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve Part 1, Height and Mass for an eight-story hotel building to be located on the vacant parcel at 620 East River Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II: Design Details:

1. Reduce the height of the proposed “architectural elements” on the rooftop and change the voids to an alternative material.
2. Reduce the depth of the porte-cochere significantly.
3. Either reduce the overall building mass to the 2012 volume or increase the setback from River Street further, more similar to the 60-foot setback from the west façade, to maintain the one and two story character and context of the River Walk, and preserve views to the river.
4. Provide additional details on the sidewalks at the curb cuts and the elevator and stair on the rooftop. Because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Nay
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[24. D3 - Petition of Greenline Architecture | 17-001561-COA | 630 West Bay Street | Hotel New Construction Part II: Design Details](#)

- 📎 [Aerial.pdf](#)
- 📎 [North Oglethorpe Ward.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- 📎 [17-001561-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal packet- Application.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal packet- Compatibilty Write Up.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet- drawings.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal packet- Material Spec List.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet- renderings.pdf](#)

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

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for Part II: Design Details of a new seven story hotel at 630 West Bay Street. The request includes a bonus floor and will require a variance to allow mechanical access to the roof. Part I: Height and Mass was approved by the Board on May 10, 2017.

Ms. Harris said that the hotel is proposed to be located on the same site as the existing Comfort Inn and Suites. This proposal is part of a larger project to construct a parking garage to the north of the buildings, but will be reviewed as separate submittals. The hotel faces West Bay Street and the south, east and west facades will be highly visible due to the proposed building's height and setbacks from adjacent buildings. Stylistically, the building is "modeled towards an industrial/warehousing type form in contemporary style."

Ms. Harris stated that on April 12, 2017 the HDBR continued the petition for Part I: Height and Mass. On May 10, 2017, the Board approved Part I: Height and Mass with the following condition:

1. Restudy extending the corbelled brick cornice across the mesh and continuing the brick parapet and stringcourse above the top of the seventh-floor windows to the top of the parapet;

The Board also recommended approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals of a variance from the standard:

Through-the-wall air conditioners may be installed in new construction when they are incorporated into the design of the window system and screened by a decorative grate.

Which was subsequently approved. The petitioner has provided study drawings illustrating the extension of the brick cornice and stringcourse over the metal mesh.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of Part II: Design Details of a new hotel at 630 West Bay Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Revise the color of the perforated metal mesh to a dark bronze finish.
2. Reduce the width of the curb cut to 20 feet, if permitted by GDOT.
3. Ensure the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.
4. Provide screen details for the proposed dumpster.
5. Revise the metal panels to an alternative masonry material.
6. Inset the window sashes a minimum of four inches.
7. Revise the roof top access and design to the minimum required for maintenance of the garden, and ensure no guest access is permitted.
8. Install a sample panel onsite per the Sample Panel Guidelines.

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

Ms. Harris reported additionally that staff recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the standard, "*All Mechanical or Access structures shall be contained within the additional story*" because the variance criteria have been met.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Deering said they agree with some of the staff recommendations. He wanted to discuss item #1

and get feedback from the Board. They believe that stainless steel will give the building décor an interesting look. They want the Board to consider that they be allowed to use stainless steel. He said they will discuss the width of the curb cut with GDOT, but he believes they will require that it be 24 feet. They will ensure that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height and provide screen details for the proposed dumpster to staff. Mr. Deering said the metal panels that staff refers to that the towers are bronze metal, they believe the panels help to add to the tower design. They believe a different material is more important than just a change in a color of a similar material.

Ms. Harris explained that it could be a contrasting color as long as it is a masonry material.

Mr. Deering stated that they believe four percent of the façade material will be a different design element that will add to the design. They will inset the window sashes a minimum of four inches. They will seek a rooftop variance along with a recommendation from the Review Board. The rooftop was not designed as a place for the guests to gather. He believes his staff drew shrubbery around the perimeter thinking that it could be a possibility. They will revise the roof top access and design to the minimum required for maintenance of the garden, and ensure no guest access is permitted. They will install a sample panel onsite in accordance with the Sample Panel Guidelines.

Ms. Caldwell questioned if the metal grids will rust.

Mr. Deering explained that the metal grids will be a stainless color.

Mr. Merriman asked if the green roof is not there to be enjoyed, what is the purpose of having it?

Mr. Deering said the purpose is for the building not to just radiate heat back out into the area.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) asked to see the brick sample and the metal mesh sample. He said he had three questions. Will the rooftop access be used for emergency only?

Mr. Deering said the rooftop access will be used for emergency and maintenance.

Mr. Carey asked if they will use a stainless steel finish?

Mr. Deering said this will be the design of the openings and perforations. The color will represent a stainless steel color. But, it will not rust.

Mr. Carey said he tends conceptually to agree with the petitioner in terms of the finish grid as opposed to dark bronze. However, his question is what is behind here. Are you matching what is here with the brick? He asked Mr. Deering if this is what he wants to achieve. He said in other words, should the grid go in front of what's behind there. Mr. Carey said he was concerned about the finish on it and whether it will look shiny. How long will it last?

Mr. Deering, in response to the public comments, stated that they felt having the brick behind the metal mesh would be a solution that would suit all situations. By placing the metal mesh in front of the brick, they believe it will read as a lighter color. But, they wanted a darker color behind it. This is why they chose to do brick behind this as well. They did not want to put darker bricks behind the pilaster. The closeness of the bars on the grid is to prevent birds from getting in there. He believes this gives a more opaque feeling to the pilasters.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the metal panel element and the color palette and materials. They agreed with all of staff recommendations with the exception of revising the color of the perforated metal mesh to a dark bronze finish and revising the metal panels to be an alternative masonry material. The Board felt a contrasting color would be more successful. The proposed color palette and materials are to be

reviewed in the field and approved by staff.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve Part II: Design Details of a new hotel at 630 West Bay Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Reduce the width of the curb cut to 20 feet, if permitted by GDOT.
2. Ensure the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.
3. Provide screen details for the proposed dumpster.
4. Inset the window sashes a minimum of four inches.
5. Revise the roof top access and design to the minimum required for maintenance of the garden, and ensure no guest access is permitted.
6. The proposed color palette and materials are to be reviewed in the field and approved by staff.
7. Install a sample panel onsite per the Sample Panel Guidelines.

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

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the standard, "All Mechanical or Access structures shall be contained within the additional story" because the variance criteria have been met.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Mic Matson

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[25. D4 - Petition of Greenline Architecture | 17-001565-COA | 630 West Bay Street | Parking Garage New Construction Part II: Design Details](#)

- 📎 [Aerial.pdf](#)
- 📎 [North Oglethorpe Ward.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- 📎 [17-001565-COA Staff Recommendation Part II.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Package- Application.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Package- narrative.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Package- specifications.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Package- drawings.pdf](#)

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

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

Ms. Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for Part II Design Details of a new four story parking garage at 630 West Bay Street. The parking garage is proposed to be located on the same site as the existing Comfort Inn and Suites. This proposal is part of a larger project to construct a hotel on the southeast portion of the lot, but will be reviewed as separate submittals. The parking garage is located internally to the site, setback from Bay Street approximately 250 feet. It will be accessed from a driveway from Bay Street and also from Pullen Street to the west, which is a private drive. Stylistically, the building is "industrial in style and will match similar materials of the new hotel, and the existing Comfort Inn on the same property in which it serves."

Ms. Harris stated that Part I: Height and Mass was reviewed by the HDBR on April 12, 2017 and approved with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II: Design Details:

1. Incorporate pilasters and green screens, or other element to add visual interest on the north façade which will be visible from Indian Street;

Pilasters have been added to the north façade to create bays approximately 20 feet wide.

2. Provide additional roofline variation on the north and south facades;

Additional roofline variation has been incorporated on the north and south facades.

3. Revise the bay spacing on the north and south facades to be greater than 15 feet and not less than 20 feet in width.

The bay spacing has been revised to be approximately 20 feet wide.

The project has also been shifted approximately 40 feet to the west on the site (into Pullen Street) to accommodate fire and emergency vehicle access.

Ms. Harris explained that there is a standard in the large scale development section that reads "*Building walls on street fronting façades shall incorporate modular masonry materials in the form of brick, cast stone, stone, concrete formed or assembled as stone to achieve a human scale over a minimum of 75 percent of surface area.*" She said this project does not have any street facing façade. Therefore, she amended the staff recommendation to remove this standard.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of Part 2: Design Details of a new four story parking garage with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Ensure that the precast concrete panels have a finish to simulate stucco and that the electrical vault is located on a secondary or rear façade.
2. Install a Sample Panel onsite per the Sample Panel Policy.

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

PETITIONER COMMENTS

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

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board was in agreement with the staff recommendations.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for Part 2: Design Details of a new four story parking garage with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Ensure that the precast concrete panels have a finish to simulate stucco and that the electrical vault is located on a secondary or rear façade.
2. Install a Sample Panel onsite per the Sample Panel Policy.

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[26. D5 - Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 17-002110-COA | 32 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

- 📎 [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Part I - Photos and Drawings.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Sample Panel Guidelines 120309.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Staff Context Images.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Material Samples.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Mass Model Photos.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Part II Drawings.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Ward Map.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Specifications.pdf](#)
- 📎 [17-002110-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

NOTE : Ms. Lynch recused herself from participating in this petition. Ms. Lynch is an owner of Lynch Associates Architects.

Mr. Andrew Lynch was present on behalf of petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the report. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details of a 4-story mixed-use building to be located at 32 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. The building will be located on the northeast corner of MLK and West Congress Streets with its front façade oriented toward MLK; the West Congress Street facade has secondary entrances to the ground floor commercial and an entrance to the residential units on the upper floors. A mezzanine is proposed between the 1st and 2nd stories.

Ms. Michalak stated that on July 8, 2015, this same applicant applied for a COA to demolish the building located on this site at 32 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard [File No. 15-003214-COA]. The HDBR voted to approve the petition with the following conditions:

1. Conduct an archeological assessment of the property after demolition;
2. Document the existing conditions through photographs and measured drawings and provide to the City's Municipal Library and Archives;
3. Reuse or recycle the historic bricks; and
4. Apply for the removal of the building from the Historic Building Map.

Because the building had lost its historic fabric the Board no longer considered it to be contributing. This approval was based on the lack of historic integrity of the building and not on economic hardship. Conditions 1-3 have not yet been met and will be included as conditions of this project's approval.

Ms. Michalak said that the Board also decided that the approval of the demolition is contingent on approval and permitting of the new construction. After the demolition approval and per the HDBR's conditions, the same applicant applied to The Planning Commission for a Zoning Amendment to remove the building from the Historic Building Map [File No. 16-001932-ZA]. The Planning Commission recommended approval to City Council and, on July 7 2016, City Council voted to remove 32 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard from the Historic Building Map; the building is now considered non-contributing (non-historic).

Ms. Michalak explained that on May 10, 2017, the Board approved New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass with the following conditions (*staff responses are italicized*):

1. Document the existing conditions through photographs and measured drawings and provide to the City's Municipal Library and Archives prior to demolition.

This information has not been provided. The applicant must provide it to staff before we will stamp the demolition permit drawings.

2. Conduct an archeological assessment of the property after demolition;

This information has not been provided. The applicant must provide it to staff before we will stamp the new construction permit drawings.

3. Provide details as to how/where the historic bricks from the existing building will be used in the construction of the new building.

This information has not been provided.

4. Lower the visual expression of first level's floor-to-floor height.

The physical height of the first floor cornice has been lowered 6 inches to 18 feet, the center higher cornice has been lowered, and an architectural element has been added under the second floor windows. Staff feels that these changes result in a compatible lower visual expression of the first floor.

5. Provide information regarding the elevator overrun's height, mass, and visibility from all public right-of-ways.

This information has been provided. The elevator overruns will extend 18 inches higher than the parapet

wall and be minimally visible from rights-of-way.

6. Further accentuate the building's subdivisions into "base, middle, and top" using material changes.

See Part II review.

7. Ensure door frames are inset not less than 3 inches and storefront glazing is inset not less than 4 inches.

This information has been provided and the standards are met.

8. Revise the height of the storefront base to be between 18-24 inches.

The storefront base has been reduced to 18 inches.

9. Provide HVAC equipment screening details.

This information has been provided.

10. Provide additional information for the north and east elevations.

This information has been provided.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details of a 4-story mixed-use building to be located at 32 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Document the existing conditions through photographs and measured drawings and provide to the City's Municipal Library and Archives prior to demolition.
2. Conduct an archeological assessment of the property after demolition.
3. Provide details as to how/where the historic bricks from the existing building will be used in the construction of the new building.
4. Create a sample panel per the attached policy; staff must review and approve the panel on site prior to commencement of construction.
5. Provide specifications for the exterior light fixtures shown on the exterior elevations, muntin profile details for the operable and fixed storefront windows, clarification that all ground floor glass will be transparent, and the canopy depths.
6. Revise the storefront base material to contrast with the wall material.
7. Ensure that an encroachment license is obtained for both canopies.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lynch stated that they did not have any objections to the staff recommendation.

Mr. Howington asked the petitioner what are their plans for reuse of the existing bricks.

Mr. Lynch answered that the bricks will probably be used on the inside of building.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board is in favor of the project. They appreciate the petitioner's willingness to work with staff. The Board was in agreement with the staff recommendations with the exception of revising the storefront base material to contract with the wall material.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for New Construction: Part II, Design Details of a 4-story mixed-use building to be located at 32 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Document the existing conditions through photographs and measured drawings and provide to the City's Municipal Library and Archives prior to demolition.
2. Conduct an archeological assessment of the property after demolition;
3. Provide details as to how/where the historic bricks from the existing building will be used in the construction of the new building.
4. Create a sample panel per the attached policy; staff must review and approve the panel on site prior to commencement of construction.
5. Provide specifications for the exterior light fixtures shown on the exterior elevations, muntin profile details for the operable and fixed storefront windows, clarification that all ground floor glass will be transparent, and the canopy depths.
6. Ensure that an encroachment license is obtained for both canopies.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[27. D6 - Petition of Paul Susznsku | 17-003004-COA | 611 Habersham Street | Mural](#)

[📎 Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[📎 Photo.pdf](#)

[📎 Aerial.pdf](#)

Panhandle Slim (artist) was present.

Ms. Harris gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting after the fact approval of a mural at 611 Habersham Street. The mural is painted onto a piece of wood and attached to the side façade of the building. Consequently, it is not painted directly on the building. The mural has a portrait of Nina Simone with a quote. The mural was attached to the building without the owner's knowledge; however, he received positive feedback and chose to apply for approval.

Ms. Harris explained that regarding the process for murals, the City of Savannah has a Historic Site and Monument Commission (HSMC) who is charged with review markers, monuments, and public art. However, any mural that is proposed for the Landmark Historic District has to come to the Review Board for approval and to the HSMC. Therefore, if this mural is approved by the Review Board, it will also have to be approved by the HSMC.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends denial of after-the-fact mural at 611 Habersham Street, because it is not visually compatible.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Panhandle Slim came forward and reported that Mr. Susznsku was present, but he is not present now as he had to go back to work. He informed the Board that Mr. Susnsku gave them permission to paint the mural on his property. He did not paint directly on the building. The message on the mural is very important to American history. He said Ms. Simone sang that song after Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was shot. The mural is appropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Christine Kirkland resides at 304 East President Street. There are some things in Savannah that are separate that keep people apart and there are somethings that unite us. Ms. Kirkland was not sure if anybody understood how much this mural unites almost everyone in Savannah. She is in favor of the mural.

Mr. Andy Paul stated that he was born and reared in Savannah. Mr. Paul works as an intern at a museum where many local citizens and tourists visit every day. Panhandle Slim work creates favorable dialog from everyone. There is a coherent positive narrative throughout Savannah. Jazz Festival is one of the biggest more vibrant events of the year. With the saying from Nina Simone contributes greatly. He is in favor of the mural.

Mr. Tim Polite resides at 315 East Huntingdon Street just around the corner from the where the mural is painted. Mr. Polite said approximately 10 years ago, he and his wife built a carriage house next door to this building. After they finished the project, they received a letter from Ms. Beth Reiter informing them that they were not in compliance with a particular architecture code. The offense was they neglected to put the "S" shaped ironclad post for their shutters to open. Ms. Reiter told them that they had to put ironclad posts on or they would have to remove the shutters. This lets them know how important their neighborhood is in the Landmark Historic District. Mr. Polite was wondering if the Board would require the ironclad post poles, but allow this mural in their neighborhood. He said the mural is totally incompatible. When he and his wife saw the mural there, they had sympathy for the owner as they believed that someone had painted graffiti and it cost the owner a lot of money to get it removed or either paint over it. When they saw that it was painted on a piece of wood, they felt it was some pertaining to a birthday, etc. Mr. Polite said they look at the mural about ten times everyday. They do not find the mural inspirational at all.

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that proposal such as this may appear that the guidelines and the historic district ordinance are to follow art, but this is not the case. He believes what has to be figured out pertaining to the mural is whether it is visually compatible or does it work within the guidelines. This is what the Review Board would have to decide upon as they come up with a decision. This isn't about art, the artist or the message. He does not believe this mural works under the guidelines of visual compatibility.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Fletcher stated that she was in favor of the painting. As it relates to visual compatibility, she does not view this as a mural, but they are viewing this as a mural. A lot of times in the neighborhoods and areas when murals are added they do not necessarily match the neighborhood, but they are put there for a specific purpose. Also, this is not a random isolated piece of art, it is a part of a campaign that is throughout the city. She said that the staff's findings reference the interior standards about new additions and things being reversible. Consequently, this mural can be removed at any time without destroying the property or the environment surrounding it. The owner is in favor the mural. It is visually compatible with what is going on in Historic Savannah.

Mr. Cook said he is definitely in favor of public art. He is not sure this mural is appropriate for a residential neighborhood. He would love to see more murals in commercial neighborhoods.

Ms. Caldwell said she likes public art. But, realizes that there are rules and regulations governing the residential areas. She believes it would be a good idea to put a limit on this if it is approved that it can remain there. This is after-the-fact.

Ms. Lynch said she is in favor of public art. This is how she views this project. She does not feel that visual compatibility necessarily complies to something so reversible and removable. There is a lot of diversity downtown. Ms. Lynch said they approved a project at Judge Realty not to long ago which is going to be just a canvas for public art and they don't need to be the ones to evaluate what the art is. This is an extremely

residential neighborhood on Abercorn Street. This is a real estate office, but it is surrounded by residences. She believes this is outside of the Review Board's purview as this is a piece of art that is not permanent and can be easily removed without being detrimental to the structure. Ms. Lynch said she is in favor of the general art and the general message.

Ms. Matson agreed with Ms. Fletcher and Ms. Lynch. She lives in this area and walks by the mural everyday. Ms. Matson is in favor of the mural.

Mr. Stephens said he is in agreement with some of the comments made thus far by the Board members. He is a huge proponent of initiatives such as this. It is disruptive, but not disruptive to the point of causing a problem. This inspires a different thought pattern as you experience all of the phases. Mr. Stephens believes this works well. As Ms. Lynch said, this may not be something that this Board should be voting on. He does not believe, though, that people should just put up something and then try to get it approved. He is an advocate of pushing this to the HSMC for further assessment.

Mr. Howington agreed that this is a tough petition. He likes the message and the artist. He also believes that spreading art throughout the city is a great thing. This art is reversible, is not painted on the building, and is temporary, but he does not see it as being compatible. Mr. Howington said he would like to see a time limit put on something like this so it would not set a precedent allowing anybody to go around town putting up art. The Judge Realty project came before the Review Board. The petitioner was not going to actually install art, but the structure for the art to be installed on and be temporary.

Ms. Lynch said she understood that a mural was painted at 24E Broughton Street, but was removed. She asked why was the mural removed.

Ms. Harris explained that the mural was painted without going through the application process. When the owner was notified, he chose to remove the mural.

Mr. Merriman informed the artist that this is not the first time that one of his projects has been downtown and has not gotten approval from the Board. There is no way that the artist does not know how the process works. Also, Mr. Polite during the public comments, made a good point about the shutters that were requested for his carriage house. Mr. Merriman explained that one of the paragraphs he reads every meeting is that "the Board cannot consider criteria not specifically identified within the ordinance. Items such as landscaping, parking availability, traffic, noise, and the impact on property values are not within the Board's purview and cannot be a factor in the issuance or denial of a certificate of appropriateness. Similarly, preferences will not be the basis for decisions."

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a mural at 611 Habersham Street because it meets the standards and is visually compatible. Approval from the Historic Site and Monument Commission will also be required.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher
Second: Mic Matson

Debra Caldwell	- Nay
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Nay
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Nay
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[17-003514-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Scott recused himself from participating in this petition. He is an employee of Dawson LS3P.

Ms. Jenny Mizejeski was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. Normally, this petition would be a staff review, but a member of the public requested that the Review Board hear this petition. The petitioner is requesting approval to replace an existing fence and windows for the property located at 200 West Harris Street. The wood fence around the south (side) and east (rear) property lines were damaged during Hurricane Matthew; after the hurricane, a chain link fence was installed until a new fence can be built. The fence along Harris Street was not damaged but will be replaced as well so that all the new fencing matches. All but five (5) of the windows on the existing building are proposed to be replaced in-kind; they have water damage.

Ms. Michalak stated that at the June 2017 HDBR Meeting, the Board approved a rear addition for this property [File NO. 17-002908-COA]. In 2013, staff approved to replace the other five (5) windows because they had water damage [File No. 13-000498-COA]. Prior to this work, all windows were wood, single-paned, true-divided lite, double-hung. Additionally, in July 2016, staff approved an after-the-fact application for iron gates within the Harris Street fence and sconces flanking the gates [File No. 16-003918-COA].

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval to replace an existing fence and windows for the property located at 200 West Harris Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Mizejeski thanked staff for their comments. They are in agreement with the staff recommendations.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Gary Arthur of the Beehive Foundation said they built the house in the 1990s. They consider this house the "star" of three traditionally designs. This was meant to be a model of how to successfully and classically inspire residents for architecture in our own day. He wanted the Board to look at the wrought iron gates that are incorporated into the wood decks. They barely register the way the architect drew them in the plans before you. Mr. Arthur said a precedence would be made for this kind of feature. It is an anomaly. In Savannah, wood fences typically have wood gates, masonry wall within an iron gate makes sense, too, and is also typical in the Historic District. But, here they have a wood fence with wood gates, but has an appendage tacked onto the front of the wood gate. There are odd wrought iron fixtures that look like a stage prop for a photographer studio. They consider this visually incompatible in the Historic District. Mr. Arthur urged the Board not to allow this in their neighborhood.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Arthur if what he showed the Board is what's there now.

Mr. Arthur said the petitioner put the gate up without getting approval and then after-the-fact, the staff approved them approximately one year later.

Ms. Michalak said what the Board is looking at is the old fence, but the petitioner will reuse the gates on the new fence.

Mr. John Ginneso resides at 327 Tattall Street. Mr. Ginneso believes the architecture style is very inappropriate. It has no design reference in the Historic District. It appears to be southern European; the application is inappropriate. He does not object to the wood fence, but objects to the iron gate on the wood fence. This will set a precedence that he does want to see. He believes that an iron gate should be installed on an iron fence.

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) did not want to overlook the fact that the petitioner did respond to the suggestions and comments regarding the addition. He believes the changes were an improvement. Mr. Carey believes, however, this particular site and the request is in the context of the petition regarding the mural. They know they have a traditional building here, designed intentionally to be a traditional building of reconstruction. In this sense, any treatment on this building going forward should be very traditional and consistent. Mr. Carey said believes what is here now creates inconsistency and confusion. The HSF is not in favor of this as proposed.

Ms. Mizejeski, in response to public comments, said as the staff stated these are typically heard at the staff level. They understand the public concerns, but this was previously approved with a prior COA. In 2016 they got approval to install the fence.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the existing fence and windows. They are not in favor of the iron gates over a wood fence; it is not visually compatible. It might look better if it was a masonry fence that matched the base of the house, even if they were decorative. If there was an element that could serve as a trellis would be better.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

1. Approve the petition to replace an existing fence and windows for the property located at 200 West Harris Street because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.
2. Deny the petition to install all decorative metal gates over the wood gates because they are not visually compatible.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[29. D8 - Petition of Ward Architecture + Preservation | 17-003633-COA | 219 East Charlton Street | Carriage House New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass, Rehabilitation, Alterations & Addition](#)

📎 [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](#)

🔗 [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

🔗 [Preservation Brief 44.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Ms. Sarah Ward was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Alyson Smith gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Part 1: Height and Mass, of a two-story carriage house as well as additions and alterations to the historic building at 219 East Charlton Street. The proposed alterations include adding an awning above the front stoop, adding two shed dormers containing windows at the eastern slope of the hipped roof, adding a three-story porch along the rear façade and altering two window openings on the rear elevation.

Ms. Smith said in its current condition, at the rear parlor level, two windows have been altered to become a double door opening with a transom above and only the framing remains. The round window has been removed, while the single door with a multi-lite transom is still in place. The petitioner has stated that the existing condition, is how the building was when the owner purchased the property about 2 months ago.

Ms. Smith stated that on April 4, 2017, staff approved white-washing, repointing and color change of the windows and doors at 219 East Charlton Street with conditions that color samples be provided and that four by four-foot test patches be provided for the proposed repointing and white-washing [File No. File No. 17-001690-COA]. A COA was not approved for the removal of the windows and alterations of the rear openings.

Ms. Smith reported staff recommends approval of the alterations and additions of a front porch awning, rear three story porch and roof dormers to the historic structure at 219 East Charlton Street with the following conditions:

1. Submit colors for all the proposed materials and provide specifications for the standing seam metal roof and ensure the that the seam height does not exceed one inch;
2. Provide the exterior overall height of the dormers and ensure that the dormer windows' muntins are no wider than 7/8 inch and that the muntin profile simulates traditional putty glazing;

Ms. Smith additional reported that staff recommend to deny the request to alter the opening and configuration of the paired windows at the second floor on the rear façade and the single door at the rear parlor level as proposed.

Ms. Smith also reported that staff recommends approval of Part I: Height and Mass for the new construction of a carriage house with the following condition:

1. Staff recommends restudying the spacing between the windows on the lane elevation of the carriage house;
- Because otherwise the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standard.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Ward thanked Ms. Smith for giving the report for this project. She informed the Board that the preservation consultant was present to answer any questions they might have pertaining to the drawings. The owner is pursuing historic preservation tax credit for this project. Ms. Ward stated that she appreciations the staff recommendation for approval with conditions. They will submit the colors and specifications for the standing seam metal roof. She said the seam height is 3/4 of an inch. The overall height of the dormers is within the existing roof height. The muntins are no wider than 7/8 inch.

Ms. Ward said the recommendation to deny the openings on the exterior elevation, their goal is to preserve the building and do as little damage or removal of the historic fabric. With the new porch on the rear is a location that is the idea to add a new addition on the back, but it does not effect the character defining façade of the building. Ms. Ward pointed out the existing openings. The sill height is at the same location and a transom is still there. They want to reinstall a door there. As for the third level of the porch, they need to put a door in as well. The thought was to be compatible with the façade below, was to have the openings align and also not to move any additional historic fabric by punching in new openings in the wall. The least amount of damage will be done by removing the center bricks and lowering the sill height and add a double door to match the doors below.

Ms. Ward said they do not believe that the windows are historic and do not replicate what was there originally,

which appears one for one windows. They are still present in the neighboring building and are also shown in historic photos. She does not know if the windows were taken out when they were being replaced, but were never put back in. However, they selected this method because they thought it would be the most visually compatible and also would remove the least amount of historic fabric.

Ms. Ward said they will restudy the spacing between the windows on the lane elevation of the carriage house. She said the design was developed to try to address some of the initial comments that they got and they are more than happy to work with staff on the opening spacing on the rear end.

Ms. Lynch stated that looking at the photo showing the two windows in relationship to the opening it appears that if the bricks were removed that are between them and lowered them, the opening would be wider than the door opening below.

Ms. Ward agreed. She said they are not the same width and do not line up exactly.

Ms. Lynch asked the petitioner if she would be changing the upper windows to match the lower windows; or would they just be different sizes.

Ms. Ward said it appears that some of the brick has been parched in, but she did not want to use the photo to make that assessment. Their idea is to use the existing opening and just remove little fabric. They want to preserve the opening as much as possible and the arches above.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no concern with the domers as they believe they will be minimally visible. They discussed the windows being made into doors, the modifications that have already been made to the house, and the brick below the double arched window. Some of the remembrance of the double arch needs to be retained.

Mr. Merriman asked Ms. Ward to clarify what will be retained.

Ms. Ward confirmed that the arches will be retained also the transom. Their goal is to keep as much of character that they can, but still allow for the adaptive and reuse and add doors to get onto the porch in the back. She pointed out the bricks that would be removed. Ms. Ward read the Secretary's Interior Standards recommend for the designing and installing additional entrances of porches for the new use is "in the manner that preserves in a manner that preserves the character of buildings, limiting such alterations to non-character defining elevations." She explained, therefore, she believes that the Secretary's guidance to them is not to do this on the front or street views, but do so on the back or secondary façade. Ms. Ward stated this is what they have tried to do. The brick will not match exactly, but it would be a reversible treatment that could be restored in the future.

The general consensus of the Board after the explanation from the petitioner was as long as the arches and transom are retained they were in agreement to alter the opening and configuration of the paired windows at the second floor on the rear façade and the single door at the rear parlor level as proposed.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby: Approve the alterations of window openings, additions of a front porch awning, rear three story porch and roof dormers at 219 East Charlton Street with the following conditions:

1. Submit colors for all the proposed materials and provide specifications for the standing seam metal roof and ensure that the seam height does not exceed one inch;
2. Provide the exterior overall height of the dormers and ensure that the dormer windows' muntins are no wider than 7/8 inch and that the muntin profile simulates traditional putty glazing;

Approve of Part 1: Height and Mass for the new construction of a carriage house with the following condition:

1. Staff recommends restudying the spacing between the windows on the lane elevation of the carriage house;

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Becky Lynch

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[30. D9 - Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 17-003634-COA | 300 and 326 West Bay Street | New Construction Hotel: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

- 📎 [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Staff Research.pdf](#)
- 📎 [New Franklin Ward Wharf Lots MAP A.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- 📎 [17-003634-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Howington recused himself from participating in this petition. He is an employee of Greenline; Northpoint Hospitality is a client Greenline.

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

Ms. Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of a 4-and-5 story hotel with two levels of subterranean parking for the properties located at 300 and 326 West Bay Street. The applicant is seeking an additional story above the Height Map using the “ground floor active uses” criterion. The building has a footprint of 24,913 square feet and qualifies as Large Scale Development. An application has also been received for the demolition of the three existing non-contributing buildings located on this site [File No. 17-002128-COA]. The demolition request was approved on the Consent Agenda with the condition that the new project is approved. There are three existing buildings on the site.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends to continue the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass at 300 and 326 West Bay Street in order for the petitioner to consider the following:

1. Redesign/Revise/Remove:
 - a. Redesign the 5-story building, which abuts and covers the historic building at 9 North

Jefferson Street, because the proposed design alters

distinctive features and spatial relationships that characterize the historic building.

- b. Reduce the overall height of the building, particularly the 5th story and where it abuts 9 North Jefferson Street, to be visually compatible with surrounding contributing buildings which consist of 1 and two story warehouse buildings. The tallest height should be reserved for the corner of the site at Bay and Montgomery Streets where it is both the furthest from the historic buildings and faces other tall non-historic hotel buildings on the south of Bay Street.
- c. Further break up the building into multiple volumes to be visually compatible with the rows of smaller attached buildings along both Bay and Factors Walk.
- d. Redesign the full glass ground floor to have more solids to be visually compatible with the ground floor openings of contributing buildings on Bay and Factors Walk.
- e. Revise the proportions of the narrow windows on the floors and the tall top floor windows to be visually compatible with adjacent contributing buildings.
- f. Redesign the front façade to emphasize and address Bay Street.
- g. Redesign the entrances, which are recessed deeply into and under the building, to be visually compatible with adjacent contributing buildings.
- h. Reduce the building cantilever and screen wall walkways along Bay Street which is not visually compatible with adjacent contributing buildings. This is a very unusual configuration and isolates the street and public sidewalk from interaction with the building and its interior.
- i. Redesign the recessed human entrances and the vehicular entrances along the Jefferson, Montgomery, and Williamson Street facades to create consistent walls of enclosures along those street.
- j. Redesign the horizontal character of the western building mass to be visually compatible with related contributing buildings which are more vertical in directional expression.
- k. Redesign the visual expression of the 5th story windows which appear to be taller than the first floor storefront in many locations due to their vertical character and the storefront's horizontal character.
- l. Redesign the access to the parking to be from the north-south service street.
- m. Redesign/move the interior vehicular "Arrival Court" along the Williams Street façade so that any parking or vehicle staging within the ground floor of the building is setback a minimum of 30 feet from any property line.
- n. Remove the cut-out in the curb, to be used as a car pull-off, along Montgomery Street.
- o. Redesign the "roofline variation" and "large scale height" for the western building form along the Bay Street façade because a change in parapet height alone does not constitute a one-half story height variation.
- p. Redesign the ground floor to have adequate "active ground floor uses" to be eligible for a bonus story or select another criterion.
- q. Redesign the architectural bays to be between 15-20 feet wide.
- r. Redesign the Bay and Williams Street facades to have a minimum of one primary entrance for every 60 feet of street frontage.
- s. Redesign the Williamson and Jefferson Street facades to have a minimum of 55 percent windows and doors on the ground floor.

2. Clarify:

- a. It is unclear if any mezzanines are proposed within the building. The tall height of 5th floor suggests that there may be multiple levels within.
- b. It is unclear whether the front-facing gable roof structures above the 5th floor are habitable spaces.
- c. The building appears to be subdivided into "base, middle, and top" using projecting cantilevered canopies, the screen wall, and

material changes; however, it is unclear.

d. It does not appear that the exterior visual expression of the top story is distinctive from the stories below. Clarification and additional information are needed as the intent may be to accomplish this with material changes.

3. Ensure:

a. Ensure that the new construction, where it is adjacent to the historic buildings, be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and the integrity of the historic property and environment would be unimpaired. Do not physically join the new building to any portion of the historic buildings or alter any of the façade that will be covered by the new building.

b. Ensure that, where intersected by a new driveway, the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration and height.

4. Provide:

a. Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18 to 24 inch tall base of contrasting material, to the lintel. Provide this information with Part II: Design Details.

b. Provide the gable roof pitches.

c. Provide the widths of the parking garage openings along the Williamson Street façade.

d. Provide electric meter and refuse storage area locations.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay introduced the persons accompanying him on behalf of this petition. They are appreciative of the staff report. Mr. Shay said he would not go through the staff entire recommendations, but will highlight the ones he seeks to get feedback from the Board on. The Kessler project will be a very high end hotel. River Street will be connected with Montgomery Street to City Market. They know that approximately 10 million people a year walk up and down River Street. They also know that approximately 5 million people walk back and forth to City Market. He said, therefore, it is safe to assume that millions of people will be using the stairs.

Mr. Shay said that Bay Street will be one of the most heaviest traveled street. They think this is a very important form to turn from where the hotel should be. This is why they have a continuous canopy along this side out of the sidewalk to Montgomery Street. They were extremely careful not bother the three live oak trees that are here with the entrance to the parking garage. The sidewalk is between 30 and 36 inches wide. They would like to have the storefront area setback from the street so that the people can choose to walk along here and not be out in the truck travel. In order to mitigate that, they would like to use some sort of screening materials here because of the views of the truck traffic. Staff does not feel that it is compatible and he guesses this is not a technique that is widely used in Savannah. He would like to get feedback from the Board on this.

Mr. Shay said the reason they chose to have the parking off of Williamson Street rather than Montgomery Street is to protect the trees and protect the feeling of cars that are arriving for the first time. They will talk with the traffic engineers about this. They feel that this branch of Williamson Street, although it functions as a lane, is a much better way for them to arrive without taking exception to the arrival court, which would be better to be street activated. With regards to the roofline variation to base, tall and so forth is an easy mistake. Mr. Shay said he made the mistake. He said this is actually the Factors Walk Character area and, therefore, is exempt from the large scale building standards. They continue to design buildings that use a lot of these principals because they are more elegant. But, he wants to be sure that with them being asked to redesign is an option and not a requirement in order to meet the standards.

Mr. Shay said they will continue to work with the roofline variations, but it is not because they are required to do so, but they are the things they choose to use to make a better looking building. As far as ensuring that the new construction will not damage the Jere's building, they agree with that and will be very careful of the disengagement of unit. The foundation will have to be carefully designed so that they are a great distance from the foundation of this building. There are a lot of recommendations, but he

would just like to take from today's meeting some idea as to whether or not the Board thinks that this is a good idea. He said they will work on the expression close to the street if the Board wants solids. But, they need to basically have a city sidewalk on the petitioner's property in this area. They also need to be able to have a continuous canopy off the foot of the Montgomery Street façade so that they can provide shade in an appealing way.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said he had a brief conversation with the petitioner just before his presentation. Mr. Carey said he expressed the HSF's interest in trying to bring a solution to the project. He is thankful that the petitioner is aware that the process with a project of this magnitude takes some time. He invited the petitioner to meet with the HSF Architecture Review Committee. They can have a special meeting concerning this project if the petitioner desires to do so. The staff has done an excellent job outlining all the critical areas and the HSF agrees with all of the recommendations.

Mr. Carey said primary concern needs to be given to Jere's Antiques. This is an important building. He is intrigued by the cantilever walkway, the north/south, along Montgomery Street. He is sure that the petitioner will show more of this as the project progresses.

Mr. Shay, in response to public comments, thanked Mr. Carey for the offer to meet with the HSF Architecture Review Committee. He will meet with them. They share the same concern about Jere's.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board centered around the traffic that will be in this area and Jere's Antiques. Bay Street is a dangerous street to walk on. They discussed the loggia with a wall in front of it does not appear to be a good solution as it does not enable anyone to walk under it as it is being cut-off from the sidewalk. It will be just a screen wall. The entrance to parking area makes a lot of architectural sense, but overall as shown it does not meet the conditions for a bonus story. There are not enough pedestrian entrances. It is believed that the building would be better benefitted if it was not all five stories. The site on Bay Street with the single five story elevation however broken up technically is overwhelming to the site as it stands. If there is a way to break this down, would be a more successful project. Maybe the height of east wing on Bay Street could be lowered to meet the antique store and keep the building in context with Factor's Walk. This would be an easy way to break up the long massive development. It appears that more thought was put towards Montgomery Street side which makes sense because of the pedestrian thoroughfare that will be here from City Market to River Street, but it really needs to address the street in the back. A large portion of the façade will be on Bay Street, but this street is not addressed. Maybe some type of vegetation would be better to use for separation instead of a fence.

Mr. Shay asked for a continuance.

Motion

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

1. Redesign / Revise / Remove:
 - a. Redesign the 5-story building, which abuts and covers the historic building at 9 North Jefferson Street, because the proposed design alters distinctive features and spatial relationships that characterize the historic building.
 - b. Reduce the overall height of the building, particularly the 5th story and where it abuts 9 North Jefferson Street, to be visually compatible with surrounding contributing buildings which consist of 1 and two story warehouse buildings. The tallest height should be reserved for the corner of the site at Bay and Montgomery Streets where it is both the furthest from the historic buildings and faces other tall non-historic hotel buildings

on the south side of Bay Street.

- c. Further break up the building into multiple volumes to be visually compatible with the rows of smaller attached buildings along both Bay and Factors Walk.
- d. Redesign the full glass ground floor to have more solids to be visually compatible with the ground floor openings of contributing buildings on Bay and Factors Walk.
- e. Revise the proportions of the narrow windows on all floors and the tall top floor windows to be visually compatible with adjacent contributing buildings.
- f. Redesign the front façade to emphasize and address Bay Street.
- g. Redesign the entrances, which are recessed deeply into and under the building, to be visually compatible with adjacent contributing buildings.
- h. Redesign the building cantilever and screen wall walkway along Bay Street which is not visually compatible with adjacent contributing buildings. This is a very unusual configuration and isolates the street and public sidewalk from interaction with the building and its interior.
- i. Redesign the recessed human entrances and the vehicular entrances along the Jefferson, Montgomery, and Williamson Street facades to create consistent walls of enclosure along those streets.
- j. Redesign the horizontal character of the western building mass to be visually compatible with related contributing buildings which are more vertical in directional expression.
- k. Redesign the visual expression of the 5th story windows which appear to be taller than the first floor storefront in many locations due to their vertical character and the storefront's horizontal character.
- l. Redesign the access to the parking to be from the north-south service street.
- m. Redesign/remove the interior vehicular "Arrival Court" along the Williamson Street façade so that any parking or vehicle staging within the ground floor of the building is setback a minimum of 30 feet from any property line.
- n. Remove the cut-out in the curb, to be used as a car pull-off, along Montgomery Street.
- o. Redesign the "roofline variation" and "large scale height" for the western building form along the Bay Street façade because a change in parapet height alone does not constitute a one-half story height variation.
- p. Redesign the ground floor to have adequate "active ground floor uses" to be eligible for a bonus story or select another criterion.
- q. Redesign the architectural bays to be between 15-20 feet wide.
- r. Redesign the Bay and Williamson Street façades to have a minimum of one primary entrance for every 60 feet of street frontage.

s. Redesign the Williamson and Jefferson Street facades to have a minimum of 55 percent windows and doors on the ground floor.

2. Clarify:

a. It is unclear if any mezzanines are proposed within the building. The tall height of the 5th floor suggests that there may be multiple levels within.

b. It is unclear whether the front-facing gable roof structures above the 5th floor are habitable spaces.

c. The building appears to be subdivided into “base, middle, and top” using projecting cantilevered canopies, the screen wall, and material changes; however, it is unclear.

d. It does not appear that the exterior visual expression of the top story is distinctive from the stories below. Clarification and additional information are needed as the intent may be to accomplish this with material changes.

3. Ensure:

a. Ensure that the new construction, where it is adjacent to the historic buildings, be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired. Do not physically join the new building to any portion of the historic buildings or alter any of the facades that will be covered by the new building.

b. Ensure that, where intersected by a new driveway, the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

4. Provide:

a. Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18 to 24 inch tall base of contrasting material, to the lintel. Provide this information with Part II: Design Details.

b. Provide the gable roof pitches.

c. Provide the widths of the parking garage openings along the Williamson Street façade.

d. Provide electric meter and refuse storage area locations.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Becky Lynch - Aye

Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Scott Cook - Aye

Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[31. D10 - Petition of Sawyer Design | 17-003636-COA | 205 West Jones Street | Carriage House Alterations](#)

📎 [17-003636-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

📎 [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for alterations and an addition to the carriage house for the property located at 205 West Jones Street. The carriage house is proposed to be expanded, on the first floor only, into the courtyard. The existing 8-foot-wide double-door, on the lane façade, is proposed to be expanded to the west to a 16-foot-wide garage door opening. The applicant is also requesting a variance from the standard that reads: *Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width* to allow for a 16-foot-wide garage opening.

Ms. Michalak reported staff recommends:

1. Approve the request for a carriage house addition because it will not be visible from a public right-of-way.
2. Deny the request for a 16-foot-wide garage opening because it is not visually compatible, does not meet the preservation standards, and does not meet the garage door design standard.
3. Recommend denial to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the design standard that reads: *Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width* to allow for a 16-foot-wide garage opening because the variance criteria are not.
4. If the Board chooses to approve any size opening increase on the carriage house, staff recommends the following conditions:
 - a. Redesign the exposed steel beam header to be more compatible with yet differentiated from the historic building.
 - b. Provide a garage door specification and color selection to staff for review.
 - c. Ensure that the sloped apron to the garage opening is not erected on the public right-of-way.

Ms. Lynch stated that she knows that the standards read that a historic carriage house openings should not be altered. However, as the opening has already been altered, would that still be the rule here pertaining to the standards?

Ms. Michalak answered she believes the 12 feet would be exempted.

Ms. Caldwell asked if the 12 feet could be approved, but not 16 feet.

Ms. Michalak answered that 12 feet is the maximum according to the ordinance.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Sawyer explained that they are trying to create a two-car garage just like their neighbor's garage. The reason they went with the steel is because the carriage house to the east has a steel header. They were trying to mimic something similar to that. Their neighbor to the east has a two-car garage and there is another garage down the lane that has a 16 foot door. Everything will remain exactly the as is. They will not change anything vertical, nor changing any of the brick. Mr. Sawyer said their intentions are to keep the force vents in place that is already partial enclosed; they will keep the 16 feet door electrical panels in place, The garage door is intended to be a simple flat panel door and will be painted Charleston green.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they have seen requests as this in the past. Mr. Carey said he is concerned about the lost of historic building material. He appreciates the petitioner's willingness to preserve elements of the building, but generally they oppose these expansive openings. Mr. Carey said he understands the petitioner's desire to have a two-car garage, but this would actually be permanently altering an historic resource. This is really difficult. Where this has been allowed has sometimes been the Zoning Board of Appeals' decision, not the Review Board's decision. The Historic Review Board's responsibility is to preserve historic buildings. The lanes have been treated too casual. They need to be careful with this as the lanes tell an important story. As someone walk in the lanes reviewing these buildings, it is their responsibility to give them the best experience.

Mr. Leonard, in response to public comments, said they agree with saving as much of the historic contents as possible. But, there are 16 feet doors in the lane. If the lane only had one opening for every carriage house in the lane had eight foot door opening, he certainly would not be leaning towards the eight foot siding or 12 foot siding, but when they see all the neighbors up and down the lane with 16 feet doors, it is difficult for him to go to his client and tell them that they can nit be like their neighbor. Therefore, all they are asking is to have an opening that is similar to their neighbor that will still save as much as of the historical contents of the carriage house as possible.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board sympathized with the petitioner, but agreed with the staff recommendations. The neighbors were able to change their garages as they were done prior to the guidelines being written as they are now. The Board was in favor of enlarging the opening to 12 feet, if this would help, but not to 16 feet.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

1. Approve the request for a carriage house addition because it will not be visible from a public right-of-way.
2. Deny the request for a 16-foot-wide garage opening because it is not visually compatible, does not meet the preservation standards, and does not meet the garage door design standard.
3. Recommend denial to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the design standard that reads: Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width to allow for a 16-foot-wide garage opening because the variance criteria are not met.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kellie Fletcher

Second: Mic Matson

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

📎 [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Stephens recused himself from participating in this petition. He is employed by the general contractor that is contracted by the owner of this project.

Mr. Christian Sottile and Attorney Harold Yellin were present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sara Farr-Newman gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for a sign master plan with guidelines for the Plant Riverside District (200 – 500 West River Street), which is currently under construction (14-004597-COA and 16-000852-COA). The site falls into two sign districts: River Street-Factor's Walk and the Historic District. The main buildings will house hotels and parking with mixed-used on the ground floor in addition to smaller mixed-used buildings throughout the site. Specific tenants are unknown for most spaces at this time and it is requested that individual signs be resubmitted to staff for final approval that are in accord with the River Street-Factor's Walk and Historic District sign ordinances. Eight sign types are proposed; the applicant is requesting variances for four of these sign types. These include the rooftop neon sign, the banner signs, freestanding/wayfinding signs in the River Street-Factor's Walk sign district, and the painted signs. Ms. Farr-Newman reported that there is an error in the staff report that says free-standing signs in the River Street-Factor's Walk. It should say in the **Historic District as well as painted signs in both districts.**

Ms. Farr-Newman stated that the sign plan indicates possible locations/sign types for each building and business. Individual tenants generally have an option of a canopy or projecting principal use sign with additional wall mounted signage options. Window signage and painted signage are also proposed to be permitted under specific conditions. For the purposes of this review, only signs that require a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) and/or permit should be decided upon by the Board. Window graphics, no greater than ten percent of the window area, and non-illuminated principal use signs equal to or less than three square feet do not require a COA or permit as provided in Sec. 8-3116 of the city zoning ordinance.

Ms. Farr-Newman said there are several other types of signage proposed. The hotels and larger businesses have a variety of fascia and projecting signage options. There are also wayfinding signs and other district identity signage proposed in addition to banner signs on light posts.

Ms. Farr-Newman explained that general guidelines are proposed for compatibility, scale, and proportion. Under these guidelines, canopy sign location and type are specified. Limited color palettes are also proposed. Additionally, the proposed guidelines incorporate requirements that are more restrictive or outside of zoning, and are not intended for HDBR to enforce or decide upon; therefore, the owner requires an initial approval letter prior to applying for a COA.

Ms. Farr-Newman additionally explained that the site falls into two signage districts: The Historic Sign Ordinance and the River Street-Factors Walk Sign Ordinance. Building A of the Three Muses Hotel, two retail kiosks, and two wayfinding sign locations fall under the River Street-Factors Walk Sign Ordinance, while the remaining buildings fall under the Historic District Sign Ordinance.

Ms. Farr-Newman stated that the Board can approve the Sign Master Plan and individual sign submittals could be reviewed by Staff, provided they are consistent with the approved Master Plan and relevant sign ordinances.

Ms. Farr-Newman reported that staff recommends approve the sign master plan for all sign types which do not require a variance with the following conditions:

1. Individual signs for the businesses must be submitted to staff for a COA prior to the installation and sign permit. Staff is not responsible for reviewing those aspects of the sign guidelines that are outside the purview of the Preservation Officer or sign ordinance (Sec. 8-3121). This review does not preclude a sign permit, building permit, or encroachment license that may also be required by the City of Savannah;

2. Only one principal use sign is permitted per business as per the historic sign district ordinance (Sec. 8-3121) and interpreted by the Zoning Administrator; because otherwise the plan meets the standards and is visually compatible.

Ms. Farr-Newman additionally reported that staff recommends a continuance for the variances to allow banner signs, painted signs, freestanding signs, and rooftop sign in order for the applicant to provide additional details such as design, location, and number of signs.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Sottile thanked the staff for reviewing the petition. They have been working on this for four years. It is exciting to see this happen. He wanted to emphasize how unusual this is as a district. It is approximately four city blocks; it is four acres of land. It is complex with an acre and one-half open plazas; it has exposure on public riverwalk; exposure on River Street and has connections from Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, Montgomery Street and Jefferson Street. Mr. Sottile said it took time for them to actually figure out how they do the signs here in a smart coordinated way. However, they have tackled it. There are approximately 35 different uses here. It is not a building nor a couple of buildings; in fact, it is a plan. Consequently, they approached it as a plan and developed guidelines. As staff mentioned, they have located it by building and on the site of a variety of locations. They are specific as can be at this point in terms of maximum sizes and importantly in locations. As businesses come and go, they can be replaced in a smart way. They have identified each type of open plan and elevation. There are eight types of signs. However, today he only wanted to talk about four of the signs. Under the wall mounted signs and Plax Projecting Signs, and Window Signs. All of these signs fall within the Historic District Sign Ordinance in the Factors Walk and Character Overlay Area. Mr. Sottile said in some cases, he believes they are looking more stricter in terms of color and certain attributes are a little different. But all of these signs are currently in the general ordinance and are easier to manage.

Mr. Sottile said as staff mentioned, there will be a variation from the Sign Ordinance. He wanted to talk about each of these with the hope of getting some input from the Board. However, he understood that the recommendation is for continuance on these signs. These will be directory signs; painted signs, banners and temporary signs for events; and parapet signs. From a procedural point, the management team for the project will review the signs before they go to MPC, the staff would review. If the sign being reviewed by staff if there is some concern, it would go to the Board. He wanted to take each sign and explain it. This is a tricky situation. We are in a living city and have a lot to learn. In cases such as this, they have a district that is both old and new. They have a power plant that is 100 years old and is a unique building type for Savannah. At the same time, they are charting the next century. They want to compliment how they do this. This shows them things that may have been forgotten as a part of the Urban Landscape. They looked at the landscape of Savannah and other places nearby close to home about things that have come before and what might be appropriate as they map out the future of this district which includes painted signs and things above the parapet on River Street and Factor's Walk.

Mr. Sottile said banner signs are being proposed for district advantage and events. The thinking is as people approach the site from multi access points, both north and south, east and west, on River Street and River Walk [from the north and south connecting street] they were thinking about how do they identify the prime riverside geography within this. An analogy is used because he believes it as some bearings. City Market is a micro district within the Historic District. It represents the market life. The lampposts have been identified throughout the district. This is an opportunity for a sign that could change seasonally. This will not be for businesses, but for the district of particular events. They specified that locations are limited to those shown on the plan. Sale promotions and advertisements are not allowed. Painted signs - the current ordinance prohibits painting on masonry buildings. This is a little outdated, but they believe this should be in the mix. They have identified the locations where the painting signs could be. They believe this would be an elegant way to identify these signs. There will be limitations on color and locations. Everything will be on a case-by-case basis. The third signs are the Free-standing signs which are way-finding for identity. These are signs that will be located at key entry points within the district. They see them as more simple and elegant. He said they have shown some examples of these signs. They are permitted to be two feet wide on small ones and the larger ones are permitted to be four feet wide and eight feet tall. They are classified as free-standing signs in the ordinance. The fourth signs are above parapet signs. He said there is one unique location and

project with a significant design opportunity. These are signs that are seen over photographs. They have one location on the West Hotel which is west of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard that will be in the identifying location to Plant Riverside. This building was designed with that in mind. They have studied the scale of lettering to be similar to what was shown on the screen. In terms of size and scale, they are not talking about what was seen at the Firestone location, but will be something that will be seen as you enter the district. The West Hotel looks down towards the River Walk. The location where this sign is being proposed to be located is west of the Old Power Plant.

Mr. Sottile said because this is somewhat complicated, he asked Attorney Yellin to come forward and provide some input on some of the procedural aspects that are being considered for the project.

Attorney Yellin explained that as a part and parcel of what Mr. Sottile has submitted, they will also submit a text amendment to advise the City of an ordinance to create the Riverside as a character district. The ordinance Section 3030, shows that there are already three such districts. This petition will go to City Council to amend the ordinance. City Market is one of those character districts. Attorney Yellin read the ordinance which states that "signage within the boundaries of City Market shall comply with the City Market sign criteria as adopted by the Historic District Board of Review and all other parts shall apply." He said they would like to also create this kind of criteria for Plant Riverside in the language as is identical - "Signage within the boundaries of Plant Riverside Character Area shall comply with Plant River Side sign criteria" which is what Mr. Sottile just showed to the Board. Attorney Yellin stated that their reason for doing this is twofold. As Mr. Sottile mentioned to the Board, there are eight different types of signs; four of these eight signs require a variance. There will be three hotels, 13 restaurants, and retail. Signs will come and go and retail opportunities will come and go. They are trying to come up with a way to make this predictable and streamline the process. All variances every single time comes to the Review Board and then to the Zoning Board of Appeals. This process could take as long as seven to ten weeks. They thought if they could get the package approved as a part of the Review Board's criteria, this would make the most sense.

Attorney Yellin pointed out that he did not know this until they met with staff [Ms. Harris and Ms. Farr-Newman] twice already that City Market as a sign criteria that allows them to get around the signage. They do not come back to the Review Board nor come back to staff. He said their sign criteria will be different. They will come back to staff. They will get approval at staff level; if staff sees something that is outrageous, they will bring it to the Review Board. Also, the second reason for doing this is they want to make it clear that the sign criteria being approved for them applies to them and only them. They are new construction on River Street and there are a lot of historic buildings on River Street; but perhaps the change might not be appropriate. Therefore, by doing it for them as a character district, they want to make it clear that it only applies to their four acres. He said between now and the next HDRB meeting, Mr. Sottile will bring back the sign criteria, the fort polio that the Board will review and may be they can come up with the sign criteria which will be the basis for the text amendment to file with the City of Savannah. This is a little unusual and probably one that they have not seen before. But, after talking with Ms. Harris and Ms. Farr-Newman, they believe this is the proper way to go. Attorney Yellin entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Howington asked if the district of the Plant Riverside District would be just as the site plan shows north of River Street.

Attorney Yellin explained that it will be bordered by Georgia Power on one side, River Street, Savannah River and defined totally in the ordinance.

Mr. Cook asked Attorney Yellin if they would come back to the Review Board for the sign criteria for the signs they are asking a variance for?

Attorney Yellin answered yes. There will be eight types of signs, including four types that will ordinarily require a variance. They would like for all of the signs to be approved as a part of a package of signs for this district only. They would like to keep this self-contained. Mr. Sottile will come back to the Review Board and he will go to City Council.

Mr. Merriman said until the Review Board gets the text amendment, they could not approve such a package. Is this right?

Attorney Yellin stated that he believes as he gets the text amendment, he will be telling MPC and City Council that they are in the process of getting the sign criteria.

Mr. Merriman asked if the text amendment would have to go before the MPC and receive a recommendation; then go to City and then come to the Review Board to be judged according to the new ordinance.

Attorney Yellin explained that the new ordinance is identical to the City Market ordinance.

Mr. Merriman stated that the proposal for the new ordinance is identical to City Market. It is not yet a new ordinance. Correct?

Attorney Yellin answered yes, that's correct. It seems to him that if a sign criteria package is approved, it can be approved subject to the text amendment. If the text amendment fails, there is no need for the sign criteria. If the text amendment is approved and the Review Board does so based on the criteria, it passes. Either way, one of them has to pass. They believe this is the best way to handle this. They still have to bring this back to the Board, but they believe this process will work.

Ms. Matson asked staff if something has to be definite for this area before it comes back to the Review Board.

Ms. Harris explained that not necessarily; the Review Board's recommendation could be contingent upon actually this happening. Therefore, the Board will not be committing to anything that will obligate City Council to do something. Ms. Farr recommendation for today is consistent with what they have on the books now. They will be developing this process to come back before the Board next time. There are no details on this today, but she believes the next time it comes to the Board they will see more information getting into what would be allowed and what could not be allowed. Ms. Harris stated that she believes the staff recommendation today is the simplest way to move forward. The staff will continue to work with the petitioner to bring something to the Board by next month.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that this is a small area, but is a huge project. More details are needed. The Board understands that the proposed text amendment will only be for the Plant Riverside District. The Board is in favor of the text amendment. They were in agreement with the staff recommendations.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the sign master plan for all sign types which do not require a variance with the following conditions:

1. Individual signs for the businesses must be submitted to staff for a COA prior to the installation and sign permit. Staff is not responsible for reviewing those aspects of the sign guidelines that are outside the purview of the Preservation Officer or sign ordinance (Sec. 8-3121). This review does not preclude a sign permit, building permit, or encroachment license that may also be required by the City of Savannah;
2. Only one principal use sign is permitted per business as per the historic sign district ordinance (Sec. 8-3121) and interpreted by the Zoning Administrator;

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

Continue the variances to allow banner signs, painted signs, freestanding signs, and a rooftop sign in order for the applicant to provide additional details such as design, location, and number of signs.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Mic Matson	- Aye

[33. D12 - Petition of Christian Sottile | 17-003638-COA | 447 Bull Street | Carriage House New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass](#)

[Aerial Map.pdf](#)

[Monterey Ward.pdf](#)

[Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

[Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Alyson Smith gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Part I: Height and Mass for a carriage house at 447 Bull Street. The primary building currently features an attached carriage house. The new structure will attach to the existing carriage house. The two-story carriage house will feature five garage openings and will orient towards West Gordon Lane. A garden pavilion structure is also proposed to be built on the southwest corner of the lot. The structure will be used for storage.

Ms. Smith reported that staff recommends approval of Part I: Height and Mass of the carriage house addition at 447 Bull Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II: Design Details:

1. Align the setback of the garden pavilion with the primary building;
2. Ensure that door frames and window sashes are inset a minimum of 3 inches from the face of the building;
3. Revise the spacing or size of the windows at the lane so that the distance between the windows is not more than two times the width of the windows;
4. Provide the following information:
 - a. baluster spacing;
 - b. vertical measurement of the smallest window on the lane façade;
 - c. additional information regarding the garage aprons, Because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Sottile said he appreciates staff's review of the project. This will appear to be going back to the future. This site tells a remarkable story and they learned a lot as they studied these buildings. As staff has given a good presentation of the project, Mr. Sottile said he would only provide additional information to address the four points that staff has recommended as conditions to be submitted with Part II - Design Details. He said looking at the setback from the streetscape. They want to hold onto this as currently design. There are a number of homes that were historically in the block and still remains here at Whitaker and Gaston Streets that are on zero lot line buildings. When you look at either side of this particular context, you will see homes that are at the zero lot line just as on Whitaker and Gaston Streets. Looking at the next block to the east, you will see the same kind of condition. This is particularly instructive as he believes it speaks to the intent of how they place that particular element back what they call the garden pavilion inside the wall. It really has to be with privacy more than anything else. The neighbor's building on East Gaston shows a larger mass of the building where it sets back. What is really essentially in the spirit of a garden wall along Gaston frontage at the zero lot line, they believe the fence line is the wall of continuity. This is something they perceive as they start thinking about the design. They intentionally set it back eight feet from the historic fence line as a way to create a vegetative and ivy coverage visual screening to provide privacy for the garden. He said they were concerned that if they set it back too far, structurally it would diminish the garden while also diminishing the functionality of privacy. Mr. Sottile said they envision this not so much as an architecture piece as it is more of a wall. In fact the height is quite low and is not to be confused as a habitable space. This is for equipment and services. Therefore, it will function as a pavilion visually, but it will function in the spirit of a wall. They want to keep the placement as presently designed.

Mr. Sottile said they have studied the window spacing for the project and have met with staff and looked at the floor plans. They believe that adding additional windows is acceptable to the design and in fact it meets the ordinance. They can have two groups of windows at Gaston Street; they have studied this. The center lines of the garage doors will be covered with the flanking windows. The height of the smaller windows on the lane entrance of the carriage house is 4' - 3". Mr. Sottile said they have taken a closer look at the apron not extending into the public right-of-way to confirm that it would not. In fact, the right-of-way is actually just a foot beyond the face of the building with the thickness of the wall, they will have two overture for the apron. The historic entrance to the carriage house still has this. Therefore, they will mirror this condition. They can see this condition up and down the lane.

Mr. Sottile said in summary, they appreciate the review and are excited to be here. He respectfully asked for the Review Board's approval with the staff's conditions.

Ms. Lynch asked Mr. Sottile to explain the height of the carriage house. When looking at the street elevations, it is as tall as the third story, the house next door. If they are talking about visual compatibility, it appears to be quite taller than the other carriage houses on the lane. She could not find anything in the guidelines that talks about this. Ms. Lynch said she believes the petitioner wants the spaces to be more than just service spaces.

Mr. Sottile said it actually contracts to everything with this particular building. Their approach to the carriage house is to align the floor plan with the two buildings. Therefore, they reset both the first and second floors to align with the carriage house. The remaining portion of the carriage house that is actually here is a three story building. They have a parapet and will screen it as much as possible. The total height of the building is taller than a midnight century carriage house.

Ms. Lynch believed this would be a question for Part II, but because he is using glaze brick for the material, she asked Mr. Sottile if he is planning to match the material of the main house or have a complementary material?

Mr. Sottile answered it will be complementary. There is no way to match what is here, but they are looking for a brick that will be very close to what is here now.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board was in favor of the project. They were in agreement with the staff recommendation excluding the aligning of the setback of the garden pavilion with the primary building.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby: Approve Part I: Height and Mass of the carriage house addition at 447 Bull Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II: Design Details:

1. Ensure that door frames and window sashes are inset a minimum of 3 inches from the face of the building;
2. Revise the spacing or size of the windows at the lane so that the distance between the windows is not more than two times the width of the windows;
3. Provide the following information:
 - a. baluster spacing;
 - b. vertical measurement of the smallest window on the lane façade;
 - c. additional information regarding the garage aprons;

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

[34. Petition of Larry Meek | 17-002581-COA | 234 Price Street | Staff Approved - After-the-Fact Brick Repointing.](#)

📎 [IMG_20170612_090008374_HDR.jpg](#)

📎 [COA - 234 Price Street 17-002581-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[35. Petition of Marysue McCarthy | 17-003308-COA | 230 Houston Street | Staff Approved - Repair Cracks](#)

📎 [COA - 230 Houston Street 17-003308-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 230 Houston Street 17-003308-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. Petition of Andrew Barber for Coastal Canvas Products, LLC | 17-00309-COA | 36 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Retractable Awnings

📎 [COA - 36 West Broughton Street 17-003309-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 36 West Broughton Street 17-003309-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. Petition of Gabrielle Solt for JDH Decks & Fences, Inc. | 17-003310-COA | 546 East Charlton Lane | Staff Approved - Replace Fence

📎 [COA - 546 East Charlton Lane 17-003310-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 546 East Charlton Lane 17-003310-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. Petition of David Bloomquist for Bloomquist Construction | 17-003353-COA | 437 Tattnell Street | Staff Approved - Remove EIFS Stucco System

📎 [Cemplaster Fiberstucco.pdf](#)

📎 [COA - 437 Tattnell Street 17-003353-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. Petition of Ray Hoover | 17-003384-COA | 345 East Broad Street | Staff Approved - Existing Asphalt Shingle Roof

📎 [COA - 345 East Broad Street 17-003384-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 345 East Broad Street 17-003384-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. Petition of Richard K. Wissmach for Wissmach Architects | 17-003502-COA | 225 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Canvas Awnings

📎 [COA - 225 East Bay Street 17-003502-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 225 East Bay Street 17-003502-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. Amended Petition of Ryan Claus for Felder & Associates | 17-003559-COA | 128 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Awning

📎 [COA - 128 Habersham Street 17-003559-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 128 Habersham Street 17-003559-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. Petition of Mark Fitzpatrick | 17-003562-COA | 210 East Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Repairs

📎 [COA - 210 East Taylor Street 17-003562-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 210 E. Taylor Street 17-003562-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. Petition of Zack Kozdron | 17-003610-COA | 539 East Charlton Street | Staff Approved - Deck and Rail

📎 [COA - 539 East Charlton Street n17-003610-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - drawings.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. Petition of Tony Hensley for SCAD | 17-003653-COA | 310 West Boundary Street | Staff Approved - Repairs and Color Changes

☞ [COA - 310 West Boundary Street 17-003653-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 310 West Boundary Street 17-3653-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

45. Petition of Edward A. Bernard | 17-003661-COA | 207 West York Street | Staff Approved - Limestone Coping

☞ [COA - 207 West York Street 17-003661-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 207 West York Street 17-003661-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

46. Petition of Paltiel Pendergrass for Commonwealth Construction of Georgia, LLC | 17-003680-COA | 226 East Hall Street | Staff Approved - Roof and Windows

☞ [COA - 226 East Hall Street 17-003680-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 226 East Hall Street 17-003680-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

47. Petition of Andrew Barber for Coastal Canvas Products, LLC | 17-003726-COA | 305 West St. Julian Street | Staff Approved - Awning Frame

☞ [COA - 305 West St. Julian Street 17-003726-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 305 West St. Julian Street 17-003726-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

48. Petition of Dohrman Construction Preservation and Consulting | 17-003754-COA | 324 East State Street | Staff Approved - Brick Repointing

☞ [Application and Submittal Packet - 324 East State Street 17-003754-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [COA - 324 East State Street 17-003754-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

49. Petition of Danielle Jarvis | 17-003757-COA | 507 East McDonough Street | Staff Approved - Color Change

☞ [COA - 507 East McDonough Street 17-003757-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 507 East McDonough Street 17-003757-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

50. Petition of Mark Fitzpatrick | 17-003794-COA | 300 Bull Street - Apt 401 | Staff Approved - Add Concrete Balcony

☞ [COA - 300 Bull Street 17-003794-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 300 Bull Street - Apt 401 17-003794-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

51. Petition of Abigail Powell for Ellsworth-Hallett Home Professionals | 17-004017-COA | 515 East Perry Street |

[Staff Approved - Color Changes](#)

- ☉ [COA - 515 East Perry Street 17-004017-COA.pdf](#)
- ☉ [Submittal Packet - 515 East Perry Street 17-004017-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

[52. Report on Work Performed Without a Certificate of Appropriateness for the July 12, 2017 HDBR Meeting](#)

- ☉ [7-12-17 HDBR Report on Work Without a COA.pdf](#)

Mr. Merriman stated that 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

[53. Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, July 13, 2017 at 3:30 p.m. in the Meyer Conference Room, MPC 110 East State Street](#)

[54. Next Pre-Meeting - Wednesday, August 9, 2017 at 12:00 p.m. in the Jerry Surrency Room, MPC, 112 East State Street](#)

[55. Next Regular Meeting - Wednesday, August 9, 2017 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 East State Street](#)

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

XV. ADJOURNMENT

[56. Adjournment](#)

There being no further business to come before the Review Board, Mr. Merriman adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen I. Harris, Director
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.