



Savannah Historic District Board of Review

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
December 12, 2018 1:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

DECEMBER 12, 2018 SAVANNAH 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: Becky Lynch, Chair
 Dwayne Stephens, Vice-Chair
 Scott Cook
 Jennifer Deacon
 Kevin Dodge
 Mic Matson
 Melissa Memory
 Nan Taylor

Members Absent: David Altschiller
 Debra Caldwell
 Kellie Fletcher

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

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

Ms. Lynch called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. She 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. Petition of Charleston Sign LLC | 18-001896-COA | 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Signs](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for signs at 512 West Oglethorpe with the following condition:

- Ensure an encroachment license from the City is obtained for signs located within the public right-of-way.

Because otherwise, the signs are visually compatible and meet the sign standards.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Mic Matson

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[3. Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 18-005092-COA | 119 Bull Street and 10 West State Street | Additions and Alterations](#)

[📎 18-005092-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[📎 Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

[📎 Staff Research - Historic Photos.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for for alterations and additions to the property located at 119 Bull Street and 10 West State Street with the following condition to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

- Ensure that the windows at the 4th floor/mezzanine on the State Street building are an operable type permitted by the ordinance.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Mic Matson

Jennifer Deacon	- Abstain
Becky Lynch	- Abstain

Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[4. Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 18-006242-COA | 31 West Congress Street | Rehabilitation, Alterations](#)

- [☞ Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- [☞ Staff Photos.pdf](#)
- [☞ Historic Photos.pdf](#)
- [☞ Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations and rehabilitation of the rear elevation at 31 West Congress Street with the following conditions:

- 1.Revise the two-over-two lite pattern to either six-over-six, or one-over-one.
- 2.Provide a window specification for the dormer windows.
- 3.Provide information regarding the material of the two new window sills.
- 4.Ensure the wood windows are single glazed. The muntin shall be no wider than 7/8 inch; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails.
- 5.Ensure window sashes are inset not less than three inches from the exterior façade.
- 6.Ensure the gentlest methods are utilized while cleaning the existing sandstone lintels sills, and exterior façade.

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Mic Matson

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[5. Petition of Barnard Architects | 18-006244-COA | 35 Whitaker Street | Alterations](#)

- [☞ 18-006244-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

- [☞ Staff Research.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Drawings and Colors.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)
- [☞ Recently approved storefront for 37 Whitaker Street.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for storefront alterations for the property located at 35 Whitaker Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Mic Matson

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[6. Petition of Sottile and Sottile | 18-006306-COA | 200-500 West River Street | Light Fixture Revision](#)

- [☞ 18-006306-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- [☞ Application - 200 - 500 West River Street 18-006306-COA.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the revised light design with the following conditions because the building is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Obtain an encroachment permit, if required;
2. Ensure that no banners, signage, additional lighting, or mechanical equipment is installed on the light fixtures;
3. Obtain approval from the Historic Site and Monument Commission for the plaques.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Mic Matson

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain

Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[7. Petition of Paul Robinson | 18-006308-COA | 313-321 West River Street | Alterations](#)

[18-006308-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[Staff Research.pdf](#)

[Submittal Packet - Openings.pdf](#)

[Submittal Packet - Platform.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

Approve alterations to the property located at 313-321 West River Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1.Redesign the proposed muntin pattern and revise the proposed window frames to be metal to match the 1990 photos.
- 2.Replace the non-historic wood window in opening No.3 with a metal-frame window.
- 3.Ensure that all new doors and windows are inset not less than 3” from the facades.

Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the standard that reads: “Windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, awning, casement or Palladian” in order to allow for fixed windows within existing masonry openings No. 1 and 2 on the second floor of the facade facing River Street because the variance criteria are met.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Mic Matson

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[8. Petition of Sottile and Sottile | 18-006307-COA | 200-500 West River Street | Signage](#)

[18-006307-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[Application.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the district identification sign and three building signs as proposed because the signs are visually compatible and consistent with the Plant Riverside Sign Ordinance and Masterplan.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Mic Matson

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[9. Petition of Reardon Design, LLC | 18-006311-COA | 125 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. | Signs](#)

[Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a principal use projecting sign at 125 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard with the following conditions:

1. Submit a material sample with the proposed rust finish for review.
2. Ensure an encroachment license from the City of Savannah is obtained.

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Mic Matson

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye

Kevin Dodge

- Aye

[10. Petition of Hansen Architects | 18-006313-COA | 201 East York Street | Roof Deck](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation .pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

📎 [Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

📎 [Anson Ward.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a roof deck at 201 East York Street with the following condition:

Provide a specification for the galvanized rods.

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Mic Matson

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Becky Lynch - Abstain

Scott Cook - Aye

Dwayne Stephens - Aye

Mic Matson - Aye

Melissa Memory - Aye

Nan Taylor - Aye

Kevin Dodge - Aye

[11. Petition of Greenline Architecture | 18-006333-COA | 128-130 East Broughton Street | Rehabilitation](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

📎 [Reynolds Ward.pdf](#)

📎 [Historic Photos.pdf](#)

📎 [Historic Context- Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

📎 [128E Broughton-HDBRNarrative.pdf](#)

📎 [128-EastBroughton-PaintStucco-colors.pdf](#)

📎 [Drawings.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for rehabilitation of the primary façade at the upper levels at 128 – 130 East Broughton Street because the work is visually

compatible and meets the design standards.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Mic Matson

- Jennifer Deacon - Aye
- Becky Lynch - Abstain
- Scott Cook - Aye
- Dwayne Stephens - Aye
- Mic Matson - Aye
- Melissa Memory - Aye
- Nan Taylor - Aye
- Kevin Dodge - Aye

[12. Petition of Loan Tran | 18-006338-COA | 36 Barnard Street | Sign and Color Change](#)

[18-006338-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a principal use fascia sign, storefront color change, and awning removal for the property located at 36 Barnard Street with the following condition because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards.
-Do not penetrate the brick faces; mechanical fasteners for the sign are to be installed in the mortar joints.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Mic Matson

- Jennifer Deacon - Aye
- Becky Lynch - Abstain
- Scott Cook - Aye
- Dwayne Stephens - Aye
- Mic Matson - Aye
- Melissa Memory - Aye
- Nan Taylor - Aye
- Kevin Dodge - Aye

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

[13. Adopt the December 12, 2018 Agenda.](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby adopt December 12, 2018 Agenda

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Melissa Memory

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[14. Approve November 14, 2018 Briefing Minutes and November 14, 2018 Regular Meeting Minutes](#)

[11-14-2018 Minutes.pdf](#)

[November 14, 2018 HBR Briefing Minutes.docx](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve November 14, 2018 Briefing Minutes and November 14, 2018 Regular Meeting Minutes

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Scott Cook

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

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

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Melissa Memory

Second: Kevin Dodge

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[16. Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 16-006852-COA | 630 East River Street \(Parking Garage\) | Part II: Design Details](#)

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Kevin Dodge

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[17. 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 as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Melissa Memory

Second: Kevin Dodge

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

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

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Melissa Memory

Second: Kevin Dodge

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

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

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Melissa Memory
Second: Kevin Dodge
Jennifer Deacon - Aye
Becky Lynch - Abstain
Scott Cook - Aye
Dwayne Stephens - Aye
Mic Matson - Aye
Melissa Memory - Aye
Nan Taylor - Aye
Kevin Dodge - Aye

[20. Petition of General Services Administration | 17-006639-COA | 124 Barnard Street | New Construction Part 2: Design Details](#)

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Melissa Memory
Second: Kevin Dodge
Jennifer Deacon - Aye
Becky Lynch - Abstain
Scott Cook - Aye
Dwayne Stephens - Aye
Mic Matson - Aye
Melissa Memory - Aye
Nan Taylor - Aye
Kevin Dodge - Aye

[21. Petition of LS3P Associates Ltd. | 18-005087-COA | 110 Ann Street | New Construction Hotel: Part II, Design Details](#)

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Melissa Memory
Second: Kevin Dodge
Jennifer Deacon - Aye
Becky Lynch - Abstain
Scott Cook - Aye
Dwayne Stephens - Aye

Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[22. Petition of LS3P Associates | 18-005088-COA | 111 Ann Street | New Construction, Part II: Design Details](#)

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Melissa Memory
Second: Kevin Dodge

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[23. Petition of Savannah WOB LLC | 18-005590-COA | 112 West Broughton Street | Signs](#)

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Melissa Memory
Second: Kevin Dodge

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[24. Petition of Felder & Associates | 18-005781-COA | 323 East Broughton Street and 115 Habersham Street | Addition and New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Melissa Memory

Second: Kevin Dodge

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[25. Petition of Rani Marapally | 18-006325-COA | 225 West Broughton Street | Storefront Alteration, Color Change, Signs, Awning](#)

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Kevin Dodge

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

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

- [15-001384-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- [Previous Part I Drawings.pdf](#)
- [Previous Part II Renderings, Specifications, and Materials.pdf](#)

🔗 [Submittal Packet - Drawings, Renderings, and Photographs.pdf](#)

🔗 [Submittal Packet - Specifications and Materials.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction Part I: Height and Mass conditions of the previous approval and Part II: Design Details of a six to eight story hotel on the property located at 600 East Bay Street. The building will be located between Bay and River Streets with a monumental stair and garden area between this building and the adjacent new hotel building to the east. Any exterior lighting and signage indicated in the submittal packet are not a part of this review. The applicant stated that they are “committed to achieving a minimum of a LEED Gold certification.

Ms. Michalak stated that on August 8, 2018, the Board approved a series of amendments (with conditions) to the Part I approval; the conditions were as follows (*comments provided by the applicant are italicized below each item*):

1. Add more articulation to the full width of the end architectural bays on the east facade.

The design of the east façade has been further articulated with horizontal banding in the brick, and a color change in the end bays. The flat east elevation (which does not face a street) is deceiving because there is no place in the ROW from which it can be seen this way. We have provided perspective views that show that there is additional fenestration that faces the streets in the southeast and northeast corners.

2. Redesign the path from the stairs between the building to River Street to have a more direct route and be more open.

The design has been revised and improved in multiple ways to meet this condition.

3. Remove the parapet wall at the courtyard roof.

This change has been made and architectural thin blade sight louver screens around mechanical equipment used instead.

4. Ensure that the base under the storefront along the Bay Street façade is 18-24 inches high.

The bases indicated on our drawings are now 18”.

5. Add a string course to the parapet walls.

Parapet walls will have string courses.

6. Ensure that the sidewalk is a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the valet driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

The drawings indicate that this condition is met.

7. Provide solar PV array calculations and a green roof certification from the City Manager.

The calculations included in the package show that the 50% requirement is met.

The petitioner believes that all conditions (subject to City Manager certification) have been met. The previously proposed exterior materials (brick, metal panels, wood) have been changed to stone and brick, with more than 40% stone on street facing facades, and 100% brick or stone cladding.

Ms. Michalak stated that between the November 2017 HDBR meeting and this meeting, City Council adopted a series of changes to the Historic District ordinance at their July 5, 2018 meeting. Because this project was under review prior to the changes, the project can continue its review under the previous ordinance; however, the applicant stated in the submittal packet that “...where possible, we will try to comply with the 2018 guidelines.” Under the previous ordinance, new construction on Factors walk is exempt from commercial and large-scale development standards.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction Part I: Height and Mass (conditions of the previous approval) for a six to eight story hotel on the property located at 600 East Bay Street with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board for review with Part II, Design Details because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Receive a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals from the standard that reads: *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.*

2. Revise the storefront base to have a contrasting design or material.
3. Add a string course to all portions of the building that have a parapet wall or flat roof that reads as a parapet wall.
4. Provide a copy of the City Manager's sustainable roof certification.

Ms. Michalak additionally reported that staff recommend to continue the New Construction Part II: Design Details for a six to eight story hotel on the property located at 600 East Bay Street in order for the petitioner to consider the following:

1. Revise the smooth textures and light colors of the proposed materials, including removal of the acrylic glazing and spandrel panels, to be visually compatible with the industrial character of the area.
2. Provide a sample of the architectural concrete awning or change to be a permitted material.
3. Revise the flush steel door on the Bay Street façade to be a type and style more commonly found on a front façade.
4. Revise fixed storefront windows on the tower elements to be an operable type.
5. Provide detailed drawings of all fence types proposed including but not limited to those in the area between this building and the hotel to the east and at the valet area. Ensure that all fence standards are met.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay came for and introduced the persons attending today's meeting with him. He said regarding the staff's recommendations, they are essentially in agreement with almost all of the recommendations. However, he wanted to discuss the staff's recommendation under item #1 Part II regarding "revising the smooth textures and light colors of the proposed materials, including removal of the acrylic glazing and spandrel panels, to be visually compatible with the industrial character of the area." He pointed out that the visual compatibility factors in the ordinance says basically that the proposed buildings have to relate and be visually compatible to predominant materials, texture, and corners used on a contributing structures to which the structure is visually related. Mr. Shay showed the Board a map of the area. He pointed out several buildings in the area that their building is related to. He said that every one of the contributing historic buildings to which their site is visually related are light in color and similar in many ways to the color they are proposing for the building. Therefore, they believe they have met the standard for visual compatibility. If they do a darker color, they might have to seek a variance because it would then not be similar in color to all the buildings that it is now visually related to.

Mr. Shay showed the Board a photograph of a stonewall in the area that is immediately related to their building. He said as the Board can see, a variety of stone colors are here. He explained that the reason for choosing the smooth texture is that the west façade of their building will actually be very close to the existing retaining wall, it will be setback a little, but they want to protect the structural integrity; they want to ensure that it is easily discernible. They want there to be a clearly distinction between what is the historic stone and what is not. Mr. Shay stated that regarding the glazing, from the definition and the ordinance, glazing is a clear translucent material to which light passes into a building. Most often it is glass; but it does not say that acrylic is to be excluded. The structural nature of what they are proposing is going to have to be thick if it is the Board's opinion that the acrylic material is going to be 60 feet above the ground and would look bad if it is scratched. Then, they can do an exploration on any kind of special coding that would be more resistance, but they believe the acrylic is a compatible material; it is clear.

Mr. Shay said regarding the spandrel, they intend for this to be 100% opaque. They are willing to study using a lighter tint, but they want to differentiate between the two because there are some areas on the buildings that will be looking into another space. Therefore, they want to ensure that they are not looking into attics and crawl spaces. The standards say that they are allowed to have clear or translucent material. As he has said, they believe they have met this part of the standard. But this is within the Board's regard of compatibility.

Mr. Shay said that during the break, they discussed with staff the idea of groupings the windows. They now understand that it is not that every single opening or every single glaze opening has to have an operable sash, but that there be enough sashes so that they meet the standard because there are

combinations of fixed and operable windows that are frequently occurring throughout contributing buildings within the Historic District.

Mr. Shay summarized that they do not have any problems with staff's recommendations with Part I. They do not have any problems with staff's recommendations 2 -5 for Part II. But they are desirous of the color scheme they have presented and believe that it is not only compatible, but that it is very similar to all of the buildings to which it is visually related. He entertained questions from the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the materials. The Board was in agreement with the staff's recommendations for Part I and with the staff recommendations for Part II - #2 - #5. It was the consensus that the spandrel panels be revised to a visually compatible material.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

Approve New Construction Part I: Height and Mass (conditions of the previous approval) for a six to eight story hotel on the property located at 600 East Bay Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Receive a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals from the standard that reads: 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.
2. Revise the storefront base to have a contrasting design or material.
3. Add a string course to all portions of the building that have a parapet wall or flat roof that reads as a parapet wall.
4. Provide a copy of the City Manager's sustainable roof certification.

Approve New Construction Part II: Design Details for a six to eight story hotel on the property located at 600 East Bay Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the spandrel panels to a visually compatible material.
2. Provide a sample of the architectural concrete awning or change to be a permitted material.
3. Revise the flush steel door on the Bay Street façade to be a type and style more commonly found on a front façade.
4. Revise fixed storefront windows on the tower elements to be an operable type.
5. Provide detailed drawings of all fence types proposed including but not limited to those in the area between this building and the hotel to the east and at the valet area. Ensure that all fence standards are met.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Mic Matson

Second: Jennifer Deacon

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[27. Petition of Edward A. Pyrch | 18-006310-COA | 523 East Perry Street | Addition and Carriage House New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

- 🔗 [18-006310-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Materials.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Specs, Photos, Model.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Dodge recused himself from participation in this petition. He is the property owner.

Mr. Edward A. Pyrch was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for an addition and alterations to the main building and for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a one-story garage at the rear of the property located at 523 East Perry Street; a brick fence/wall will be reviewed with the addition and alterations. The majority of the one-story porch addition will not be visible as it will be screened by the new brick fence/wall and garage; it will be 8 feet deep and the full width of the rear of the building. The applicant is also requesting a variance from the maximum permitted lot coverage of 75% to allow the proposed lot coverage of 80%.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends to continue the request for an addition to the main building located at 523 East Perry Street in order for the petitioner to address the following:

1. Reduce the depth of the rear porch addition in order to reduce or eliminate the requested lot coverage variance.
2. With regard to materials:
 - Revise the proposed roof to be standing seam metal with a 1" seam height.
 - Revise the columns to be a wood or wood composite product.
 - Ensure that the new door is wood or wood clad.

Ms. Michalak additionally reported that staff recommends approve the request for alterations to the main building, the brick wall, and New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a one-story garage at the rear of the property located at 523 East Perry Street with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board for review with Part II: Design Details because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that the windows are the Sierra Pacific "Premium" or "Monument" Series; the H3 2.0 series is not permitted.
2. Ensure that the wood human gate proposed within the brick wall is painted or stained.
3. Ensure that the garage window is inset not less than 3".
4. Add a string course to the garage parapet wall.

Ms. Michalak reported further that staff recommends denial to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a lot coverage variance to permit 80% because the variance criteria are not met.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Pyrch stated that 4 feet would be needed to meet the 75% lot coverage. He explained that a 6 foot porch would be 78%; a 7 foot porch would be 79%. They are at 80% and believe that anything less than 8 feet would not be totally usable and anything less than this would be a stoop. Essentially, they agree with the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Pyrch said they would be happy to continue their petition to the next meeting. They will make all the changes in their Part II Designs Details. They looked at the Sanborn maps. They are hopeful of submitting their application to the Zoning Board of Appeals [ZBA] in time to be on the January 23, 2019 agenda. He entertained questions from the Board.

Ms. Deacon asked Mr. Pyrch if they would be seeking a recommendation from ZBA without the approval recommendation from the Historic District Board of Review.

Mr. Pyrch answered yes.

Ms. Michalak explained that the petitioner intends to seek a variance from the ZBA with or without an approval recommendation from the Historic Board of Review.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] asked that the rear elevation of the carriage house be shown again on the monitor. He said it appears to be a little atypical than what is seen in most carriage houses. The proportions seems a little different. The doors appear to be taller. Mr. Carey stated that their Architecture Review Committee wanted to know if the design is trying to be what they typically see or what they traditionally see without trying to make it something that it is not.

Mr. Pyrch, in response to the public comments, stated that the width of the lot is 15'. Therefore, they believe that putting in an 8' or 9' door would be too small. If they had a 10' wide door that was only 7' high, it would really look odd. It would be too squat. But, they believe that a 10' door x 10' would fit the facade nicely. Mr. Pyrch explained the reason for the height and the 16' floor is that it wants to become a two-car garage vertically on the inside. Therefore, they are looking a 11' - 6" minimum ceiling. The parapet wall adds a little height to cover the HVAC for the main house. He explained further that in proportionally, the main house also has a very high parapet wall that is in scale with this and the warehouse behind. The two and one-half story garage directly to the east and the two story carriage house on the new construction directly across the street are both 80%. He added that one is about 80% and the other is about 82% because the lot sets back to a 23' lot. This is the reason for the height. The brick on this is matching exactly the existing recent two years ago approved fence, brick wall, between 521 and 523. The two other units have the same match. He believes that they can add another string course to give it some scale.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board was in agreement with the staff recommendations. They believe that a string course on top of the carriage house would help the header. Another opening in the garage might be helpful along Houston Street. A single opening in this span would seem off. Two openings might give it more balance.

They discussed the variance request. The porch could be reduced.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

Continue the request for an addition to the main building located at 523 East Perry Street in order for the petitioner to address the following:

- 1.Reduce the depth of the rear porch addition in order to reduce or eliminate the requested lot coverage variance.
- 2.With regard to materials:
 - Revise the proposed roof to be standing seam metal with a 1” seam height.
 - Revise the columns to be a wood or wood composite product.
 - Ensure that the new door is wood or wood clad.

Approve the request for alterations to the main building, the brick wall, and New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a one-story garage at the rear of the property located at 523 East Perry Street with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board for review with Part II: Design Details because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1.Ensure that the windows are the Sierra Pacific “Premium” or “Monument” Series; the H3 2.0 series is not permitted.
- 2.Ensure that the wood human gate proposed within the brick wall is painted or stained.
- 3.Ensure that the garage window is inset not less than 3”.
- 4.Add a string course to the garage parapet wall.

Recommend denial to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a lot coverage variance to permit 80% because the variance criteria are not met.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Mic Matson

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Abstain

[28. Petition of LS3P | 18-006314-COA | 2 Whitaker Street | Demolition and New Construction Part I: Height and Mass](#)

- 📎 [18-006314-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Aerial.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Model photographs.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet Revised sm.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Application - 2 Whitaker Street 18-006314-COA.pdf](#)

☉ [Staff photo Case 4, Box 1 - Image 1500.pdf](#)

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

Mr. Michael Garcia was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to demolish an existing non-contributing building and Part I: Height and Mass of a new seven story tall apartment building at 2 Whitaker Street. Retail and commercial will be located on the ground floor and the building will feature a full basement. The building is designed to front Whitaker Street, though Bay Street is addressed. The petitioner is seeking to earn a bonus story.

The petitioner is also requesting a recommendation for variances from the following standards:

- The exterior expression of the height of the second story shall be not less than 12 feet*
- Recess Standard. Incorporate recesses within the wall plane. Building frontage shall be limited to 30 feet with recesses of at least 12 feet in width and four feet (4') in depth (Figure 8). Recesses shall extend to the ground or begin immediately above the ground floor.*

Ms. Harris stated that the rehabilitation of the adjacent building, 21 West Bay Street, is part of the same project but is not under review at this time. The petitioner intends to submit for the rehabilitation with the Part II: Design Details of 2 Whitaker Street.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends to approve the demolition of the non-contributing building and Part I: Height and Mass for a new seven story building at 2 Whitaker Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II: Design Details because the building is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. A demolition permit not be issued until a COA for the new construction is approved.
2. Provide additional accentuation/prominence to the Bay Street entrance.
3. Ensure that a sill is incorporated into the storefront where a base is not utilized.
4. Revise the bay spacing to meet the 15-20 standard.

Ms. Harris additionally reported that staff recommends approve the request for a variance from the Recess Standard because the variance criteria have been met.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Garcia thanked the staff for having multiple meetings with them. He said they are in agreement with staff recommendations #1 - A demolition permit not be issued until a COA for the new construction is approved; #2 - Provide additional accentuation/prominence to the Bay Street entrance; and #3 - Ensure that a sill is incorporated into the storefront where a base is not utilized. Mr. Garcia said they wanted to discuss #4 - Revise the bay spacing to meet the 15-20 standard.

Mr. Garcia explained that the exhibit shows that they meet the 15-20 base station standard minus one bay along Bay Street. When they get to Whitaker Street and do the center pilaster, they also meet the 15-20 standard along this end. Additionally, there is historic precedent within the vicinity which is commonly called the Savannah News building. Presently, in this building, there are six bays; each bay is approximately 12 to 13 feet in length. Given this precedent, along with their ability to meet most of the bay spacing with the exception of this one along with meeting the standard, they would like for staff and the Board to consider waving the strict compliance of the bay spacing standard. He entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Dodge asked Mr. Garcia to clarify why the bay spacing standard is not met.

Mr. Garcia explained that it would be a mixture of not only a text but also adhering to the foot recess standard, although they wanted to keep all of the standards along Bay and Whitaker Streets consistent with each other in terms of size. Both recesses are 16'-6". Mr. Garcia stated that reducing the recess to anything else would cause the bay spacing not to meet the standards. Because of the general size of the 60" x 90' lot, when they try to comply with the recess standards along the bay spacing there is a little bit of

mathematical competition here. They will be happy to work this out with staff.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said they agree with the staff's recommendations. He said he heard the petitioner address the Bay Street entrance. The primary entrance needs to be maintained as much as possible. Mr. Carey the HSF is not satisfied with the top story. They believe the top story dies as it is trying to be hidden. They believe the base, middle, and top argument is very valid, but they do not believe that the top is there as it appears to be weak. Mr. Carey said the HSF believes the top needs some weight. This is a prominent corner. It relates well to the building across Whitaker Street. They believe this would be an improvement to enhance what is good so that it becomes even better if it is made heavier.

Mr. Garcia, in response to the public comments, stated that one reason they were looking to having the variance for the continuous parapet around them following the recess standard as there is a historic precedent for that within downtown Savannah. He said one example is the Derenne Building on the corner of Liberty and Drayton Streets. The continued parapet similar to this condition, which they all know that the Derenne Building is also on a corner and is a featured building as well. Therefore, they thought doing something like this would not diminish the top of base, but would add a little more continuous appeal to it. The recesses on a 60' x 90' lot is not something that is conventional seen with these types of lots. So, they are trying to keep as much continuous plane effect along Whitaker and Bay Streets as well.

Mr. Dodge asked Mr. Carey what he meant by saying the building needs some weight on the top floor. Should it be higher?

Mr. Carey answered no. The main block of the building without any real differentiation other than the finished material, the example given by the petition is excellent when he talks about the Derenne Building. But this does not look like the top of the Derenne Building. A line is shown here and there is one more story similar to this, but it is too light.

Ms. Lynch asked Mr. Carey if he was talking only about the cornice detail in proportion or to the entire story.

Mr. Carey answered that his reaction is in accordance with their Architecture Review Committee who believes that the top is lacking weight. They leave the designing to the designers, but they believe that an opportunity is here to look at the base, middle, and top requirement. This needs to be a true element.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board agreed with staff recommendations. They believed that this is a successful application for the new standards for getting the bonus story. The petitioner has shown that they meet the bonus story requirements. They were in agreement with the HSF that the building needs more visual weight and the entire band across the top of the building when you look at it on the Derenne Building it looks like it is the cornice for the entire building, but here it looks like the only cornice the petitioner is showing is for the actual parapet edge. They believe that within the Part II - Design Details, there could be some level of articulation at the top that would give more character and more weight. The Board sympathized with the petitioner in trying to meet the 15-20 foot bay spacing, but they believe that this is something that all petitioners who want to develop under the large scale development will have to deal with this. They encouraged the petitioner to try to meet this requirement between now and their Part II - Design Details submission. One Board member was flexible with the bay spacing; he believed that the petitioner made a good case for having it as submitted.

Ms. Lynch stated this building is next door to a number of contributing buildings. Even though, it is on the site of a building that was demolished, she does not believe that this would be setting a precedent for every building on this block being seven stories tall. There are many historic buildings, especially on Broughton Street that tower above the existing buildings. Some beautiful buildings have been torn down. The Derenne Building is a good example for a very handsome historic building that does not match the buildings adjacent to it. Ms. Lynch believes that there are many precedents for a variance and skylines in

this part of the Historic District. She supports the height of the building, even though it is much taller than the surrounding buildings.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the demolition of the non-contributing building and Part I: Height and Mass for a new seven story building at 2 Whitaker Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II: Design Details because the building is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1.A demolition permit not be issued until a COA for the new construction is approved.
- 2.Provide additional accentuation/prominence to the Bay Street entrance.
- 3.Ensure that a sill is incorporated into the storefront where a base is not utilized.

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the Recess Standard because the variance criteria have been met.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Kevin Dodge

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[29. Petition of LS3P Associates Ltd. | 18-006315-COA | 114 West Bay Street | Rooftop Addition and Alterations](#)

[📎 18-006315-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[📎 Later Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Elizabeth Schminke was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for the rehabilitation of the property located at 114 West Bay Street. The Cotton Sail Hotel within the adjacent building at 126 West Bay Street intends to expand into this building. Also, the platform over Factors Walk in front of this building is proposed to be reconstructed; this property belongs to the City of Savannah. The rehabilitation consists of removal of all stucco from the building's façade; the brick façade and headers will be repaired and repointed as required as can be seen in the historic photograph from 1949. The brick will be painted also in keeping with the 1949 photograph. A new metal cornice will be installed to match the adjacent one recently installed on the Cotton Sail Hotel; however, the existing brick dentils will remain exposed. The existing storefront will be repaired and repainted to match the Cotton Sail and new wood storefront will be installed to replace non-historic alterations. New awnings to match Cotton Sail will be installed.

Ms. Michalak explained that the concrete parking lot currently covering Factors Walk will be demolished; the existing steel support structure will be repaired, and a wood pedestrian plaza will be constructed. Until the middle of the last century, this area was completely covered with a wood deck; the concrete platform first appeared on the 1954 Sanborn Map. The applicant notified staff before the meeting that they intend to withdraw the request for the rooftop addition.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approve the rehabilitation and Factors Walk reconstruction for the property located at 114 West Bay Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Provide a paint color selection for the brick facades of the historic building.
2. Ensure that all new doors and windows are inset not less than 3 inches from the façade.
3. Ensure that the new storefront is inset not less than 4 inches from the façade.

Ms. Taylor questioned if any guidelines or recommendations have been given regarding paint colors.

Ms. Michalak answered that staff has talked with the petitioner about the paint colors. At one point, they discussed a white color.

Ms. Taylor said she was wondering if the petitioner is trying to tie-in this building with the rest of the building. So, if it is a white color, it would be different from what is already there.

Ms. Michalak said the building is not tied-in with what is there. These are actually two buildings. A firewall is on the inside of the building. They believe the building were built at the same time, but they are actually not one building. The only good photo they have is from 1949.

Ms. Memory asked if the petitioner was proposing access through the firewall.

Ms. Michalak answered not that she was aware.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Schminke thanked Ms. Michalak for meeting with them multiple times. They are in agreement with all of the staff recommendations. They will coordinate with staff to ensure that all the recommendations are incorporated in their new design. She said as reported, they want to continue the rooftop addition. Ms. Schminke entertained questions from the petitioner.

Ms. Lynch asked the petitioner if their decision to paint the building when they remove the stucco off because of the historic photos or was it the massing of the bricks after the stucco was removed.

Ms. Schminke explained that some of this is under view as stucco is here. They plan to do some careful demolition to find out what is here. The photos show that there is evidence of paint. But, as she has said, they will not know what is here until they do some exploration demolition. Their intention is to work with staff to find out what is best for this building. They do not have an issue in differentiating it; it appears to be two different buildings. But, they will treat the building with the gentlest means.

Ms. Memory asked that going through the firewall, what would it look like in three dimensional space?

Ms. Schminke answered that there are somethings that they have not worked out. The owner's intention is to have this as an extension of the existing hotel. However, a lot of things will be worked out once they get inside and see what the conditions are.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] stated that they hold an easement on this building. They have a legal interest in this building. The HSF has not received an alteration request for this property. They will need to get the alteration request first. These are usually worked these simultaneously with MPC. They are not trying to create a back and forth step. This is really a reminder and an invitation for the petitioner to meet with the HSF regarding the administration of the easement. These things might include paint color and how the openings will be treated on both sides of buildings at Bay and River Streets.

Mr. Carey said regarding puncturing the firewall, this might be a historic tax credit project. Therefore, the question of going through the firewall would be a factor in the tax credit project. Also, this might guide some direction of how to treat this building.

Ms. Schminke, in an answer to the public comments, said she will call the HSF tomorrow. She said they are fully aware of the tax credit elements and are presently discussing this with the owner.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Memory asked Mr. Carey if any of these things would change significantly enough so that the entire project should be continued. Mr. Carey answered that he would hate for a party to get in front of another party. He explained that the

truth is the HSF has legal rights of control over the exterior of the property by virtue of the easement. Since they have not seen anything in a formalized location, might be premature for them to say it is okay, go ahead. The HSF does not have any absolute prohibitions and in the past they have been a little reluctant to approve rooftop additions. It might be awkward if the Review Board said "yes" and the HSF said "no."

Mr. Dodge stated that according to the petitioner, the owner cannot do anything to the building until some demolition work is done. The HSF could not make a proposal until the work is done. Is this correct?

Mr. Carey said the work is exploratory and he believes this makes good sense. But, the HSF certainly could not make a determination before they get an application.

The Board discussed the rehabilitation and Factors Walk reconstruction for the property. They were in agreement with the staff's three conditional recommendations to be submitted to staff for final review and approval : 1. Provide a paint color selection for the brick facades of the historic building.; 2. Ensure that all new doors and windows are inset not less than 3 inches from the façade; and 3. Ensure that the new storefront is inset not less than 4 inches from the façade. The Board continued the rooftop addition as requested by the petitioner.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

Approve rehabilitation and Factors Walk reconstruction for the property located at 114 West Bay Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Provide a paint color selection for the brick facades of the historic building.
2. Ensure that all new doors and windows are inset not less than 3 inches from the façade.
3. Ensure that the new storefront is inset not less than 4 inches from the façade.

Continue the request for a rooftop addition for the property located at 114 West Bay Street at the applicant's request.

Continue the request for a variance from the standard that reads: "Additions to roofs shall not be visible from the front elevation" at the applicant's request.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Nan Taylor

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[30. Petition of SHEDDarchitecture | 18-006336-COA | 514-524 East Liberty Street | Demolition and New Construction Part I Height and Mass](#)

[18-006336-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[aerial.pdf](#)

☞ [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

☞ [Application - 514, 516, 518, 520, 522 and 524 East Liberty Street 18-006336-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

☞ [Crawford Ward.pdf](#)

☞ [Revised Submittal Packet to include east and west elevations.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Matson left the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Mr. Shedrick Coleman was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to demolish an existing non-contributing building on the site and New Construction Part I: Height and Mass for six three-story townhomes/carriage houses along Liberty Lane. Per the applicant's project description, the buildings face the interior courtyard, accessed from a gate on Liberty Street. This project is part of a larger project on the site, but because multiple buildings are involved, they will be reviewed individually. The additional building, located along at the street, will be reviewed under file 18-006335-COA. Standards which apply to the entire project, such as lot coverage, will be addressed under both petitions.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the demolition of the non-contributing building with the condition that the building is documented per the MPC's Document Policy prior to the issuance of a demolition permit.

Ms. Harris additionally reported that staff recommends denial of the request New Construction- Part I: Height and Mass for six, three-story buildings at the lane because the following visual compatibility and design standards have not been met:

Visual Compatibility factors:

- **Height.** *New construction shall be permitted to build to the number of stories as shown on the Historic District Height Map [see Height (n)(2)] and the Height of a building and the height of individual components of a building shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which it is Visually Related.*
- **Proportion of structure's front facade.** *The relationship of the width of a structure to the height of its front facade shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which it is Visually Related.*
- **Rhythm of solids to voids in front facades.** *The relationship of solids to voids in the facades visible from the public right-of-way of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is Visually Related.*
- **Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection.** *The relationship of entrances, porch projections, and walkways to structures shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which they are Visually Related.*
- **Roof shapes.** *The roof shape of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which it is Visually Related.*
- **Scale of a building.** *The mass of a structure and size of windows, door openings, porches column spacing, stairs, balconies and additions shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is Visually Related.*
- **Directional expression of front elevation.** *A structure shall be visually compatible with the structures to which it is visually related in its directional character, whether this be vertical character, horizontal character, or nondirectional character.*

Design Standards:

- *Accessory buildings which front a lane shall be no taller than two stories.*
- *Non-habitable rooftop structures such as church spires; cupolas; chimneys; tanks and supports; parapet walls not over 4 feet high; and Mechanical or Access Structures [see Definitions (a)] shall not be*

considered a story.

- *The exterior expression of the height of the first story, or the second story in the case of a raised basement shall be not less than 11 feet.*
- *A proposed building located on an east-west through street shall utilize an historic building form fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward.*
- *A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street.*
- *Bay windows shall extend to the ground unless they are oriel, beveled or are supported by brackets.*

Ms. Harris stated that additionally, this project will have to comply with the Section 8-3056 Group Development Standards of the Zoning Ordinance. While not typically under the purview of the Historic Review Board, a particular provision will have a major impact on the design and is not currently being met. Specifically, the standard which states, "*Location. No dwelling structure established as part of a residential group development shall be situated on a lot so as to face the rear of another dwelling structure within the development or an adjoining property*" has not been met. This issue should be addressed prior to any design-related approval.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Coleman stated that at the end of this discussion, he will ask for a continuance. He explained that everything he will talk about will be in reference to the carriage house to possibly get it resolved prior to moving forward. Based on the staff's report, they want to define that the cottages and the carriage houses were considered accessory buildings. From this standpoint, the accessory buildings are required to be two story maximum. An accessory building can not have separate electric meters. It has to be tied to a primary structure. Therefore, they never designed the project other than townhouses that have parking underneath which has to be accessed off of the lane. Therefore, its form is driven by the rules of the ordinance. The buildings can be on the lane. There is nothing prohibiting putting a townhouse to the lane side. It is all about height and mass which is what he will agree with from that standpoint. But, to say that their building is a carriage house simply because of its location is not supported by what the ordinance says. Mr. Coleman, elaborating on the group development criteria that was noted in the write-up, the issue of being able to enter and not face the rear existing residential development does not apply if you are saying that these are carriage houses. The group development standards specifically says that "a group development consists of two or more principle buildings." Mr. Coleman said their buildings would be considered principle buildings. The issue regarding looking at the back would be an issue, but it can not be a carriage house and a principle building at the same time. They need to resolve the issue on what the Board is going to consider this as. Is it a principle? Then, they will address the height and everything else relative to that part of the carriage house. Then, they will have to look at what building it is connected to. From this standpoint, it really should not even be a separate project as it has to be tied to a building which would necessitate really becoming a part of 504 East Liberty Street because they would have to put all of the electrical work into the building.

Mr. Coleman said, therefore, what is this an auxiliary building to. This really is where they are present that this is not an accessory building from that standpoint. So, they would like to get some information on the carriage house versus the principle building issue and then they will resubmit their project relative to that direction to get some clarification. Consequently, they do not feel it is prudent to discuss the issues now being raised because the criteria listed here are going to jump back and forth as far as one side saying one thing and the other side saying another. This is not consistent in the staff report.

Mr. Dodge said this is a little confusing. Based on what he understood, what Mr. Coleman said differs from what Ms. Harris said. What he understood is it does not matter as long as height is considered whether it is a primary building or a carriage house in that both can not be any higher than two stories. Is this correct?

Mr. Coleman, in an answer to Mr. Dodge's question, said that is not correct. The limitation on two stories is specifically for auxiliary buildings which are carriage houses or garages such as these things for people. He said there is a distinct difference.

Mr. Dodge said one of the Board members asked Ms. Harris what is the height requirement for a cottage on the lane and Ms. Harris stated that it was two stories also.

Mr. Coleman replied that he has not found anything in the ordinance that pulls the cottage out as a typology that says it is a primary structure that is limited to two stories. The ordinance does say that an auxiliary building is two stories and he raises no argument here. He said also on the issue of the lane with buildings behind them are cottages, the structures that fronts the lane behind their project are actually exact townhouse units like the ones that faces Perry Street.

Basically, they built townhouses facing Perry Street and the exact same townhouses face the lane. Therefore, they are not cottages, but townhouses that face the lane. He said he had pictures with him that would show that this is the case. Mr. Coleman pointed to an area and said this is Perry Street and behind this is the lane structures. They are the exact same buildings. They are not cottages, but are townhouses development facing the lane. This is basically what they are trying to do. In fact, the buildings are two stories, but there is no limitation there. They are clearly trying to do something that is compatible. Their first attempt also is stepping back the building as the lane to try address that. Now, whether it is step back enough, may be not; but the porch, the deck, was not the driving factor of the step back. The step back was acknowledging the fact that they are on the lane. They understood that this was an issue.

Mr. Dodge said it appears a point of contention is whether a two or three story structure is allowed there.

Mr. Coleman explained that the point of contention is a carriage house because this where it becomes an auxiliary building.

Ms. Lynch asked Mr. Coleman what type of buildings does he see the project as.

Mr. Coleman said he sees the project as townhouses. They were trying to see what came out of this, but in their continuance, they will address this moving forward. But, they can not address it if they are still being told that they have a two story limitation and it is a carriage house. This is why they are seeking some clarification on this point and asking for a continuance to deal with the design issues raised by staff.

Ms. Lynch asked Mr. Coleman if the project was designed as group development.

Mr. Coleman replied, "yes," group development.

Mr. Cook asked if the Zoning Administrator has made a determination on this parcel concerning what the buildings would be classified as.

Mr. Coleman answered that there really has not been any need to do so. Since they are going through the site development approval now, the main point will be the entry to the building. They can do the group development if the site parcel works out within the 75% coverage. The issue of the entry facing the rear would be something that they would have to address; and this is something that they have addressed. Moving forward they will submit this after this meeting.

Mr. Cook asked Mr. Coleman, therefore; you have submitted this to SPR?

Mr. Coleman answered "yes" we have. He said they are going through this process now. He asked for a continuance.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said it can be argued that anything on the lane can be an accessory. He said he listened carefully to what the petitioner said, but he is not convinced solely on his arguments. Therefore, he is glad that the petition is asking for a continuance. Mr. Carey said the HSF agrees with the staff's recommendations. They believe the staff has done a thorough report, outlining other options. However, he believes this boils down to compatibility. He does not believe that the accessory structures as proposed nor how they are defined in terms of use are visually compatible. This is a lane building. By definition, it is a secondary part of that block. Therefore, to put primary type structures greater than two stories, they do not have precedent for that. Mr. Carey he does not believe that the argument will fly for more than two stories on the lane.

Mr. Coleman, in response to public comments, said he appreciates Mr. Carey's comments, but his statements were not arbitrary. They are based on specific code language. Because an accessory building is clearly defined, it is not up for discussion as to whether which version is correct. Mr. Coleman said he is trying to take the information that is presented in the code and apply it as a design fashion to his project. It has nothing to do with entries, but has a lot to do with the defining characteristics that are noted within the ordinance. This does relate to what the building contains. How does it relate to a primary building and the fact that you can not have separate electric meters is a major deterrent to what an accessory building isn't. It makes sense that if you have an accessory building, it is connected to another building and it is not a stand-alone building of its own; inclusively are those townhouses that are behind his project are separately metered. Therefore, from this standpoint, they are consistent with the idea that they are not carriage houses, they are not accessory buildings; but they are primary structures as well. He does not believe they have to debate accessory buildings verses primary buildings, as a typology they are already defined in the ordinance.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

The Board discussed staff's recommendation for denial, based on the project not meeting the following visual compatibility and design standards have not been met:

Visual Compatibility factors:

- Height. New construction shall be permitted to build to the number of stories as shown on the Historic District Height Map [see Height (n)(2)] and the Height of a building and the height of individual components of a building shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which it is Visually Related.*
- Proportion of structure's front facade. The relationship of the width of a structure to the height of its front facade shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which it is Visually Related.*
- Rhythm of solids to voids in front facades. The relationship of solids to voids in the facades visible from the public right-of-way of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is Visually Related.*
- Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection. The relationship of entrances, porch projections, and walkways to structures shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which they are Visually Related.*
- Roof shapes. The roof shape of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which it is Visually Related.*
- Scale of a building. The mass of a structure and size of windows, door openings, porches column spacing, stairs, balconies and additions shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is Visually Related.*
- Directional expression of front elevation. A structure shall be visually compatible with the structures to which it is visually related in its directional character, whether this be vertical character, horizontal character, or nondirectional character.*

Design Standards:

- Accessory buildings which front a lane shall be no taller than two stories.*
- Non-habitable rooftop structures such as church spires; cupolas; chimneys; tanks and supports; parapet walls not over 4 feet high; and Mechanical or Access Structures [see Definitions (a)] shall not be considered a story.*
- The exterior expression of the height of the first story, or the second story in the case of a raised basement shall be not less than 11 feet.*
- A proposed building located on an east-west through street shall utilize an historic building form fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward.*
- A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street.*
- Bay windows shall extend to the ground unless they are oriel, beveled or are supported by brackets.*

The Board discussion focused primarily on the three-story height of the buildings at the lane. The general consensus of the Board was that three stories is not visually compatible and does not fit the historic development pattern of the district, regardless of whether the buildings are considered carriage houses or townhouses.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the demolition of the non-contributing building with the condition that the building is documented per the MPC's Documentation Policy prior to the issuance of a demolition permit.

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition for New Construction Part I: Height and Mass at 504 East Liberty Street at the petitioner's request.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Nan Taylor

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[31. Petition of SHEDDarchitecture | 18-006335-COA | 504 East Liberty Street | New Construction Part I: Height and Mass](#)

- [☞ aerial.pdf](#)
- [☞ Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- [☞ Application - 504 East Liberty Street 18-006335-COA.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- [☞ Crawford Ward.pdf](#)
- [☞ 18-006335-COA Staff Recommendation...pdf](#)
- [☞ Revised Submittal Packet to include east and west elevations.pdf](#)

Mr. Shedrick Coleman was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of new construction Part I: Height and Mass of a new three-story building at 504 East Liberty Street. This project is part of a larger project on the site, but because multiple buildings are involved, they will be reviewed individually. The additional building, located along the lane, will be reviewed under file 18-006336-COA. Standards which apply to the entire project, such as lot coverage, will be addressed under both petitions.

The proposed building will be located on a vacant portion of a lot, adjacent to an existing non-contributing building. The adjacent building, known at 506-512 East Liberty Street, was approved earlier this year for

alterations to the entrances and stoops (18-000285-COA).

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends a continuance for New Construction Part I: Height and Mass at 504 East Liberty Street for the petitioner to consider the following:

1. Revise the unusually tall and narrow window configuration on the front façade.
2. Provide elevations for the east and west facades.
3. Provide additional articulation on the west façade and add fenestration to the east façade.
4. Revise the uncovered stoop to a covered stoop with greater height from the ground.
5. Eliminate or substantially redesign the very deep cornice, three feet, two inches, on the south, east and north façades; ensure that a string course is incorporated.
6. Locate the refuse storage area.
7. While materials are not part of Part I: Height and Mass review, staff provides the following recommendations so that they may be incorporated in Part II: Design Details. Staff recommends that changes in material occur in correspondence in changes to architectural features (such as bay windows or cornices) rather than on flat, vertical planes. Staff recommends eliminating the stucco trim on the sides of the windows and doors as this is not typical on contributing masonry buildings. Staff further recommends that the Board allow the petitioner to present both Parts I and II together.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Coleman said they really do not have any major issues with what staff has presented as far as a continuance and some of the items that have been raised, However, he wanted to add clarification on the reasons why some of the designs took the direction and they will possibly restudy revising the design as well He said regarding the tall windows - this use was about looking at a tripod. In dealing with special area sometimes on historic buildings you will see a special window and the main door that reflects a special staircase they had which bridges those to stories. They really wanted to reflect that something special was there. However, as the Board can see the windows that are in-between fits the floor thickness. Therefore, removing it will not present a major problem. However, they felt that this was a nice way to say that something special was happening here. He said regarding the east and west facade to determine on the articulation on the west facades with a future building going right up against it, they felt that putting any kind of decoration on that wall would not be necessary; however, stuccoing the wall [not painting it] would be reasonable. Mr. Coleman said on the east facade, definitely adding windows between their existing building and the new building is not a problem.

Mr. Coleman said they prefer not to have the stoop covered. They definitely feel that raising the stoop with a more formalized stoop configuration would benefit. They want this to be a more modern building without trying to mimic the exact pattern of historical buildings. However, they will take a look at a covered stoop as well to see whether they can make it really come together in a way that benefits the architecture that they have created. They like the corners as is, but they can definitely reduce them as there is no magic to them being three feet two versus it being a little less pronounced or projection. He said they will look at this as well. The refuse storage areas actually located in the next project, as they are all tied together, the materials are not a problem. Mr. Coleman said they are in agreement with the items and will restudy them moving forward.

Mr. Dodge asked if there was a specific reason for the three foot two inch cornice.

Mr. Coleman said for him it was really about bringing an end to what he considers a narrow, tall building. This really says this is the end with the parapet. Visually for him, it was a stronger statement of where the building really terminated.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board believes that a little refining would enhance the building. They discussed the stucco. They were in agreement with the staff recommendations.

Mr. Coleman requested a continuance in conjunction with the staff's recommendations.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition for New Construction Part I: Height and Mass at 504 East Liberty Street for the petitioner to consider the following:

1. Revise the unusually tall and narrow window configuration on the front façade.
2. Provide additional articulation on the west façade and add fenestration to the east façade.
3. Revise the uncovered stoop to a covered stoop with greater height from the ground.
4. Eliminate or substantially redesign the very deep cornice, three feet, two inches, on the south, east and north façades; ensure that a string course is incorporated.
5. Locate the refuse storage area.
6. While materials are not part of Part I: Height and Mass review, the Board provides the following recommendations so that they may be incorporated in Part II: Design Details. Revise changes in material to occur in correspondence in changes to architectural features (such as bay windows or cornices) rather than on flat, vertical planes. Eliminate the stucco trim on the sides of the windows and doors as this is not typical on contributing masonry buildings. Revise the painted CMU blocks on the east facade to a different material.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Mic Matson

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

[32. Petition of Homeline Architecture | 18-006337-COA | 107 East Jones Street | Alterations, Addition](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

📎 [Calhoun Ward.pdf](#)

📎 [Project Narrative.pdf](#)

📎 [Drawings.pdf](#)

📎 [Specifications.pdf](#)

📎 [Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Alyson Smith gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to alter an existing rear

addition and to construct a new addition at the rear of the residential building located at 107 East Jones Street. The existing rear three story addition is proposed to be altered by removing the third floor and altering the pre-1954 two-story portion. A new third floor addition is proposed to be added to the rear of the building. An uncovered parlor level porch is proposed to project from the rear addition.

Ms. Smith reported that staff recommends continue the request for alterations and an addition to 107 East Jones Street for the following items to be restudied:

1. Reduce the height and mass of the addition to appear as a subordinate appendage and to minimize the damage and loss of historic character, building material, and original form.
2. Reduce the height of the third-floor addition to create an offset from the historic roofline.
3. Preserve and incorporate a greater amount of fabric from the existing two-story addition's south elevation.
4. Reduce the width of the addition to create an offset from the historic structure.
5. Omit the back painted spandrel glass.
6. Ensure the muntins used to divide the lites in the doors are no wider than 7/8 inch.

Mr. Dodge asked staff why were they recommending to omit the back painted spandrel glass.

Ms. Smith explained that staff believes that it disrupts the solid to void rhythm.

Mr. Dodge asked if staff believes it should be glass but not painted or should it be a solid material.

Ms. Smith answered that the glass needs to be transparent.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Deering said he appreciates the staff report. It is well-written. Their client wishes to expand his home and principally add an elevator. Mr. Deering pointed out an area, the master bedroom, and the window in the dining room. He explained that access is difficult from the parking area to this location. If an elevator is put here, it would be another odd mass on the back of the house in addition to the other odd masses. He explained that this family needs an elevator due to the medical conditions of one of their family members. The family wants to remain downtown. They are rooted and very involved in the downtown area.

Mr. Deering said to get put the elevator in this home, they would do a reorganization of the plan and create a living space across the back of the house. Thereby putting an elevator within an addition and not in another part of the house such as many they see on the outside of houses in Savannah. Therefore, they will put the elevator inside the house. It fits very well; it works well, is not exposed from the exterior. The family also wants to get as much daylight as possible. There are not many windows in this house on the south side. Therefore, they want to do something that is very good and not do something that would only be another addition to the back of this historic house. If you walk the lanes, there are a lot of regular, non-inspiring lane elevations. Mr. Deering said in reviewing this house, it was built in 1853.

Mr. Deering said they have taken the idea from an architect that he admires [John Lewis] who created lovely protocols on the back of nice houses. He appreciates the form; it is almost modern. They have taken all these ideas and have eliminated all the historical detailing from the back of the house. He showed the Board pictures of houses in the area that look like what they want to do at 107 East Jones Street.

Mr. Deering said the staff contends that there are character defining features on the 1954 addition. The brick has been altered; the interior has been changed from time-to-time; the windows have been replaced. This building is not like 31 East Jones Street. He knows that the Review Board looked at this project many times. He was supportive to the Board because they asked and got the petitioner to keep this defining characteristic feature which is the three story bay window on the back. He thought it was very important for the Board to do this. But, the back of this house is not the same thing. It is a hodge podge of things that have been added over a hundred years and they do not believe that any defining

features are left.

Mr. Deering said they are willing to reduce the height by a foot; they will reduce the width on the western side of the second floor of the building and step it back. He showed the Board the 1964 addition. He said above this, there will be a three or four inch inset so you would know that this portion was added. They also would like to drop the whole thing down one foot so that you would be able to tell that it is an addition when you look at it from the lane. Also, there is a cornice that runs from the side of the house and stops before it reaches the corner of the 1853 house. He explained that they will change this cornice profile and continue it across, but make it lower than the adjacent house cornice. He said regarding the spandrel glass, they will alter the plan on the second floor level and have changed the plan where there is no need for blackening out the glass. They will ensure that the muntins on the doors and windows of the project are no wider than 7/8 inches. He entertained questions from the Board.

Ms. Taylor said the petitioner mentioned that they were willing to reduce the height by a foot, she asked how much are they will to reduce the width?

Mr. Deering answered they are willing to reduce the width by three or four inches.

Ms. Lynch asked if there is a reason for the parapet being here instead of some other roof form due to the elevator behind it.

Mr. Deering answered that there are overruns on the elevator area and they did not want it to come to a slop roof. It would look like a little box and they did not want that.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Lowell Kronowitz came forward and stated that he was reared in the house that is being discussed. He asked the Board members how many of them live downtown and how many of them have lived in a home that has three stories. Therefore, they are 40 or 50 years old. When they are 70 years old, would they still want to live in this house? The answer is probably they can not. He understands that a health reason is causing that this to be addressed now. Mr. Kronowitz said the reason they no longer lives in this house is because they were not allowed to put an elevator here for his parents when they were 50 years old. They recognized that if they wanted to live here for the next 20 years, his parents would not be able to walk up three flights of stairs. Mr. Kronowitz was in support of the elevator being installed here.

Mr. Bill Lovett resides at 115 East Jones Street. Mr. Lovett said anything that will be done to the back of this house will be an improvement to what is there now. There is a need for the elevator to be installed here. Mr. Lovett supports the petition.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion focused primarily on the design. The petitioner is willing to address the staff's concerns and make the necessary adjustments. They were okay with losing a little of the fabric to do what the petitioner has designed to do. Therefore, Board was in agreement with the staff's recommendations with the exception of #3.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations and an addition to 107 East Jones Street with the following conditions:

- 1.Reduce the height of the third-floor addition to create an offset from the historic roofline.
- 2.Reduce the width of the addition to create an offset from the historic structure.
- 3.Omit the back painted spandrel glass.
- 4.Ensure the muntins used to divide the lites in the doors are no wider than 7/8 inch.

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jennifer Deacon

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Mic Matson	- Not Present
Melissa Memory	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

[33. Petition of Jon Sawyer for Sawyer Design | 18-005103-COA | 233 East Gordon Street | Staff Approved - Replace Rear Porch](#)

- 📎 [COA - 233 East Gordon Street 18-005103-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - 233 East Gordon Street 18-005103-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet 2 - 233 East Gordon Street 18-005103-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet 3 - 233 East Gordon Street 18-005103-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet 4 - 233 East Gordon Street 18-005103-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[34. Petition of Ann Shealy for Coastal Canvas Products | 18-006199-COA | 204 West St. Julian Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

- 📎 [COA - 204 West St. Julian Street 18-006199-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - 204 West St. Julian Street 18-006199-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[35. Amended Petition of Josh Bull for Greenline Architecture | 18-006214-COA | 520-522 East Harris Street | Staff Approved - Garage Door](#)

- 📎 [COA - 520-522 East Harris Street 18-006214-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - 520-522 East Harris Street 18-006214-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[36. Petition of Kelly Gubenko for Omega Construction | 18-006243-COA | 319 West Congress Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

- 📎 [319-321 W Congress Facade.pdf](#)
- 📎 [COA - 319 West Congress Street 18-006243-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[37. Petition of Amy Schultz for Metalcrafts | 18-006271-COA | 618 Drayton Street | Staff Approved - Replace Roof](#)

- ☞ [COA - 618 Drayton Street 18-006271-COA.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Submittal Packet - 618 Drayton Street 18-006271-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[38. Amended Petition of Angel Borja | 18-006309-COA | 300 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Exterior Downlights](#)

- ☞ [COA - 300 West Broughton Street 18-006309-COA.pdf](#)
- ☞ [WG Savannah Exterior Downlight Cutsheet.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[39. Petition of Patrick Phelps for Hansen Architects | 18-006312-COA | 220 East Bryan Street | Staff Approved - Fence](#)

- ☞ [COA - 220 East Bryan Street 18-006312-COA.pdf](#)
- ☞ [1616_220 E Bryan-HDBR Full Submittal_18-11-14.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[40. Petition of Joyce Swaratz for NSCDA-GA | 18-006351-COA | 319 Abercorn Street | Staff Approved - Iron Handrails](#)

- ☞ [COA - 319 Abercorn Street 18-006351-COA.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Submittal Packet - 319 Abercorn Street 18-006351-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[41. Petition of Christian Sottile for Sottile & Sottile | 18-006352-COA | 200-500 West River Street | Staff Approved - Projecting Sign](#)

- ☞ [COA - 200-500 West River Street 18-006352-COA.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Electric Moon Sign - Proposed Reduction - Updated 10.26.2018 \(002\).pdf](#)
- ☞ [Electric Moon Sign Reduction_To Scale_Elevation_10-26-2018 \(002\).pdf](#)
- ☞ [Zoning Administrator interpretation.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[42. Petition of Ray Mitch Hoover for Your Exterior Pros | 18-006382-COA | 218 West Jones Street | Staff Approved - Repairs](#)

- ☞ [COA - 218 West Jones Street 18-006382-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[43. Petition of William Shira | 18-006424-COA | 508 East Perry Street | Staff Approved - Shutters](#)

- ☞ [COA - 508 East Perry Street 18-006424-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[44. Petition of Charles Angell for the House Doctor | 18-006463-COA | 212 West Jones Street | Staff Approved - Siding](#)

- ☞ [COA - 212 West Jones Street 18-006463-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[45. Petition of Ray Mitch Hoover for Your Exterior Pros | 18-006493-COA | 405 Tattnall Street | Staff Approved - Roof Replacement](#)

📎 [COA - 405 Tattnall Street 18-006493-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 405 Tattnall Street 18-006493-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[46. Petition of Barbara June Hutchinson | 18-006499-COA | 518 East Bryan Street | Staff Approved - Replace Front Door](#)

📎 [COA - 518 East Bryan Street 18-006499-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 518 East Bryan Street 18-006499-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[47. Petition of Patrick Thompson | 18-006566-COA | 218 West Jones Street | Staff Approved - Mechanical Equipment Screening](#)

📎 [COA - 218 West Jones Street 18-006566-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 218 West Jones Street 18-006566-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[48. Petition of Debra Sindler | 18-006567-COA | 224 East Gordon Street | Staff Approved - Second Floor Shutters](#)

📎 [COA - 224 East Gordon Street 18-006567-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 224 East Gordon Street 18-006567-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[49. Petition of Sam Carroll for Carroll Construction | 18-006590-COA | 537 East Charlton Street | Staff Approved - In-Kind Wood Repair](#)

📎 [COA - 537 East Charlton Street 18-006590-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 537 East Charlton Street 18-006590-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[50. Petition of Hoyt Powell for HP Construction, Inc. | 18-006608-COA | 412 East Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Replace Front Facade Windows](#)

📎 [COA - 412 East Taylor Street 18-006608-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 412 East Taylor Street 18-006608-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

[51. Report on Work Performed Without a COA for the December 12, 2018 HDBR Meeting](#)

📎 [12-12-18 HDBR Report on Work Without a COA.pdf](#)

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

[52. Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, December 13, 2018 at 3:30 p.m. in the Meyer Conference Room, MPC 110 East State Street](#)

[53. Next Pre-Meeting - Wednesday, January 9, 2019 at 12:00 p.m. in the Jerry Surrency Room, MPC, 112 East State Street](#)

[54. Next Regular Meeting - Wednesday, January 9, 2019 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 East State Street](#)

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

[55. Nominating Committee Report](#)

Ms. Lynch reported that nominating committee met. The members were **Ms. Matson, Mr. Stephens, and Ms. Lynch**. They decided to nominate the current officers for one additional year in keeping with what has been done the previous years.

Ms. Lynch stated that Ms. Deacon and Ms. Matson last day on the Board is December 31, 2018. She thanked them for their years of service. City Council has reappointed **Kellie Fletcher and Becky Lynch** for another term and appointed **Ellie Isaacs and Stan Houle**.

Ms. Lynch stated that in terms of their Retreat, the Board talked about doing something in January, 2019. **Ms. Michalak** said she will bring this to Ms. Harris's attention for further discussion.

Mr. Stephens said he spoke with Ms. Harris after the project for Boundary and Louisville Streets was in the papers. Mr. Stephens explained that he had some concerns regarding the old train freight depot as it appears that it will be demolished to build luxury apartments here. From a human standpoint, Mr. Stephens said he believes it is important to have structures that still tell a story. May be if the Board is in agreement, they could send a letter to the MPC addressing their position against the demolition.

Ms. Michalak informed the Board that this is the second attempt to build something on this site. The last time, Pat Shay wanted to build here. In talking with him over a six month period, they were able to get him to save most of the depot. But, to her knowledge, there has not been a willingness for the applicant to sit down with them this time. Staff has the history of this building that they complied the last time this came up. The property abuts the Savannah and Ogeechee Canal which is on the National Register.

It was the consensus of the Board that they will send a letter to MPC addressing their concerns.

Ms. Michalak said she will bring this to Ms. Harris's attention.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

[56. Adjournment](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, Ms. Lynch adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:50 pm..

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen 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.