



Savannah Historic District Board of Review

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
May 10, 2017 1:00 P. M.
Meeting Minutes

MAY 10, 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.

HDRB Members Present: Stephen Merriman, Jr., Chair
Zena McClain, Esq., Vice-Chair
Scott Cook
Jennifer Deacon
Kellie Fletcher
Keith Howington
Becky Lynch
Mic Matson
Dwayne Stephens

HDRB Members Not Present: Debra Caldwell
Andy McGarrity

MPC Staff Present: Ellen Harris, Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation
Sara Farr, Historic Preservation Planner
Leah Michalak, Historic Preservation Planner
Alyson Smith, Historic Preservation Planner
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

City of Savannah Staff Present: City Attorney Brooks Stillwell

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

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

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

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

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

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

[3. Petition of Wubbena Architects | 17-000712-COA | 217 East Charlton Street | Stoop Alterations](#)

- [📎 Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- [📎 Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- [📎 Lafayette Ward.pdf](#)
- [📎 Specifications.pdf](#)
- [📎 Staff Photos.pdf](#)
- [📎 Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition of the front porch reconstruction at 217 East Charlton Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to construction:

1. Submit a detail drawing of the balusters. The balusters should match the design and configuration as depicted in the photo;
2. Redesign the newel post so that it is rounded to match the post in the historic photo and the design of the balustrade;
3. Provide additional information to substantiate the overall proportion and width of the portico is consistent with the proportions in the historic photo;
4. Remove the roof’s side elevation ornamental infill trim and enclose the sides using solid wood. Include the ornamental trim on both elevations below the cornice line to match and connect with the front elevation;

Because otherwise the project meets the Design Standards and is visually compatible.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.	
Second: Kellie Fletcher	
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye

Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[4. Petition of Sign D'Sign | 17-001967-COA | 105 Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

[📎 Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Package.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for an under awning sign at 105 Whitaker Street with the condition it is not less than one foot from the outer edge of the awning, because otherwise the sign meets the standards and is visually compatible.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Kellie Fletcher

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

[5. Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 17-002024-COA | 570 East York Street | Sign](#)

[📎 Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Package.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the proposed sign at 570 East York Street, because it meets the standards and is visually compatible.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Kellie Fletcher	
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[6. Petition of James Burnsed | 17-002111-COA | 150 West St. Julian Street | Sign](#)

- [📎 Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- [📎 Aerial View.pdf](#)
- [📎 The Cay Building Sign Guidelines.pdf](#)
- [📎 Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition of the projecting principal use sign at 150 West St. Julian Street as proposed with the following condition:

- Ensure that an encroachment permit is obtained;

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye

Mic Matson - Aye

[7. Peitition of Tyson Sign Company | 17-002153-COA | 15 East Broughton Street | Sign](#)

[Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[Submittal Package.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the proposed principal use sign at 15 East Broughton Street, because the sign meets the standards and is visually compatible.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Kellie Fletcher

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

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

[8. Adopt the May 10, 2017 Agenda](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby adopt the May 10, 2017 agenda with the change to move the agenda item regarding the ZBA remand to the top of the Regular Agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jennifer Deacon

Second: Becky Lynch

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

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

9. Approval of April 12, 2017 HBR Briefing Minutes

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

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve April 12, 2017 HBR Briefing Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jennifer Deacon

Second: Kellie Fletcher

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

10. Approval of April 12, 2017 Meeting Minutes

[04-12-2017 Minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve April 12, 2017 Meeting Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jennifer Deacon

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- 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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

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

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

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

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

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

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

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

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

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

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

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

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

[15. Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 16-006848-COA | 501 Montgomery Street | New Construction Part II: Design Details](#)

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

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

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

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

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

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

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.
 Second: Keith Howington

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

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

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.
 Second: Kellie Fletcher

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

[19. Petition of Hansen Architects | 17-001568-COA | 701, 702, 703 Howard Street | New Construction Part II: Design Details](#)

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

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

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

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

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

[21. 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 approve to continue the petition to the next regular meeting as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye

Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

[22. Remand by the Zoning Board of Appeals | Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 16-006855-COA | 301 Tattnall Street | New Construction Part 1: Height and Mass](#)

- 📎 [Maps and Images 1346.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Application 1346.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Addendum to Appeal.pdf](#)
- 📎 [COA - 301 Tattnall Street 16-006855-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Ward map.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Parcel Combination - New Pin - Email_5_1_17.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Comments to ZBA 4-27-17.pdf](#)
- 📎 [ZBA Decision 4-27-17.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Signature Petition to ZBA 4-27-17.pdf](#)

City Attorney Stillwell stated that the staff asked him to come to the meeting today as there was some confusion about what is the general procedure for this matter. City Attorney Stillwell recapped that several meetings ago, the Historic District Board of Review approved the Height and Mass application for a hotel at 301 Tattnall Street. He believed at the following meeting, the Review Board approved the bonus story in accordance with the provision of the ordinance. One of the neighbors appealed the height and mass determination to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) on the grounds that the Historic District Board of Review misunderstood the instructions or the correct law that should be applied as the Board felt they were required to approve the bonus story. The ZBA remanded this back to the Review Board to basically rehear the issue. However, the statute says that the only issue to be reheard is the matter that was in error as found by the ZBA. The ZBA found that the error of the Review Board was essentially the instructions.

City Attorney Stillwell said, therefore, he did not believe that it would be appropriate for the Review Board to hear the entire matter again. If the Review Board hears the entire matter, it would have to be re-advertised and start from the beginning. He explained that the only issue that was remanded by the ZBA is the issue that the Board misunderstood that they had the discretion of not granting the bonus story. He asked Ms. Harris to give the applicable standard and then asked the Board members who voted at the meeting to supplement, for the record, as to whether they understood the applicable standard and whether they had any misunderstanding about it. City Attorney Stillwell asked the attorneys to explain to the Board briefly their opinions, but his opinion is that the records be supplemented and move on.

Attorney John Manly stated that he is representing the Beehive Foundation and Gary Arthur appealed this body's decision to the ZBA. Attorney Manly said he disagrees with City Attorney Stillwell's statement that the records could be clarified. One of the members of the Review Board that voted in favor of the

petition is no longer on this Board. In order for them to get an honest assessment of what the impressions were of the members, they would have to poll every member who voted in favor and this cannot be done now. Therefore, what he is asking is that the Review Board review, what City Attorney Stillwell said not to do, is to have a public hearing on this petition. He said "hit the reset button" and bring this back before this body; allow them to present evidence; allow the petitioner to present their case; and allow the public to make comments. At that point, they know what the rules are and they can all make an effort to make a determination to what the legal standard is and then from there, if it comes out against him, then he knows the playing grounds and then he goes to ZBA. This same thing applies to Attorney Yellin. Attorney Manly said he believes this is the most applicable and the most legal way to do this. As City Attorney Stillwell has said, they all are confused and do not know what the Review Board is suppose to do in light of the remand from the ZBA. Also, Attorney Manly said he is not sure the ZBA has the authority to do what they did and to remand this body. Remands allow for deferments or for nothing. He said, therefore, he questions whether the Review Board could hear a remand from the ZBA.

Attorney Manly said secondly, as for the notice requirement, the ordinance is clear that notices are required 30 days in advance of the hearing. The Review Board heard this item on April 12. ZBA held its meeting on April 27. Therefore, it is impossible for the 30 day notice to have been provided. They found out that this item was on the agenda as of last Friday. He believes that allowing the motion to hit the reset button solves a lot of the issues. It will also allow the public to have the ability to come in and express their views. There are new members on the Review Board and he believes that it is enlightening and instructive to know what the neighbors think regarding their opinions going forward with this project. He asked that there be a motion to allow the Review Board to review this petition again. The ZBA should have made a ruling.

Attorney Harold Yellin stated that he is representing the petitioner. Attorney Yellin said that an applicant can only appeal to this Board for two reasons. They need to find that a procedural error occurred. Visual compatibility is not grounds for citizens to appeal. He said in their opinion, February 8, 2017 did not contain a procedural error and did not contain any abuse discretion. In fact, Mr. Manly's original appeal did not make such an allegation. It was only until he added an addendum to his original appeal he added unusual language. The basic premise of Mr. Manly's appeal to ZBA is that the Review Board was under the impression that they were bound to approve an additional story on the proposed structure if it met certain criteria.

Attorney Yellin said he wanted to make two comments. The first comment is prior to the meeting, the Board received the staff report from the HDBR staff. On page 4 of the staff report, it says "the heights including the bonus story as it qualifies as large scale development and is eligible for a bonus story." Attorney Yellin explained that at least three places in the staff report the Board was told prior to the meeting that this property was eligible for another story.

Attorney Yellin stated that for the record, at the 47 minute and 45 second mark, Ms. Alyson Smith said to the Board "the proposed height includes a bonus story as it qualifies as large scale development, it is eligible for a bonus story. At the 49 minute and 22 second mark, Ms. Smith said "in regards to the design standards under height, the building meets the definition of large scale development and it is eligible for one story above the height map "if one of the criterion is met." Another example is at the 52 minute mark where Ms. Smith said "may be permitted" [not shall be permitted]. At the 53 minute mark, "in order to qualify one of the criterion must be met." Mr. Lynch, as the petitioner, at the 75 minute mark said, "it is eligible for a bonus story." The list goes on and on. The staff report and the audio reflects that on February 8, 2017 everyone here was aware that this was something that was eligible.

Attorney Yellin said he is very concerned just as he said at ZBA that you can not appeal to this board based on an impression that you did not know what the rules were. If these are the new rules, then he suspects that every decision that this board makes from this forward will be appealed to the ZBA because someone will say that they were under the impression -- and under the impression, bias impression and qualification; under an impression of who knows what. They can not simply go on appealing this Board to the ZBA every time someone has an impression. This is not an acceptable law nor is it a procedure. He said the audio tape was played at the ZBA meeting and the one person who they believed was confused was Mr. Howington. Mr. Howington is one of the longest serving members of the Review Board and has served as chairman of this board. Therefore, we can say that Mr. Howington was not confused. When the ZBA heard Mr. Howington's voice, they said the Board was confused.

Attorney Yellin stated that this seems to be about fundamental fairness, but yet fundamental fairness is not exhibited here. They were present on February 8, 2017 and the Historic Review Board voted, considered, and approved height and mass. Attorney Manly wants a whole new procedure where people can come and talk about a petition, but they were here on February 8, 2017 when this petition was heard. A large crowd was present at that hearing. They spoke their mind and the Board heard what they had to say. They also heard what Mr. Lynch had to say and the Board voted in favor of height and mass and for a bonus story. Therefore, the idea of having a new hearing is a little disingenuous; they have already had a hearing. Attorney Yellin said it is his opinion that the Review Board understood what the word "eligible" means and based on the City Attorney's opinion, they trust that the Board will clarify the record and will confirm that they understood the standards as presented to them on February 8, 2017 by the staff and that they understood the true meaning of the word "eligible." This will allow them to move to the next step. Attorney Yellin thanked the Board and entertained questions.

City Attorney Stillwell clarified that the City is not taking a position one way or the other on this issue. He is here to clarify what the staff asked him about the law. He is also trying to get both parties to a point where they have a clear record where a judge will not say let's send this back to the Review Board or the ZBA for clarification on what they really meant. City Attorney Stillwell said he was not asking that this petition be reheard. He does not believe that this is warranted by what the ZBA did. The ZBA asked that the Review Board reconsider the one issue. They are authorized to remand it on the particular issue that they found fault with. He was not asking the Review Board to have a rehearing or vote again on this, but to supplement the record for those people who were here and voted on it at the last time.

Ms. McClain asked if there was a written statement from the ZBA?

City Attorney Stillwell said one of the attorneys informed him that they listened to a tape of the Review Board proceeding. They heard something that Ms. Harris said in the meeting and how Mr. Howington or one of the other Board members responded. Based on that, one of the ZBA member said [he did not want to put words in the person's mouth] perhaps the Board was confused. On this basis, Mr. Morgan moved that based on the audio of the meeting, it appeared that a procedural error in the standards was applied by at least one of the Board member that moved him to grant an appeal on that error and remand it back to the Review Board to consider it in light of the instructions on the proper standard. City Attorney Stillwell said he agrees with both attorneys that some will question whether they are right to remand it back and exactly for what. But, he is trying to clarify the record so if the ZBA is to rehear this, they will have a clear record and clear understanding of what was decided here.

Ms. McClain asked the City Attorney should Mr. Howington be the only person to clarify for the record.

City Attorney Stillwell said the motion did not name Mr. Howington. The record stated "a Board member."

Mr. Merriman said that one Board member who voted in favor is no longer on the Review Board. He explained that he believes the City Attorney is saying that all Board members who voted in favor of the bonus story clarify for the records that they understood what they were voting for.

Ms. Harris explained that the section of the ordinance that addresses bonus story under Large Scale Development Standards states that large scale development shall comply with the following standards which include visual compatibility factors, design standards, footprint, mass, etc., including the section called "height." Of particular relevance is the section that talks about additional stories. She read, "the following properties are eligible for an additional story on the area of the building that is unaffected by table 1 which is above the "R" zoning district, a maximum of one story above the historic height map may be permitted if the property is located on Oglethorpe Avenue, Liberty Street and trust lot. One or more of the criteria below must be met in order to qualify for a bonus story." Ms. Harris said for the case in question, the criterion selected was "the multiple ground floor active uses permitted in the base zoning district (including but not limited to retail, office, lobby, restaurant), expand the length of the façade on all the street fronting elevations, not including lanes and maintaining individual primary exterior entrances."

Ms. Harris said City Attorney Stillwell has stated that the critical matter is whether or not the Board was aware that they had the discretion to approve or not approve a bonus story; that is within their discretion. This has always been consistent with staff interpretation as well as the staff recommendation.

Ms. McClain said she was trying to understand the word "remand." Whenever a body decides to remand a case, you rehear it, so to speak. She was trying to understand exactly whether the ZBA has the authority to remand. Has this been researched? If so, would it be the Review Board's responsibility to actually rehear the petition since it is on "remand?"

City Attorney Stillwell said he does not believe the Review Board is required to rehear the petition. He does not believe that the ZBA has the authority to have the Review Board rehear the whole petition, but review the specific language that is the historical review ordinance. The ordinance says that the ZBA shall review the appeal at a public hearing and determine if the Board abused its discretion in reaching a decision and/or a procedural error has occurred. In this case as they heard what Mr. Parker said in his motion, the ZBA found that the Review Board made a procedural error. If it is determined that an abusive discretion or procedural error occurred, the Zoning Board of Appeals may approve, modify, reject, or remand the application to the Board [the Review Board] for reconsideration of elements of the application affected by the error. The City Attorney explained that exactly what this means obviously will be discussed for a while, but the way he interprets this is the element of the Review Board's decision affected by the error was the actual vote. The question is whether the Board understood that they had discretion or didn't have discretion. It does not have anything to do with was there visual compatibility or was there proper public notice.

Ms. McClain asked that when it is said procedural error, does it mean how the Board interpreted that particular section?

City Attorney Stillwell answered correct. As one of the attorneys said [and he agrees] it is questionable once this goes to a court, whether it is proper to reverse or remand something on the basis of what you assumed somebody might have thought and voted for. If you apply this rule, then every time Congress passes a law, there could be a challenge to it on the basis of some member of Congress did not understand something. He said we all could see what that would lead to very quickly.

Ms. McClain stated in the City Attorney's reading whether the ZBA can remand, yes they can and the Review Board can rehear the petition. Their decision to whether or not to remand is basically their interpretation of what they hear. This is subjective pretty much in a sense.

City Attorney Stillwell said on one hand, he guesses this could be said, but the ZBA's only authority is to remand for the Review Board to [he guesses this is what the Board can interpret how they want to] reconsider any element of the application that was affected by the error. The alleged error is that someone misunderstood the law or misunderstood the ordinance.

Ms. McClain asked if it is now back to the Review Board and they can decide whether they want to rehear the petition. This is their option?

City Attorney Stillwell stated that if the Board agreed to do this, he believes it is questionable whether that is legally appropriate, but he believes whatever happens at the Review Board or ZBA will be appealed. But, he certainly believes that the Review Board has the authority to make that motion.

Ms. McClain stated that she was concerned because the Board is constantly changing. They have people who resign, term ends, and she just believes that this will create additional problems for the Review Board. She said since this came back to the Board on remand, she believes that the Board can rehear this given that this is an entirely different board would be appropriate. Ms. McClain said she believes the Board can vote to rehear the entire case.

City Attorney Stillwell said the Board can do so, but this would be appealable too. He explained that he was not present to make the Board's decision, but present to give an opinion.

Ms. McClain said, therefore, no matter what they decide, there are attorneys on both sides and she was certain there will be a litigation, but the Review Board can decide to rehear this.

City Attorney Stillwell said one of his reasons for giving his opinion is that he does not believe it is appropriate to overturn a decision of this body or really any legislative body on the grounds that you think

some one might have thought something and voted on it. But, this is an issue to be litigated elsewhere.

Ms. McClain asked why is this coming back before the Review Board.

City Attorney Stillwell said the petition is back before the Review Board because the ZBA obviously either did not consider the issue or glossed over it. He said he does not know as he was not involved in that specific question. However, he believes it would be a bad precedent to rehear every case where somebody allegedly thought somebody else made a decision based on bad information. Therefore, his recommendation is that the Review board supplement the record and then move on. However, the decision is at the discretion of the Review Board.

Ms. McClain said if she was the attorney on the opposing side, she would have a problem with it. What if the particular Board members say that they did understand when in fact what they said at that time could be interpreted that they did not understand what was going on.

Mr. Merriman stated the Board has the right to make a motion if they want to rehear the petition. They asked City Attorney Stillwell to come and clarify and give the Board some instructions on what they need to do in order to move forward.

Ms. Deacon stated that she voted for approval of this project. She does understand the Review Board has the discretion to allow a bonus story. She felt the project was eligible for the bonus story.

Mr. Howington said he voted for approval of this project for the additional bonus story after hearing the case and what the petitioner provided. He understands the term eligible means that the petitioner may be entitled to an additional story. Mr. Howington said he believes the petitioner met the requirements for the additional story.

Ms. Fletcher said based on the standards that was before the Review Board with reference to the bonus story, she had a clear understand then and also has a clear understanding now of what she voted in favor for.

Mr. Merriman said that Ms. Tess Scheer also voted in favor of the bonus story, but she is no longer on the Review Board. He said even if Ms. Scheer voted against the petition, they would have had enough votes to pass the item.

City Attorney Stillwell asked if anyone had anything else they wanted to present for the records.

No one came forward.

[23. Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 16-006851-COA | 620 East River Street \(Hilton Hotel\) | New Construction](#)
[Part I: Height and Mass](#)

- 📎 [16-006851-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet- drawings.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet- Revised GDP.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Aerial.pdf](#)
- 📎 [New Franklin Ward Wharf Lots MAP B.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal packet- Site Circulation.pdf](#)
- 📎 [2012 COA and Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- 📎 [January 2017 Submittal.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Howington recused himself from participation in this petition.

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for 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. This review includes both Part A and Part B.

Ms. Harris explained that at the meeting held on January 18, 2017 this petition was continued with the following conditions:

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.

The petitioner has stated that the proposed design has been so modified.

2. Reduce the height of the tower element significantly or eliminate entirely.

The petitioner has stated that the proposed design has been modified to eliminate the tower element, but retains two architectural cupola features which are significantly lower in height, which will conceal mechanical equipment from view.

3. Further break down the width of the west façade.

The has stated that design has been altered to provide a variety of visual expressions that are related to the interior functions, and added pilasters to the façade to break down the visual length of this façade.

4. Revise the square windows to be vertical in character and have a 5:3 ratio.

The petitioner has stated that square windows have been eliminated and all openings are now composed of elements that meet the 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.

The design has been revised to provide a ground level story of 14' and a second story of 11', plus parapet to reduce the overall height from approximately 37' to approximately 29' and to make this consistent with the north façade."

6. Revise the 12 foot wide bay spacing.

The design has been modified to create 20' wide bays of pairs of windows between wide pilasters on the

upper stories. The lower two stories have been modified to provide spacing that is human scaled and more consistent with larger scaled historic buildings within the historic district.

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

The petitioner has stated that the proposed design has been modified.

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.

The petitioner has stated that formal decorative Art Deco elements have been eliminated in favor of arches and pilasters and cupola more in keeping with the historical context, including the historic Rourke iron works which were demolished in 1960.

9. Ensure that a minimum of 10 feet is provided along the river's edge to meet the standard. *The existing river work is approximately 16 feet wide, and will be preserved, thereby meeting the standard."*

10. Contain the mechanical and access structures within the additional story.

The stairwells will not extend above the roofline, and the mechanical equipment will be housed within the architectural (domed) features, so that no mechanical equipment will be visible above the bonus story.

11. Redesign all parapets to not exceed four feet high.

The design has been modified to reduce the parapets to four feet or less above the roof line; additionally three dimensional architectural features have been added to improve the skyline silhouette of the building.

12. Reduce all curb cuts to a maximum of 20 feet wide.

The proposed design has been so modified.

13. Where intersected by a new driveway, ensure the sidewalk shall serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

The proposed design has been so modified.

14. Provide information regarding the visibility of the roof HVAC units from Trustees' Garden.

The proposed design scale model provides this information; all mechanical equipment is proposed to be hidden from view by the proposed architectural cupola features.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends that the request for New Construction: Part I, height and Mass for an eight-story hotel building to be located on the vacant parcel at 620 East River Street be continue in order for the petitioner to consider the following:

1. Reduce the height and scale of the domes and integrate into the massing of the building, or eliminate entirely.
2. Incorporate a regular rhythm of punched openings (windows) into the bays rather than the larger expanses of storefront or curtainwall system.
3. Restudy the 12-foot wide bay spacing on the first and second floors.
4. Incorporate voids within the six and seven-foot wide spaces between the bays.
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.

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.
7. Reduce the depth of the porte-cochere significantly.
8. Substantially reduce the number of balconies, and where balconies are incorporated, eliminate the privacy dividers.
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.
10. Redesign the architectural features which appear to be parapet walls throughout the building's design.
11. Revise the sidewalk adjacent to the street to be a continuous uninterrupted pathway in materials, configuration and height.
12. Provide the location of the electric meter.
13. Incorporate a primary exterior entrance to the ballroom.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay came forward and introduced the persons accompanying him at today's meeting. He explained that Attorney Yellin and Mr. Roach were present in case questions were raised about zoning and other technical issues. Mr. Shay said he wanted to remind the Board about the earlier petition and point out to the new Board members that this project goes back almost five years. Conditions were stated by the Board which have been included in the staff report. One thing that has changed is the hotel, which was always proposed for this corridor, is from a limited service hotel to a full service hotel. This hotel will take the place that was held about the last 50 years or so by the Desoto on East Liberty Street. Because it is a full service hotel instead of a limited hotel, it provides a significant amount of additional guest services, ballrooms, three meal restaurants, retail, and bar.

Mr. Shay explained that what they previously presented to the Board actually had a building mass that came all the way out to the front. But, significantly now they want the Board to understand that they are trying to make this a much better hotel for Savannah. They are in the process of also following all the rules and standards. They have listened very carefully to the decisions that they heard from the Review Board in January, 2017. He showed the Board a graphic of the Height Map as listed on the MPC's website of what the existing conditions are and pointed out that the entitlement allows for the entire area to be three stories or 45 feet above Bay Street, which in term measures in front of City Hall. The Height Map was altered to create this entire length. There were discussions by some of the opponents that without having the two-story element on the riverfront, it was significant to point out that the City Council choice not to make this a part of the entitlement, it does not have a two-story zone map. When they heard the decision from the Review Board, they decided that they should respect that as it would be more consistent with the Part I-A master plan which was approved with conditions. This was approved with a note that they would sit back the front of this building to approximately align with the Marriott Hotel that is next door. They were asked to do this back then and if he reads the decision carefully when they were before the Board in January, 2017, they were asked to do so.

Mr. Shay pointed out to the Board what they have done. The design effort by the City is to extend the river walk across the front of the existing Marriott so that it can connect to the Savannah River landing. One of the reasons given and it is given in the staff's report today for why that setback is needed is to preserve the views of the river. He wanted to point out also that the reason the Marriott is not parallel is because the river actually bends to the north. Therefore, anywhere you stand on their property, you will always be able to see the ground level. Mr. Shay stated that he really does not understand what part of the difference between the setback that they proposed and the setback that is recommended in the staff report which is different than the decision that the Board actually made in January, which they relied on in order to do all these things. From the model, they can see that if these were two story buildings along this side following the design that there are two story portions of the front of the design that they propose today showing the outline of the Marriott. Therefore, these two are in line and there is no view of the river by the amount of the two-story extension. The other item that he wanted to present is the issue

regarding the reduction of the height of the tower. He said they followed through on that decision.

Mr. Shay said the Board informed them in January, 2017 that they wanted the width and depth of the porte cochere to be reduced. He stated that they significantly reduced the porte cochere. The staff report recommended to the Board that the balconies be reduced. He explained that the balconies are only on the side of the hotel that faces the river. This allows for view of the traffic up and down the river. The balconies will be very popular and, therefore, they want to keep a number balconies. No reference is made to the standards and no reference is made as to how they are visually incompatible. There are no large scale buildings in the area for them to be compatible with. They believe that having balconies in this area is a good idea. The Marriott next door is not a historic building, but that architect also thought balconies were a good idea because balconies are all along the facades that face the river. Mr. Shay said they wanted the Board to share their thoughts with them regarding the balconies.

Mr. Shay said the last time they presented the design, the Board deliberated a long time. They have carefully reviewed the decisions of what the Board wanted them to do. He believes that they have followed through on all the Board's decisions. They are willing to restudy the architecture detailing and try to make it in keeping with the industrial context. Mr. Shay said he was hopeful that the Board would approve the hotel today with conditions as they did the last time. He asked that they be able to move to Part II.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they believe the changes that have been made from the January 2017 submittal are an improvement to the design. However, they agree with the staff's recommendation for a continuance as they believe that there are still some significant items that still need to be restudied. They believe that the height and scale of the domes need to be reduced and/or integrated into the massing of the building or eliminate them entirely. The HSF feels strongly about increasing the setback of the eight story portion of building on the north façade. They agree with substantially reducing the number of balconies. They do not believe that a fixed storefront is an approved window type; it needs to be an operable window.

Ms. Meunier said the HSF agrees with the comment about the Part II Design Detail restudying the architectural detailing to be more in keeping with the industrial character of the historic context. She said they agree with the 12 foot wide bay spacing and the comment that was made by the petitioner, particularly on the one and two story portions of the west façade where it is utilized that the studs create a more human scale. However, on the west façade at the main entrances, there are some variations in the sizes of the bays. They ask that there be more rhythm in the bays on this façade.

Mr. Joe Saseen said he is in favor of the hotel. However, when someone wants to put a hotel on the river, the entire selling point is for the customers to be able to see the river. Mr. Saseen said he does not understand cutting on balconies facing the river. The balconies are put there for the customers to have a nice view of the river. He does not really like modern things, but he has to live with the future. The only thing he opposes is the stark whiteness of the building. This color does not belong on the waterfront.

Mr. Shay, in response to the public comments, said it is their desire to maintain one and two-story context at the riverfront, which they have presented. This is consistent with what was previously approved with conditions. He believes that there really is no place where someone could stand on the public right-of-way and not read this as the two-story base for the overall building. The zoning in this area is allowed to be three stories above Bay Street or 45 feet above Bay Street. Therefore, they will do everything they can to set this back that distance. He said they are not going to paint building stark white; in Part II is where they will get to the materiality. They want to do stone and brick on the façade. This is a little bit in contradiction to the idea of making it more industrial in character. He wants to come back to the Board and get their feelings in Part II on the two-story bays. The building will not be stark white.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

The Board discussed staff recommendations which were as follows:

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

eliminate entirely.

2. Incorporate a regular rhythm of punched openings (windows) into the bays rather than the larger expanses of storefront or curtainwall system.
3. Restudy the 12-foot wide bay spacing on the first and second floors.
4. Incorporate voids within the six and seven-foot wide spaces between the bays.
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.
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.
7. Reduce the depth of the porte-cochere significantly.
8. Substantially reduce the number of balconies, and where balconies are incorporated, eliminate the privacy dividers.
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.
10. Redesign the architectural features which appear to be parapet walls throughout the building's design.
11. Revise the sidewalk adjacent to the street to be a continuous uninterrupted pathway in materials, configuration and height.
12. Provide the location of the electric meter.
13. Incorporate a primary exterior entrance to the ballroom.

Additionally, the Board discussed the requirement to incorporate the mechanical equipment into the bonus story, as part of the requirements for the bonus story. The standard was not met in the submittal.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition for Part I: Height and Mass of a new eight story hotel at 620 East River Street at the request of the petitioner.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Dwayne Stephens

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

- ④ [16-006852-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- ④ [Submittal Packet- Revised GDP.pdf](#)
- ④ [Submittal Packet-drawings sm.pdf](#)
- ④ [Aerial.pdf](#)
- ④ [New Franklin Ward Wharf Lots MAP B.pdf](#)
- ④ [2012 COA and Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- ④ [Submittal packet- Site Circulation.pdf](#)
- ④ [January 2017 Submittal.pdf](#)
- ④ [Submittal Packet- Perspectives.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part 1, Height and Mass for a nine-story parking garage to be located on the vacant parcel at 630 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 and II reviews. This review includes both Part A and Part B.

Ms. Harris explained that this building is in the northeast corner of the Savannah Historic District. It is, roughly, triangular-shaped and has frontage along both River Street and General McIntosh Boulevard. The vehicular entrance is along River Street and there is a secondary automobile egress along General McIntosh Boulevard. The footprint of the building is 19,375 square feet.

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

1. Incorporate additional voids in the areas immediately adjacent to the central curved element, at the roofline which feature larger solids, and on the south façade of the building, eastern bay.
2. Redesign the automobile entrance and exit which features a 24-foot wide opening to either only serve as an entrance or have two smaller openings for an entrance and exit, rather than one large.
3. Eliminate the strong horizontal bands which interrupt the bays.
4. On the southwest corner of the building, eliminate the landing entrance to the retail space and inset the stairs, similar to entrances in other locations.
5. Ensure that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway.
6. Ensure the electric meter is located on a secondary or rear façade.
7. Provide the location of the HVAC units.
8. Ensure there is a 10-foot pedestrian setback along the north side of River Street.

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

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay introduced the team members accompanying him at the meeting today. He said the recommendation that they have the most difficulty with is number one which states, "incorporate additional voids in the areas immediately adjacent to the central curved element, at the roofline which feature larger solids, and on the south façade of the building, eastern bay." He explained that it is a hard façade to analyze and evaluate through drawings because it is a very articulated object. Mr. Shay stated that if the Board would look at it straight on, they would understand better why they are desirous of having a pause in the rhythm of

the openings on either side of this, which they think is the signature of architecture element for the building. He further explained that it is important for the Board to know that because of the size of the building because of the geometry of the site, it has three ramps inside. Therefore, there are three levels within every level. They studied the openings with they introduced them. Mr. Shay said for a compositional reason, they want to be able to have something here that has openings and some here that breaks the visual rhythm as it crosses the geometry that is on the façade.

Mr. Shay stated that the retail on the ground level has also two levels of parking. All has to be mechanically ventilated. They are in preliminary discussion with the restaurant and take this corner. He said they know they will need to have mechanical shafts and things that need to come up through the building. He said they would like to have a little solid space to work with. For this reason they would like for the Board to inform exactly how they are to treat this. They would to be able to go back and study this.

Mr. Shay said regarding the two small opening for the automobile entrance, they want to have the chance to study this before they make a commitment. He said regarding the strong horizontal bands which interrupt the bays, it is important to the mass and also the upper region of the façade. Up on the roof, the mechanical equipment will serve the retail space and also the fact that the lower levels have to be mechanical ventilators. They will restudy this.

Mr. Shay said they agree with staff remaining recommendations.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they believe that the changes that have been made are improvements. The HSF agrees with the staff recommendations. Ms. Meunier said, however, the HSF would like for the central curved element to be restudied as they do not believe that presently it is in keeping with the other elements of the design. She stated particularly that the parapet with the large openings directly below it seems to be the front architecture language.

Mr. Shay, in response to public comments, stated that they have been trying very hard to tie all three of these buildings together, not necessarily in language, but in their universal adherence to the idea that the bottom two stories are to be articulate. They will take the opportunity to restudy this, but they will not restudy the round element above. They feel strongly that the architecture of the center portion of the parking garage is already flush into the project.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the horizontal element, the automobile entrance and exit which features a 24-foot wide opening; the voids in the area immediately adjacent to the central curved element at the roofline; the landing entrances to the retail space and inset the stairs. They Board discussed further that additional information needs to be provided regarding the retail space, specifically the ceiling height to ensure that it is useable, active space and meets the intend of the standard to qualify for a bonus story. The Board agreed with the staff recommendations, but concerning recommendation #1, they felt that the voids in the areas immediately adjacent to the central curved element at the roofline which feature larger solids, and on the south façade of the building, eastern bay, not be a requirement, but that it be restudied.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve Part I Height and Mass with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II Design Details:

1. Restudy the voids in the areas immediately adjacent to the central curved element, at the roofline which feature larger solids, and on the south façade of the building, eastern bay.
2. Redesign the automobile entrance and exit which features a 24-foot wide opening to either only serve as an entrance or have two smaller openings for an entrance and exit, rather than one large.
3. Eliminate the strong horizontal bands which interrupt the bays.
4. On the southwest corner of the building, eliminate the landing entrance to the retail space and inset the stairs, simila to entrances in other locations.
5. Ensure that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway.
6. Ensure the electric meter is located on a secondary or rear façade.
7. Provide the location of the HVAC units.
8. Ensure there is a 10-foot pedestrian setback along the north side of River Street.
9. Restudy the curved area of the building, including the two-story element, to ensure cohesion with the overall design.
10. Provide additional information regarding the retail space, specifically the ceiling height, to ensure that it is useable, active space and meets the intent of the standard to qualify for a bonus story.

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Becky Lynch

Second: Scott Cook

Jennifer Deacon	- Nay
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[25. Petition of Greenline Architecture | 17-001561-COA | 630 West Bay Street | Hotel New Construction Part I: Height and Mass](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet- Hotel Compatibilty Write Up.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet- Drawings.pdf](#)

📎 [Aerial.pdf](#)

📎 [North Oglethorpe Ward.pdf](#)

📎 [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet- Metal mesh examples.pdf](#)

📎 [17-001561-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal packet- rendering.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Keith 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 the revised design for Part I Height and Mass of a new seven story hotel at 630 West Bay Street. The request includes a bonus floor. 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 in order for the petitioner to address the following:

1. *Revise the ground floor, east façade to incorporate additional, regular voids, more similar to the west façade.*

The condition has been met. The ground floor, east façade has been revised to incorporate regular voids.

2. *Revise the recessed metal panel ribbons in the towers to be voids instead of solids.*

The condition has not been met. The metal panel ribbons have been retained.

3. *Revise the Bay Street entrance to be more prominent through the incorporation of a canopy or other elements.*

The condition has been met. A canopy has been incorporated.

4. *Ensure that the storefront glazing extends from a sill or an 18-24 tall base of a contrasting material.*

The condition has been met. The storefront extends from a brick sill.

5. *Ensure that a stringcourse is incorporated.*

The condition has been met. A stringcourse has been incorporated.

6. *Ensure the curb cut does not exceed 20 feet in width.*

The curb cuts must comply with GDOT standards as Bay Street is a state road at this location.

7. *Revise the PTAC units to be incorporated into the window system and restudy the metal mesh vertical elements to ensure that the building meets the 100% modular masonry materials criteria for the bonus story.*

The condition has not been met. The petitioner has provided additional information to support the original design of the VTAC units.

8. *Incorporate additional roofline variation into the west facade.*

The condition has been met. The west façade has been revised to incorporate a tower at the entrance on the west façade.

9. *Ensure that the proposed green roof complies with the City of Savannah Green Roof*

Ordinance (Sec. 8-1178).

The condition will be met as the design develops.

10. *Revise the bay widths on both the east and west facades to ensure they are not less than 15 nor either greater than 20 feet in width.*

The condition has been met. The bay widths meet the standard.

Ms. Harris said that additional revisions include expanding the limestone element on the west elevation from 23 feet to approximately 29 feet; incorporating a row of windows in the same element; eliminating the aluminum curtain wall system in two areas on the west façade; and adding a row of windows to the north area of the west façade.

Ms. Harris said that the petitioner is requesting a variance from the standards.

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

1. Revise the recessed metal panel ribbons in the towers to be voids instead of solids;
2. Extend the corbelled brick cornice across the mesh and continue the brick parapet and stringcourse above the top of the seventh-floor windows to the top of the parapet;

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

Ms. Harris also reported that staff recommends approval of the 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.

Because the variance criteria have been met.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

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

Ms. Deacon asked Mr. Deering to explain further how the masonry materials requirement was met or how it was calculated for the eligibility for a bonus story.

Mr. Deering explained that there is a requirement that it be 100% modular masonry materials. They are using 34% limestone. Brick will be behind the metal mesh in the areas of the pilaster not used for VTAC units. However, there is not a requirement for how much brick is required for it to be considered 100% modular masonry. They believe that the wire mesh pilasters are a design element. If they actually took the percentage of wire mesh panels and incorporated it into the glazing, he believes the Board would have an issue with this as it being glazing rather than wire mesh.

Ms. Lynch asked the petitioner if he had any issue with the staff recommendation of carrying the corbelled brick cornice across the mesh and continue the brick parapet and stringcourse above the top of the seventh-floor windows to the top of the parapet.

Mr. Deering answered that he did not have an opposition to this recommendation.

Ms. Lynch stated that it was her understanding of reviewing this petition in April, 2017, that the metal ribbons recessed in the east side could not be voids because they are on property line.

Mr. Deering said he did want to ask for clarification on this. He showed the Board the towers that are on the site. They are on the zero lot line. They can not have any glazing here. So, they felt the solution that came up with was better in that the ribbon elements actually add interest to the towers rather than just

placing window openings that are bricked in. He guessed most recently of this type are the ones on the H & M building on Broughton Street. When you are on Jefferson and Congress Streets at look at this building, there are just false window openings. They did not want to try to create that language. Therefore, they wanted to be more selective. Mr. Deering explained that as he said during their last review, they see the tower elements as nods to the industrial nature of the river in the past with the concrete silos that were a cross the river. Also, some silos were on this side of the river.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said at the last meeting when this petition was heard they did not make any comments. Mr. Carey said this is a good project. However, he believes that the industrial nature of the proposed building will be successful if they do not tinkle with it too much. The HSF agrees with the recommendations including the requested variance.

Mr. Carey said the materials issue will be discussed more fully in Part II, but the HSF believes that the limestone should be a little more rusticated and not be flat or sheer.

Mr. Merriman invited the petitioner to respond to the public comments. Mr. Deering declined.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the metal panel ribbons in the towers being voids instead of solids. They do not believe that the metal panel will be the solution for this. They discussed the variance. Ms. Lynch stated that she came into this review believing that the project was not in compliance with the requirements for an additional story because even if it technically has masonry all over the exterior, the fact that the metal mesh is the defining feature of the design and the requirement of using 100% masonry is not like a technicality with the masonry there, but is more an exterior in expression. She does not have an issue with using the metal mesh, but has reservations about how this would be detailed because if it is transparent enough to see what is behind it, could look very choppy. But, if it is not transparent enough would deny what is surround it and what is justifying its eligibility.

Mr. Merriman stated that he believes the petitioner is meeting the requirement. He is using 100% modular masonry. This is a unique situation of the PTAC. Mr. Merriman stated that almost every petition for a hotel that this Board reviews wants a bonus story. Most of the time the ground floor use is exploited to get the bonus story. Most of the time it is not used afterward. Therefore, it is nice to see somebody using something different. You can not fake using all masonry materials.

Mr. Stephens stated that he believes with going more into the materiality aspect in Part II will allow more for reading the masonry material.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve Part I Height and Mass with the following condition to be submitted with Part II Design Details:

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;

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

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby recommend 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.

Because the variance criteria have been met.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Mic Matson

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

[26. Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 17-002110-COA | 32 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

- [☞ Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- [☞ Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Mass Model Photos.pdf](#)
- [☞ Staff Context Images.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Photos and Drawings.pdf](#)
- [☞ Ward Map.pdf](#)

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

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass 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 explained 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.

Ms. Michalak said that 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. She explained that it is not that the petitioner did not intend to meet the conditions, but it is because these are items that cannot happen until the building is demolished.

Ms. Michalak stated that 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 reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass 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 the Board with Part II, Design Details:

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 will be used in the construction of the new building.
4. Lower the first level floor-to-floor height.
5. Provide information regarding the elevator overrun's height, mass, and visibility from all public right-of-ways.
6. Further accentuate the building's subdivisions into "base, middle, and top" using material changes.
7. Ensure door frames are inset not less than 3 inches and storefront glazing is inset not less than 4 inches.
8. Revise the height of the storefront base to be between 18-24 inches.
9. Provide HVAC equipment screening details.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lynch stated that they have reviewed the staff comments. As Ms. Michalak stated, items #1-3 will be met after the completion of the demolition. Mr. Lynch said they are concerned with item #4 - Lower the first level floor-to-floor height. They have done a lot of research looking at adjacent buildings. He explained that on Congress Street a building is there with the top cornice is 6' - 6". Two other buildings are in the area. One has a cornice line about 20' and the other is in the 18' range. Therefore, they did not feel that the scale of their first floor is out of line. In order to make a mezzanine functional, a certain amount of space is needed in order to get window clearance. Mr. Lynch said they have provided 7' - 6" and 9' - 6" to the floor height. This really gives them about 8' of clearance underneath the mezzanine. He said they can look at lowering the center mass. They would like to get the entry a little more prominent from the front and side elevation. It was raised a little, but they will bring it down a little and possibly remove a couple of inches. But, overall they did not feel that it was totally out of line from the adjacent context.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that overall they feel the design

is successful. The HSF is in agreement with the staff's comments. Ms. Meunier said they share the concern about lowering the floor height on the first floor. The only additional consideration would be if there is a way to possibly make the exterior expression of the first floor appear lower without having to reduce the internal floor-to-floor heights.

Mr. Lynch, in response to public comments, said they will work towards reducing the expression. As he has stated, they are locked in by the head of the windows to make them functional for the mezzanine level. But, they will look at trying to reduce the height of the center portion.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed lowering the first level floor-to-floor height. The Board agreed with the HSF's comments regarding lowering the visual expression of the first level's floor-to-floor height. Ms. Deacon said in Part II, the Board needs to see the elevations of the building that will be visible to the adjacent buildings.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass 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 the Board with Part II, Design Details:

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. Lower the visual expression of the first level's floor-to-floor height.
5. Provide information regarding the elevator overrun's height, mass, and visibility from all public right-of-ways.
6. Further accentuate the building's subdivisions into "base, middle, and top" using material changes.
7. Ensure door frames are inset not less than 3 inches and storefront glazing is inset not less than 4 inches.
8. Revise the height of the storefront base to be between 18-24 inches.
9. Provide HVAC equipment screening details.
10. Provide additional information for the north and east elevations.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jennifer Deacon

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye

Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

[27. Petition of Ray Robertson | 17-001602-COA | 535 East Broad Street | Staff Approved - Replace Wood Sashes](#)

📎 [535 East Broad Street - photos.pdf](#)

📎 [COA - 535 East Broad Street 17-001602-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff Approved.

[28. Petition of Debra Caldwell | 17-001789-COA | 223 East Jones Street | Staff approved - Fence](#)

📎 [Photos.docx](#)

📎 [COA - 223 East Jones Street 17-001789-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff Approved.

[29. Petition of Ralph Anderson | 17-001829-COA | 3 West Jones Street \[Carriage House\] | Staff approved - Alterations](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Back of 3 West Jones Street 17-001829-COA.jpg](#)

📎 [COA - 3 West Jones Street 17-001829-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff Approved.

[30. Petition of John Ranivand | 17-001968-COA | 402 East Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 402 East Gaston Street 17-001968-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [COA - 402 East Gaston Street 17-001968-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff Approved.

[31. Petition of Simona Perry for C.A. Perry Realtor, Inc. | 17-002046-COA | 305 East Liberty Street | Staff Approved - Stucco Repair and Painting](#)

📎 [COA - 305 East Liberty Street 17-002046-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 305 East Liberty Street 17-002046-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff Approved.

[32. Petition of Ray Hoover for Tech Roof Pros | 17-002108-COA | 430 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Roof Replacement](#)

📎 [COA - 430 Habersham Street 17-002108-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 430 Habersham Street 17-002108-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff Approved.

[33. Petition of Mallory Teeple | 17-002097-COA | 13 East Perry Street | Staff Approved - Awnings](#)

📎 [COA - 13 East Perry Street 17-002097-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 13 West Perry Street 17-002097-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff Approved.

[34. Petition of Doug Bean for Doug Bean Signs, Inc. | 17-002127-COA | 217 East Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Change](#)

☞ [COA - 217 East Gaston Street 17-002127-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 217 East Gaston Street 17-002127-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff Approved.

[35. Petition of Josh W. Bull for Greenline Architecture | 17-002132-COA | 509 Tattnall Street | Staff Approved - Fence](#)

☞ [COA - 509 Tattnall Street 17-002132-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 509 Tattnall Street 17-002132-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff Approved.

[36. Petition of Paul Giguere | 17-002139-COA | 417 East Congress Street | Staff Approved - Fence](#)

☞ [417 East Congress Street - Image.pdf](#)

☞ [COA - 417 East Congress Street 17-002139-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff Approved.

[37. Petition of Alchemy Restoration | 17-002187-COA | 507 Barnard Street | Staff Approved - Color Changes](#)

☞ [COA - 507 Barnard Street 17-002187-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 507 Barnard Street 17-002187-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff Approved.

[38. Petition of Jacqueline R. Mason | 17-002292-COA | 114 East Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

☞ [COA - 114 East Gaston Street 17-002292-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 114 East Gaston Street 17-002292-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff Approved.

[39. Petition of Matthew Hallett for Ellsworth-Hallett, LLC | 17-002382-COA | 139 Lincoln Street | Staff Approved - Color Changes](#)

☞ [COA - 139 Lincoln Street 17-002382-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 139 Lincoln Street 17-002382-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff Approved.

[40. Petition of Ray Hoover for Tech Roof Residential | 17-002483-COA | 236 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

☞ [COA - 236 East Oglethorpe Avenue 17-002483-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 236 East Oglethorpe Avenue 17-002483-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff Approved.

[41. Petition of Tony Hensley for SCAD | 17-002540-COA | 310 West Boundary Street | Staff Approved - Windows](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 310 West Boundary St. 17-002540-COA.pdf](#)

[☺ COA - 310 West Boundary Street 17-002540-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff Approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

[42. Report on Work Performed Without a COA](#)

[☺ 5-10-17 HDBR Report on Work Without a COA.pdf](#)

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

[43. Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, May 18, 2017 at 3:30 p.m. in the Meyer Conference Room, MPC 110 East State Street](#)

[44. Next Pre-Meeting - Wednesday, June 14, 2017 at 12:00 p.m. in the Jerry Surrency Room, MPC, 112 East State Street](#)

[45. Next Regular Meeting - Wednesday, June 14, 2017 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 East State Street](#)

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

[46. Historic Preservation Commission Training and State Historic Preservation Conference- May 18-20, 2017 Madison, GA](#)

Ms. Harris reported that two Board members, Ms. Deacon and Ms. Fletcher and one staff member, Ms. Alyson Smith will attend the Historic Preservation Commission Training. Ms. Harris reminded the Board that the MPC will pay for their lodging, meals, and gas expense.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

[47. Adjournment](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, Mr. Merriman adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen I. Harris
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation
EIH:mem

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