



Savannah Historic District Board of Review

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
June 12, 2019 1:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

JUNE 12, 2019 SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

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
 David Altschiller
 Debra Caldwell
 Scott Cook
 Kevin Dodge
 Stan Houle
 Ellie Isaacs
 Melissa Memory
 Nan Taylor

:

MPC Staff Present: Pamela Everett, Esq., Assistant Executive Director
 Leah Michalak, Director of Historic Preservation
 Ryan Jarles, Cultural Resources 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 1:00 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 Commonwealth Construction | 19-002191-COA | 402 East Hall Street | Fences](#)

📎 [Application - 402 East Hall Street 19-002191-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [submittal packet - 402 East Hall Street.pdf](#)

📎 [19-002191-COA Recommendation.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the installation of 2 new fences and a new gate at 402 East Hall Street because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Stan Houle

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

[3. Petition of Whitfield Signs | 19-002720-COA | 350 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. | Signs](#)

[📎 19-002720-COA Recommendation.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal packet.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for one principal use fascia sign and one under-awning sign at 350 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. with the following conditions:

- 1.Ensure the signs are installed using the gentlest means possible;
- 2.Reduce the under-awning sign to be no more than 6 square feet;

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Stan Houle

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye

Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

[4. Petition of Sanders Architecture | 19-002936-COA | 311 East Harris Street | Alterations](#)

- [19-002936-COA Recommendation.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet - 311 East Harris Street 19-002936-COA.pdf](#)
- [pictures and paint sample.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition to install a new door to the west elevation of 311 East Harris Street with the following condition:

- 1.Ensure the work is completed using the gentlest means possible.

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Stan Houle

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

[5. Petition of LS3P Associates Ltd. | 19-002954-COA | 5 West Liberty Street | Alterations](#)

- [Staff Recommendation .pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet - Project Narrative & Specifications.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations at 5 West Liberty Street with the following conditions:

1. Ensure the windows are inset not less than three inches from the exterior façade.

2. Ensure an encroachment permit is obtained for the planters and canopy.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Stan Houle

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

[6. Petition of Doug Bean Signs Inc. | 19-002965-COA | 115 East Bay Street | Sign](#)

[☞ updated submittal packet.pdf](#)

[☞ Application - 115 East Bay Street 19-002965-COA.pdf](#)

[☞ 19-002965-COA Recommendation.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a principal use projecting sign at 115 East Bay Street with the following condition:

1. An encroachment license be obtained if the sign is within the public right of way.

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Stan Houle

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye

Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

[7. Petition of SCAD - Tony Hensley | 19-002974-COA | 229 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. | Fence and Shade Structure](#)

- [Submittal Packet - 229 MLK Jr. Blvd 19-002974-COA.pdf](#)
- [Application - 229 MLK Jr. Blvd 19-002974-COA.pdf](#)
- [19-002974-COA Rcommendation.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the installation of a fence and shade structure on the southwest corner of 229 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd with the following conditions:

- 1.The wood fence be painted or stained; Provide a color selection to staff for review and approval.
- 2.Reduce the height of the shade structure to a maximum of 11'-0" to meet the standard.

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Stan Houle

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

[8. Adopt June 12, 2019 Agenda](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby adopt June 12, 2019 Agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[9. Approve May 8, 2019 Briefing Minutes and May 8, 2019 Regular Minutes](#)

[☞ May 8, 2019 HBR Briefing Minutes.docx](#)

[☞ 05-08-2019 Minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve May 8, 2019 Briefing Minutes and May 8, 2019 Regular Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

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

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: Nan Taylor

- | | |
|-------------------|-----------|
| Debra Caldwell | - Aye |
| Becky Lynch | - Abstain |
| Scott Cook | - Aye |
| Dwayne Stephens | - Aye |
| Melissa Memory | - Aye |
| David Altschiller | - Aye |
| Nan Taylor | - Aye |
| Kevin Dodge | - Aye |
| Stan Houle | - Aye |
| Ellie Isaacs | - Aye |

[11. 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 continue the petition as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: Nan Taylor

- | | |
|-------------------|-----------|
| Debra Caldwell | - Aye |
| Becky Lynch | - Abstain |
| Scott Cook | - Aye |
| Dwayne Stephens | - Aye |
| Melissa Memory | - Aye |
| David Altschiller | - Aye |
| Nan Taylor | - Aye |
| Kevin Dodge | - Aye |
| Stan Houle | - Aye |
| Ellie Isaacs | - Aye |

[12. Petition of LS3P | 18-006314-COA | 2 Whitaker Street | Demolition and New Construction Part II: Design Details](#)

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion:

Second:

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

[13. Petition of Lott Barber | 18-006769-COA | 145 Montgomery Street | New Construction Part II: Design Details](#)

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: Nan Taylor

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

[14. Petition of Kevan Hoertdoerfer Architects | 19-001532-COA | 7 MLK, Jr. Blvd. | Rehabilitation and Alterations](#)

Motion

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: Nan Taylor

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

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

- 📎 [17-002904-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Drawings and Photos.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Franklin Ward.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Historical Photographs.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Liberty Ward.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Mass Model.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Middle Oglethorpe Ward.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Previous Submittal Packet- Drawings.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Previous Submittal Packet- Model Photographs.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Previous Submittal Packet- Project Description.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Aerial.pdf](#)
- 📎 [63MLK-Concept Rendering.pdf](#)

Mr. Keith Howington was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of a six (6) story hotel at 63 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. The building features a

symmetrical front façade facing MLK with two floors of underground parking. The footprint is 26,992 square feet (reduced from 35,000 sf) and the building is U-shaped, with an open valet/parking entrance area facing Zubley Street. Architecturally, the building is evocative of the Art Deco style. The project is classified as Large-Scale Development and the petitioner is requesting one bonus story above the Height Map (this is a 5-story height zone). The proposed building was originally reviewed under a previous version of the Historic District Ordinance; therefore, the prior version still applies. The building has been substantially redesigned since it was last seen by the HDBR on June 14, 2017. The HDBR granted approval for the demolition of the 1965 building on July 9, 2014 and it was subsequently demolished (14-002864-COA). The site is currently vacant.

Ms. Michalak explained that this hotel project was first heard at the June 14, 2017 HDBR Meeting where Part I: Height and Mass was continued in order for the petitioner to address the following per staff's recommendation. A narrative addressing the recommendations was not provided with this submittal packet; therefore, the *italicized* comments under each recommendation were determined (and written) by staff:

1. Substantially reduce the overall height, including the height of the ground and sixth floor.

The recommendation has not been adequately addressed. The overall height, to the top of the spire, has been reduced from 100' to 99'; the height of the ground floor remains 20' and the 6th floor has increased from 13'-6" to 16'-0".

2. Provide elevations of the east and west facades within the "U".

The recommendation has been addressed. These elevations can be seen in the transverse building sections on drawings A4.1.

3. Provide true transparent voids at the south corner of the building on the sixth floor, on the western bays of the south façade, and on the west façade.

The recommendation has been addressed; these are now true transparent window openings into the pool area on the roof of the 5th floor.

4. Restudy the proportions of the sixth floor which feature a large amount of blank space above the windows.

The recommendation has not been adequately addressed. The front façade "blank space" previously proposed above the windows is now proposed below the windows instead. Staff recommends that the front façade of the 6th floor be a similar design to the 6th floor of the other facades which feature appropriately located windows with a string course just above the window heads and a parapet above the string course.

5. Add voids to the south façade, at the eastern two bays.

The recommendation has been addressed. The façade has been substantially redesigned, including adding more voids at the two eastern bays.

6. Restudy the rhythm of the window and door openings which feature balconies on the south façade.

Balconies with door openings no longer exist on the south façade.

7. Incorporate a regular rhythm of storefronts on the ground floor of the north façade.

The recommendation has been addressed. The ground floor storefront has a more regular rhythm consistent with the window pattern on the floors above.

8. Reduce the height and simplify the parapet shapes on the north and south elevations.

The recommendation has been addressed. The parapet height and shapes have all been significantly redesigned to echo the Art Deco design of the spire on the front façade.

9. Revise the top floor setback to be symmetrical.

The recommendation has been addressed. The front façade no longer has any setbacks and is symmetrical.

10. Add additional visual expression and differentiation to the top story on the west, south and north facades.

The recommendation has been addressed. A variety of techniques are proposed to add visual expression and differentiation to the top story.

11. Restudy the location, configuration, and number of access points to the vehicle drop off area.

The recommendation has not been fully addressed. The number of access points have been reduced from four to two, the location of the access points has been moved more toward the center of the wall of continuity, and the wall of continuity has been redesigned to be more consistent and solid. However, access to parking is required to be from a north-south service street. While staff does not believe access to the parking is appropriate from MLK, access could be provided from Ann Street, which serves as a lane in this location. If access were to remain on the east-west street; a variance will be necessary. Furthermore, the location of the vehicular drop off area creates 247 linear feet of dead space along Zubley Street. As proposed, this configuration creates two "back of house" areas - one along Zubley and one along Ann - rather than the more typical one back of house area. Staff recommends that the drop off area be restudied.

12. Select an additional massing standard to meet. The massing standards for recess and roofline variation are not met.

The recommendation has been addressed. The applicant indicated that "Subdivide Horizontally" and "Roofline Variation" have been selected.

13. Provide additional roofline variation on the north and south elevations which feature more than 120 linear feet of continuous height.

The recommendation has been addressed. The north and south facades are each 310 linear feet; roofline variation is expressed with Art Deco-style towers. The south façade has three towers spaced 111 feet apart. The north façade has five towers space between 46 and 56 feet apart.

14. Contain the mechanical access structure within the additional story.

The recommendation has been addressed. The mechanical equipment is on top of the 5th story; the building drops from 6 to 5-stories on the eastern half.

15. Increase the percentage of limestone on the north, south and west facades to 30% to meet the standard.

The recommendation has been addressed. All three facades' stone has increased to 30%; the east (front) façade is 34% stone.

16. Revise the bay widths to be greater than 15 feet wide and less than 20 feet wide.

The recommendation has been addressed. All bay widths have been revised to meet the standard (see drawing A3.4).

17. Increase the number of entrances on the north and south facades to at least five each to meet the

standard.

The recommendation has not been fully addressed. The north façade now has 6 entrances and the south façade has 6 entrances; the standard requires that: "A minimum of one (1) primary entrance shall be provided for every 60 feet of street frontage, excluding lanes. Intervals between entrances shall not be less than 15 feet nor exceed 90 feet." Within the previous ordinance, the definition of a primary entrance is: "An entrance to a use that has or could have an individual street address. Service doors and emergency exits are not primary entrances." The doors on the north façade consists of: Register, Hallway, two elevator lobbies, Dining, and Food Prep; only the Register and elevator lobbies seem to meet the definition for a primary entrance. The doors on the south façade consist of: Lobby Bar, an emergency stair exit, two entrances into a vestibule (which are too close together), the main Vestibule/Lobby, and Dining; only the Lobby Bar and Main Lobby seem to meet the definition for a primary entrance.

18. Increase the amount of glazing on the south façade to 35% to meet the standard.

The recommendation has been addressed. The petitioner indicates on the drawings that the south façade has 35% glazing on the ground floor.

Ms. Michalak stated that at the June 13, 2018 HDBR Meeting, the Board approved a 12-month extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness application. She reported that staff recommends to continue the request for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of a six (6) story hotel at 63 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd in order for the petitioner to address the following:

1. Reduce the overall building height; specifically including the height of the ground and sixth floor.
2. Increase the height of the second story to 12 feet to meet the minimum standard.
3. Restudy the proportions of the sixth floor, east (front) façade, which features a large amount of blank space above the windows.
4. Restudy the location of the vehicle drop off area which is not permitted on an east-west street. Relocate the drop off area to Ann Street and ensure that it does not create "dead space" within the building. If the drop off area remains on Zubley, a variance from the standard will be required.
5. If the drop off area remains on Zubley, ensure the sidewalk (which crosses the two curb cuts on Zubley) be revised to serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.
6. Increase the number of primary entrances on the north and south facades to a minimum of five (5) on each facade to meet the standard.
7. Clarify whether any through-wall HVAC systems are proposed; if yes, ensure that they are incorporated into the design of the window system and screened by a decorative grate.
8. Ensure the window sashes and door frames are inset not less than four (4) inches.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Howington thanked the Board for hearing their petition today. Pertaining to the staff's recommendations, Mr. Howington said they will ensure that the window sashes and door frames are inset not less than four (4) inches [#8]. He said for the record, this is shown on their plans. The answer to staff recommendation #7 is partially yes. He informed the Board that if they look at the north and south elevations, they will see that they have gone to a contemporary Art Deco style. They wanted to focus on what is important to Art Deco buildings. The natural stone patterns will come back to the height of the sixth floor. Staff's recommendation #5 recommends restudying the location of the vehicle drop off area which is not permitted on an east-west street and ensure that the sidewalk is uninterrupted. Mr. Howington explained that vehicle drop-off area is shown on their plans as well.

Mr. Howington said that the staff's recommendations for numbers 5, 7, and 8 are done. He explained that staff's recommendation for #1 recommends reducing the overall building height; especially the height

of the ground and sixth floor. He said in 2017, they actually had the building higher and at that meeting, more than half of the Board members were in favor of that the height because it was the terminus at Broughton Street. However, from that meeting, they reduced the height. They had a 20-foot stringcourse on the ground floor. The ordinance does not say that the ground floor should be 20 feet but says that the exterior expression of the height of the second floor shall not be less than 12 feet. This is making reference to the visual expression. They have done this. The base has been reduced from 20 feet to 18 feet. As shown on the elevation, from the top of the horizontal base to the fourth line of the second floor is 12' - 6". Therefore, they feel that the visual expression has met the intent of the ordinance. He said in clarifying the 6th floor, they intentionally raised this floor at MLK for two reasons. Upon designing a building, one looks at what is the historic pattern of the street. MLK is very unique due to the fact that the historic pattern as shown in the historic photos shows that the terminus of Broughton Street has a higher entrance, which he would say is the cornice line and is about 18 feet. Firestone got it right as it had a tall entrance here. Therefore, looking at the pattern of the street starting at the historic train shed, is taller on MLK [the front] and lower on the back. He cited several buildings along the area that are taller on MLK and lower on the back. Consequently, they wanted to repeat this height as it is very important and as he has said is unique to MLK.

Mr. Howington said regarding staff recommendation #3 concerning "restudy the proportions of the sixth floor, east (front) façade, which features a large amount of blank space above the windows." He explained that this is a part of Part II Design Details and they will work on this as they go forward. Pertaining to staff recommendation #4, "restudy the location of the vehicle drop off area which is not permitted on an east-west street," he explained that they intentionally put the drop off point where it is because they want to be respectful of the back street which is Ann Street. Zubley Street is on the south side and is an east-west connector street. It was asked if this has happened before and the answer is yes. He said that Residence Inn drops off on the south side and Hampton Inn drops off on the north side; Holiday Inn drops off on the south side as well as Courtyard Marriott on the north side. Therefore, there is an actual precedent of what has happened before.

Mr. Howington wanted to clarify something that staff has mentioned as he did not believe they were talking about the entire sixth floor because this floor is only 10 feet except for the front portion that addresses the MLK pattern. The front parapet is only two feet higher than the back parapet. Therefore, they are not talking about a lot of height. They only bumped up the height to address MLK. He said in looking at the height of a building, he does not believe that it is correct to say that the building is 99 feet. If they look at the massing of this building it is only 77 feet. Therefore, what they are looking at is a spire/tower. Therefore, he does not believe that this should be considered as the main height of the building. Now, it is a part of the building, but it is not the main mass of the building.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Joe Sasseen stated that 63 MLK is a focal point for Broughton Street. He asked the Board to give the architect a little leeway in this area because the area is dark and this area needs to be brightened up.

Ms. Ardis Wood asked if trees will be on all sides of the street and what is the width of the sidewalk.

Mr. Howington in response to the questions of the public, explained that on MLK there is a very wide sidewalk, approximately 20 feet deep. Zubley Street sidewalk is approximately 5 or 6 feet. Ann Street is wide also and on Orange Street side, there is no sidewalk. He explained that something happened with the Ships of the Sea and they needed a portion of Orange Street to be maintained as a portion of their parking lot. Mr. Howington said pertaining to the question about the trees that they have not gotten this far, but he believes that trees will be here.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board believes the building has come a long way since 2017. But, the building is still a little too top-heavy. A little more work needs to be done on the sixth floor. The Board understood the petitioner's point of how the building needs to address Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, but the building is tall at the 6th floor. They were concerned about how the pool would appear from the street level. The Board discussed the entrance being on Zubley Street as the drop off point. They are aware that traffic on this street is extremely hectic especially when it bottlenecks at Broughton Street and Martin Luther King Jr.

Boulevard. Zubley might be the best location for the parking area. They believe that the east-west streets would be better as opposed to MLK or Ann Street. Mr. Cook said he was not opposed to the height of the building. He explained that what he was saying was pertaining to the proportions of the building, the visual compatibility within the district.

Ms. Lynch explained that staff has recommended a continuance. The petitioner would need to ask for the continuance.

Mr. Howington stated that if the Board felt that they have met most of the criteria, they would love to explore reducing the building a few feet and consider requesting a variance for Zubley Street. However, he feels they have met most of the criteria. But, if the Board does not feel as he has stated, then he is asking for a continuance. He also said he would ask for a variance if the Board feels the entrance should be on Zubley Street. He would rather address this now. He believes they presently meet some of the criteria for a precedent.

Ms. Michalak explained that there is no criteria for a precedent. She read the variance criteria. Ms. Michalak stated that in recommending a variance, each of those criteria would need to be addressed; and if it does meet the criteria for a variance, then how does it do so.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the request for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of a six (6) story hotel at 63 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd in order for the petitioner to address the following:

- 1.Reduce the overall building height; specifically including the height of the ground and sixth floor.
- 2.Increase the height of the second story to 12 feet to meet the minimum standard.
- 3.Restudy the proportions of the sixth floor, east (front) façade, which features a large amount of blank space above the windows.
- 4.Restudy the location of the vehicle drop off area which is not permitted on an east-west street. Relocate the drop off area to Ann Street and ensure that it does not create “dead space” within the building. If the drop off area remains on Zubley, a variance from the standard will be required.
- 5.If the drop off area remains on Zubley, ensure the sidewalk (which crosses the two curb cuts on Zubley) be revised to serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.
- 6.Increase the number of primary entrances on the north and south facades to a minimum of five (5) on each facade to meet the standard.
- 7.Clarify whether any through-wall HVAC systems are proposed; if yes, ensure that they are incorporated into the design of the window system and screened by a decorative grate.
- 8.Ensure the window sashes and door frames are inset not less than four (4) inches.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye

Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

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

- 📎 [Staff Recommendation .pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet_Narrative.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet_Drawings.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Drawings \(November 14, 2018\).pdf](#)
- 📎 [Board Decision- November 14, 2018.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Public Comment_Rosenwald.pdf](#)

Mr. Ryan Claus was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Alyson Smith gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for a rear addition to 323 East Broughton Street (Kennedy Pharmacy) and the construction of a new bathroom facility building (Part II, Design Details) at 115 Habersham Street; which is a parcel associated with the Davenport House. For the purposes of this review the Kennedy Pharmacy building is considered a Monumental Building since it will be used as a museum and preservation center. Etched glass signage is proposed within the transoms on the lane and east façade of the addition. The restroom building will be minimally visible from the rights-of-way; likely only the roof and one façade will be visible above and around the existing site walls.

Ms. Smith stated that on November 14, 2018, the HDBR continued the request for a rear addition in order for the petitioner to consider the following:

- a. Resolve the lot coverage issue;

The condition has been met.

- b. Provide all items in the SIGNS checklist and ensure that the etched glass signs proposed in the transoms on the lane and east façade meet the standards with the Broughton Street Sign Ordinance.

c.

The condition has not been met.

- c. Redesign the new penetrations on the rear façade of the historic building to utilize existing openings and minimize the loss of historic fabric.

The condition has been met. The petitioner states that, "all historic openings on the Kennedy Pharmacy will be preserved. To accommodate access to the Preservation Center, one new opening will be added on the rear wall of the second floor."

- d. Do not enclose the inside of the historic window opening on the east façade.

The condition is met.

- e. Relocate the elevator so that its overrun does not affect the roof shape of the historic building.

The condition is met. The elevator has been relocated.

- f. Incorporate architectural articulation on the west façade of the addition.

The condition is met. Corbeled brick bands have been added to the west and south elevation.

- g. Provide material and color samples for all products proposed on the addition.

The condition is partially met.

Ms. Smith explained that the HDBR recommended denial to the Zoning Board of Appeals to permit 90% lot coverage in the RIP-A zoning district because the variance criteria was not met.

The Kennedy Pharmacy site has since been rezoned from RIP-A (which permits a building coverage maximum of 75% with parking requirements), to B-C-1 (which permits 100% lot coverage and does not have parking requirements). Two of the other three corner lots at the intersection are zoned B-C-1. In addition, all remaining parcels on the same block face are zoned B-C-1.

Ms. Smith said the HDBR approved Part I, Height and Mass for the construction of a restroom facility at 115 Habersham Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II, Design Details because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

- a. Revise the mass model to show the correct design and location of the new building;

The condition is met.

- b. Provide proposed lot coverage percentage;

The petitioner has stated the lot coverage will increase by 9%.

- c. Screen the new refuse storage area;

The condition is met. The existing 6' wood fence will be extended to screen the new refuse storage area.

- d. Provide the proposed location for the new electrical meter.

The condition is met. The meter will be located on the existing rear brick wall.

Ms. Smith reported that for 323 East Broughton Street (Kennedy Pharmacy) staff recommends:

1. Approve the request for a rear addition to 323 East Broughton Street with the following conditions:

- a. Provide all items in the SIGNS checklist and ensure that the etched glass signs proposed in the transoms on the lane and east façade meet the standards with the Broughton Street Sign Ordinance for review by the HDBR.

- b. Provide a color sample of the proposed finish for the wood louvers, brick and mortar sample, and a specification and color sample for the railings to be submitted to staff for review and approval.

Ms. Smith reported for 115 Habersham Street (Restroom Facility) staff recommends:

1. Approve the request for Part II, Design Details for the construction of a restroom facility at 115 Habersham Street with the following conditions:

- a. Ensure the metal standing seam does not exceed one inch.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Claus said they will address the items. They feel that they have met the intent of all the visibility factors pertaining to proportions, proportion of openings, rhythm of solid to void relationship. He explained that there is a lot of brick here which ties back into the historic structure and the pharmacy. Not only do they have the west facade, which is totally brick, but the south wraps the entire corner. They have an A-frame which they feel is important to keep. The contemporary addition is on the back and is differentiated from the new. They feel this successfully creates an overall design. The contemporary elements are only used in that it was influenced by the historic design. They looked at using more brick in the primary facade along Habersham Street. They feel the contemporary materiality is balanced. Mr. Claus said they agree with staff's recommendations.

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said he was present to answer questions that the Board might have. He appreciates all the comments they have received regarding their project.

Ms. Issacs asked if the curtain wall is white or silver.

Mr. Claus said it will be a clear Anodized silver.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Bob Rosenwald said he agrees with the staff report that says this is a highly contemporary addition. He said he does not believe that the overall design is compatible. He read a part of the ordinance concerning primary focus. He does see how persons walking by on the Habersham Street side would not see this as the primary focus because of the way this it designed, compared to the Kennedy Pharmacy on one side, the Davenport on the other; Berrien House across the street, along with the Kehoe House. Even though it might be small, etc., he does not believe that this is the kind of place to experiment with contemporary design.

Ms. Ardis Wood showed the Board some images. Ms. Wood said the old Jewish Synagogue has a modern addition to a historic building. The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation says that new additions should be differentiated from the historic building. A new addition to a historic structure should preserve the building's historic character. Because this building is so different, the proposed addition does not preserve the historic character of either Kennedy or Davenport. Ms. Wood said the Standards states that new construction shall be visually compatible with structures, squares, and places to which they are visually related. The treatment should not be so different so that it becomes the primary focus. As Mr. Rosenwald has said by being so different, the proposed addition does become the primary focus. The design of the new addition is highly contemporary. However, because the building is contemporary does not mean that it is compatible.

Mr. Dillon Turner said this addition will be quite ugly and they will be replacing it in the next 20 years. He asked the Board to deny this project.

Mr. Claus, in response to public comments, said he values everyone's opinion. It was mentioned that the integrity of the project is compromised by the addition. But, they feel totally contrary to that as they feel they are celebrating, preserving, and proposing something that is unique. In looking at the renderings, they get a good feel for the way the addition is nestled in. Not only are they preserving the trees in the area, but this is a minor addition to this permanent structure. They are incorporating the elements that are more traditional in nature as best as they can while having the contrast too.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Lynch explained that this is a Monumental Building because it is a museum and different standards are applied. The Board discussed the addition. Most of the Board members were in favor of this project. But, a few of the members did not see it being visually compatible. This is just an addition, but suggests a pattern they would not like to see on another project. The materials are not successful with the current building.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

323 East Broughton Street (Kennedy Pharmacy):

1. Approve the request for a rear addition to 323 East Broughton Street with the following conditions:

- a) Provide all items in the SIGNS checklist and ensure that the etched glass signs proposed in the transoms on the lane and east façade meet the standards with the Broughton Street Sign Ordinance for review by the HDBR.
- b) Provide a color sample of the proposed finish for the wood louvers, brick and mortar sample, and a specification and color sample for the railings to be submitted to staff for review and approval.

115 Habersham Street (Restroom Facility):

2. Approve the request for Part II, Design Details for the construction of a restroom facility at 115 Habersham Street with the following conditions:

a) Ensure the metal standing seam does not exceed one inch.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Nay
David Altschiller	- Nay
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Nay
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

[17. Petition of Niles Bolton & Associates | 19-001562-COA | 415 East Oglethorpe Avenue | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

- 🔗 [19-001562-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previous 4-10-19 Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Additional Staff Research.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Aerial.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Crawford Ward.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [1980s Rendering.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Police Barracks - built 1869.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Old Jail - 1887.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Renderings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Comments from Resident.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Public Comment - Ardis Wood.pdf](#)

Mr. Jeff Smith 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 to construct apartment buildings (four buildings per building code) on the vacant property located at 415 East Oglethorpe Avenue. The north buildings (Buildings "1 West" and "1 East"), facing Oglethorpe Avenue, collectively have 77 units and are proposed to be 5-stories high. The south buildings (Buildings "2 West" and "2 East"), facing East Hull Street, collectively have 64 units and are proposed to be 4-

stories high. East Oglethorpe Lane will be reinstated in the center of the property, running east to west, between Price and Habersham Streets. These properties are tything lots for the entire northwest corner of Crawford Ward; each of the four buildings qualifies as Large-Scale Development per the Historic District ordinance. Underneath the full site, including the reconstructed lane, a parking structure is proposed; access to the structure is at the southeast corner of "Building 1 East".

Ms. Michalak stated that the project was first reviewed by the Board at the April 10, 2019 HDBR Meeting. Part I was continued "in order for the applicant to revise the project to meet all standards and provide a complete application package as described [in red] throughout the staff report." These items included (but were not limited to) the following:

1. Staff determined that they cannot assess visual compatibility of the buildings until standards (as described in the remainder of the report) are met.
2. Elevations of the rear facades of both buildings along Oglethorpe Lane were not provided.
3. It appears that several parapet walls exceed 4 feet (6 feet high or more). In addition, there are several roof structures, such as domed roofs, and it is unclear if they are non-habitable as detailed sections, indicating their interior purpose, were not provided.
4. The first floor, above the raised foundation for both buildings is proposed to be 10'-8" (11' minimum required).
5. The fourth floor is 9'-1" (10' minimum required).
6. The building does not utilize an historic buildings form fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward.
7. The hip roof pitches were not provided.
8. Many residential balconies are proposed throughout both buildings. Their depth or support method are not noted in plan or section; a detailed elevation appears to show some kind of support method.
9. Information regarding column caps and base molding was not provided. Staff requests clarification that the proposed spacing on "on-center" and that the distance between balusters will not exceed 4".
10. It appears that the garage opening approaches 30 feet in width (a maximum of 12' is permitted).
11. The parking entrance, which appears to be over 30 feet in width is adjacent to Price Street. It must be setback from a minimum of 30 from all property lines.
12. Staff recommends that screening be provided around the transformers since they will likely be highly visible from Price Street.
13. It appears that HVAC units are proposed to be located on the roofs of the buildings; however, no information was provided regarding whether they'd be visible from any public right-of-way and no screening is indicated.
14. "Subdivide Horizontally" massing device was selected; however, although the first floor of the building appears to be subdivided from the upper stories by a water table/string course, it is not clear how the upper floor is consistently divided into a "top" at all facades. Particularly, Building B does not have a "top;" only the parapet wall is differentiated from the floors below.
15. "Roofline Variation" massing device was selected; however, a change in parapet height does not constitute a one-half story variation nor does a hip roof above the eave.
16. Bays vary in width from 7'-11" to 26'-9"; they are required to be between 15-20' wide.
17. Ensure that window and doors are inset not less than 4 inches.

Additionally, the applicant was requesting a variance from the standard that reads:

Footprint. *Building footprints shall not exceed 13,500 square feet within the National Historic Landmark District boundaries. Building footprints shall not exceed 40,500 square feet outside the National Historic Landmark District boundaries. Multiple buildings, as defined by Building Code, with building footprints equal to or less than the maximum permitted may be*

constructed for shared use(s).

Ms. Michalak explained that this variance would be to allow for Building A to have a footprint of 19,270 sf and Building B to have a footprint of 19,277 sf. The buildings are within the National Historic Landmark District boundaries which requires a maximum square footage of 13,500 sf for each building. Staff stated that the variance criteria were not met.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends to continue the request for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass to construct apartment buildings (four buildings per building code) on the vacant property located at 415 East Oglethorpe Avenue in order for the applicant to consider the following:

1. Reduce the exterior expression of all top levels of all buildings to a maximum of 10 feet (to the underside of the cornice) so that the height and proportions are more visually compatible;
2. Add a primary entrance to Building 2 East along Hull Street;
3. Revise the unusual roof parapet condition on the south and east façades of Building 2 East;
4. Remove all tower elements proposed on the buildings; once the tower elements have been removed, revise the rooflines to ensure that the "roofline variation" standards are met. In the case that any tower elements remain in the design, the windows and/or vents are to be revised/removed so as not to appear that the space is habitable;
5. Relocate the parking entrance that is adjacent to Price Street to be setback a minimum of 30 feet from all property lines;
6. Add screening around the transformers.

She also reported that staff recommends that the Board permit the applicant to return to a future meeting with both Parts I and II for review by the Board.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Smith thanked staff for their input on the project. He said that the project has evolved. Originally, it was a six story building, with a 100% lot coverage. As the Board knows, it is extremely expensive to put the parking below grade. He addressed the staff's recommendations. #1 - They are in agreement to reduce the exterior expression; #2 - They recognize the requirement in terms of the ordinance. The thought behind the building is two-fold. This is a residential building, but has a commercial feel. There are seven entrances along Hull Street. One entrance is into the building, and the others are entrances to the individual apartments. In addition this building has entrances across the lane and off of Price Street to the east. He said that #3 concerns the parapet wall condition on the south and east facades of Building 2 East. Mr. Smith said they have addressed this in their renderings submittal; #4 - Remove all tower elements on the proposed buildings. He explained stated that there is no habitable space at the roofline. This will be redesigned. The tower in the southwest corner is close to SCAD and the Police Barracks. He believes this tower has a good reason to be there. It helps with the roofline variation standard and they want it to be seen on this corner. Mr. Smith said he is not in agreement with the comments on Building one; concerning relocating the parking entrance that is adjacent to Price Street to be a minimum of 30 feet from all property lines, there is no parking on the ground floor. There are 136 parking spaces in basement. There is a parking space for every apartment in the basement. Mr. Smith explained that in order to get 136 spaces here, they needed to locate the ramp in such a way that would require the least amount of space. He explained the way the cars would enter and leave the parking area. No darkness will be here as they will control the lights. The transformers will be screened.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Bob Rosenwald of the Downtown Neighborhood Association [DNA], said he appreciates the petitioner's efforts to redesign the building. However, they continue to believe that the footprint is still too large. A firewall is here, but when they look at it, they see two buildings not four. The project is technically meeting the letter of the law, but in his view it is not meeting the spirit. There is no main door on the Hull Street side because of the individual apartment entrances. Using the main door in the other building tells him that this is really one building. Inside a hallway is here that goes the entire length and the only separation is the firewall. Mr. Rosenwald said the language in the building code permits firewalls

to define buildings which has been done in this case, but from the outside it looks like two large buildings. He said regarding the parking entry on Price Street, he realizes that the traffic from the lane is going west to east, but since the entrance is so enticing at Price Street, people will come down Price Street going southbound and turn in trying to go downhill. He is aware of this because he lives here and people go to Screaming Mimi's all the time going the wrong way on Hull Street.

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) thanked the petitioner for good faith efforts to restore the lane and also meet with the community, the design and preservation community, and the Downtown Neighborhood Association. This has been an evolution and they saw it. What is seen today is some fine-tuning. However, he believes that Mr. Rosenwald made some good points. Mr. Carey believes the staff's report and recommendations are on point. He thanked the petitioner for their willingness to make some adjustments such as the removal of the towers which will soften the corners of the building. Mr. Carey believes that something can be done with the rooftop element such as reducing it. He appreciates the petitioner's reference to the Old County Jail, but that is a little too much in terms of getting some interplay between those two elements.

Mr. Smith in response to the public comments, said the International Firewall Code is used to separate the buildings to less than 13,500 square feet per building. They are also using the firewall to separate the exterior expression in the building. On Oglethorpe Avenue, the firewall appears where it is expected to do so. It is their intent to relate more to the Police Barracks building and step down in terms of brick. They are using the Educational Building as their beginning point. They are attempting to separate the buildings at the firewall. He explained that the folks who might come down Price Street and try to make a right turn will be controlled by signage. He said concerning the tower on the south west corner, they agree and would like to have an expression here. They are willing to do some more roofline work.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board thanked the petitioner for the work that has been done, but still believes it is a large structure. The massing needs to be separated. They are aware of the purpose of the firewall, but the size of the structure is their concern. They are in agreement with the staff recommendation to continue this petition. They also agreed with the petitioner bringing Parts I and II at the same time. Factually, the Part II Design Detail might allow the petitioner to play around with the materiality.

Ms. Lynch polled the Board concerning their concern about the 30 foot parking parking setback. The Board did not have a problem with the parking setback as designed.

Mr. Smith said the Part II Design Details consist of a lot of work.

Ms. Lynch informed Mr. Smith that he is not obligated to do Part I and II at the same time. This was a recommendation from staff, but if he chooses, he can do Part I and Part II separately.

Mr. Smith asked for the continuance.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

Continue the request for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass to construct apartment buildings (four buildings per building code) on the vacant property located at 415 East Oglethorpe Avenue in order for the applicant to consider the following:

- 1.Reduce the exterior expression of all top levels of all buildings to a maximum of 10 feet (to the underside of the cornice) so that the height and proportions are more visually compatible;
- 2.Add a primary entrance to Building 2 East along Hull Street;
- 3.Revise the unusual roof parapet condition on the south and east façades of Building 2 East;
- 4.Remove all tower elements proposed on the buildings; once the tower elements have been removed, revise

the rooflines to ensure that the “roofline variation” standards are met. In the case that any tower elements remain in the design, the windows and/or vents are to be revised/removed so as not to appear that the space is habitable;

5.Add screening around the transformers.

Additionally, the Board permits the applicant to return to a future meeting with both Parts I and II for review by the Board.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Scott Cook

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

[18. Petition of JP Morgan Chase Bank | 19-002942-COA | 201 West Broughton Street | Signs](#)

[☞ Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Daniel Bowman was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Alyson Smith gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval to install new signage at 201 West Broughton Street. Two illuminated fascia signs are proposed. One will orient towards West Broughton Street and the other will orient towards Barnard Street. One supplemental I.D. sign is proposed next to the primary entrance. Two additional interior signs are proposed to hang within approximately 3 feet of the storefront.

Ms. Smith reported that staff recommends approval of the signage at 201 West Broughton Street with the following conditions:

1. Omit the interior illuminated hanging sculpted octagon signs.
2. Submit material samples for the signs.
3. Ensure the fascia signs do not project out from the building façade more than 15 inches.
4. Ensure the signs are halo lit, not face lit.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Bowman said they have removed the two interior hanging octagon signs. The signs will not project more than 15 inches from the building and they will ensure that the signs are halo lit, not face lit.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DECISION

The Board agreed with the staff's recommendations.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for signage at 201 West Broughton Street with the following conditions:

- 1.Omit the interior illuminated hanging sculpted octagon signs.
- 2.Submit material samples for the signs.
- 3.Ensure the fascia signs do not project out from the building façade more than 15 inches.
- 4.Ensure the signs are halo lit, not face lit.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Stan Houle

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

[19. Petition of Scott Singeisen | 19-002943-COA | 519 East Gordon Lane | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

- 🔗 [19-002943-COA Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Application and submission packet - 519 East Gordon Lane 19-002943-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previously Approved Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previously Approved Submittal Packet - Mass Model.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previously Approved Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previously Approved 18-000916-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previously Approved Board Decision 18-000916-COA.pdf](#)

Phil Kiely and Jody Krall were present on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Ryan Jarles gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval to add a second story

dwelling to an existing one-story garage at the rear of the property located at 519 East Gordon Street because the previous COA received on March 14, 2018 expired March 14, 2019 [18-000916-COA]. Per the Savannah Historic District application requirements: "Additions that are equal to or exceed the size of the existing building will be reviewed as new construction." Therefore, this review is for Part I, New Construction of a two-story carriage house because the second story will be equal to the size of the existing garage building. The following amendments are included with this application:

1. Changing of roof form to include an overhang.
2. Height change from 21'-10" to 23'-10"
3. Inclusion of trim piece delineating first and second floor.
4. Shifting the window grouping on the right elevation by 1'- 6-13/32" to the right.
5. Inclusion of a projecting roof feature.
6. Enlarging the left and right elevation on the second floor 1'-2" to include a second story overhang on the rear elevation.

Mr. Jarles stated that the main building and the garage were constructed in 2006-2007 and are not contributing structures within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District or the Savannah Local Historic District. In May 2006, the Board approved new construction of the main house and the one-story garage [File No. HRB 06-3526-2]. Part of this project recombined what was previously two lots that historically had a two-story wood duplex on the street facing portion; the rear was divided into two more lots with single story dwelling units on them that faced the lane. This was the common configuration throughout this area. Very little of the rear/lane context remains; most lots have been recombined to include the lane lots. One row of seven lane dwellings exists to the east of this site. New construction lane buildings consist of one and two-story garage and dwellings.

Mr. Jarles stated that on March 14, 2018 the Board approved Part I, Height and Mass to add a second story dwelling to an existing one-story garage at the rear of the property located at 519 East Gordon Street [18-000916-COA]. Part II, New Construction of a two-story carriage house was approved on April 11, 2018. The applicant is resubmitting Part I, Height and Mass because the COA expired on March 14, 2019 and work had not begun.

Mr. Jarles reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass to add a second story dwelling to an existing one-story garage at the rear of the property located at 519 East Gordon 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 door frames and window sashes are inset no less than 3 inches from the face of the building.
2. Ensure that the railings do not exceed 36 inches high, that the baluster spacing does not exceed 4 inches, and add a bottom rail to railing.
3. Provide the HVAC unit and refuse storage locations; ensure that they are screened from the public rights-of-way.
4. Return the roof to the original design found in approval [18-000916-COA] or revise the design to a roof form permitted by the standard.
5. Remove the projecting roof feature in its entirety.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Kiely said the light shaft is designed to look like a chimney. There is not a house within 100 feet that does not have a chimney sticking out of the roof. The shaft will provide light and ventilation without having direct sunlight. The windows will be compatible with the house in the front.

Ms. Judy Krall said they agree with the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Dodge asked the petitioners if there was a reason why they changed the roof from its original configuration.

Mr. Kiely said he believes they did not want the roof to extend beyond the face of the building. They wanted it to look like the building in the front. This is why they wanted the cantilever on the roof. They talked about a hip roof, but this would make it taller.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the roof. The Board was in agreement with the staff recommendations.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for Part I, Height and Mass to add a second story dwelling to an existing one-story garage at the rear of the property located at 519 East Gordon 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 door frames and window sashes are inset no less than 3 inches from the face of the building.
- 2.Ensure that the railings do not exceed 36 inches high, that the baluster spacing does not exceed 4 inches, and add a bottom rail to railing.
- 3.Provide the HVAC unit and refuse storage locations; ensure that they are screened from the public rights-of-way.
- 4.Return the roof to the original design found in approval [18-000916-COA] or revise the design to a roof form permitted by the standard.
- 5.Remove the projecting roof feature in its entirety.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Scott Cook

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Nay
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

20. Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 19-002968-COA | 719 East Broad Street | Alterations

📎 [Mercer Ward.pdf](#)

📎 [Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

📎 [719 E Broad - Material Selections -Reduced size-.pdf](#)

📎 [1903.00-190524_719 E Broad-HBR Submission_reduced size.pdf](#)

[Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

NOTE:

Ms. Debra Caldwell left the meeting at 4:51 p.m.

Ms. Lynch recused herself from participating in this petition. She is part owner of Lynch Associates Architects

Mr. Dwayne Stephens, Vice-Chair, chaired this hearing.

Mr. Justin Bienvenu was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Alyson Smith gave the staff report. The applicant is proposing to alter the non-contributing commercial building located at 719 East Broad Street. The building features two primary facades along East Gwinnett Street and East Broad Street. Both facades will be completely altered to include new windows, doors, canopies, light fixtures and material finish. The building currently features two tenant spaces and the intent is to create four commercial spaces. The number and location of the entrances are proposed to change along East Broad Street. The building is proposed to be stuccoed with Portland cement and feature aluminum storefront windows with tile and wood panel bases, metal canopies and transom windows. An existing cooler is currently screened by a wood fence along East Gwinnett Street. The existing cooler will remain on site. The wood fence will be demolished, and the cooler will be screened with a new stucco finished wall with aluminum green wall lattice. Signage will be submitted under another COA application.

Ms. Smith reported that staff recommends approval of the alterations at 719 East Broad Street with the following conditions:

1. Provide/note the location of the electric meter, HVAC units and refuse storage for review.
2. Provide the percent of storefront glazing for review of compliance with the glazing standard.
3. Submit all color samples for all materials to staff for review and approval. Confirm that the stucco will have a smooth finish.
4. Omit the aluminum awnings and use either a fabric awning or a metal canopy.
5. Ensure the storefront glazing is inset a minimum of four inches from the face of the building.
6. Ensure an encroachment permit is obtained for the awnings and canopies.
7. Submit a COA application for all signage.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Bienvenu said they agree with the staff recommendations.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board was in agreement with the staff recommendation.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations at 719 East Broad Street with the following conditions:

1. Provide/note the location of the electric meter, HVAC units and refuse storage for review.
2. Provide the percent of storefront glazing for review of compliance with the glazing standard.

3. Submit all color samples for all materials to staff for review and approval. Confirm that the stucco will have a smooth finish.
4. Omit the aluminum awnings and use either a fabric awning or a metal canopy.
5. Ensure the storefront glazing is inset a minimum of four inches from the face of the building.
6. Ensure an encroachment permit is obtained for the awnings and canopies.
7. Submit a COA application for all signage.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Debra Caldwell	- Not Present
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

[21. Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 19-002969-COA | 132 East Broughton Street | Amendment and Variance Request](#)

📎 [19-002969-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

📎 [Project Narrative - Variance Criteria.pdf](#)

📎 [Previous Submittal Packet - Narrative, Specifications, Materials, and Colors.pdf](#)

📎 [Historic Photos.pdf](#)

📎 [Previous Submittal Packet - Photos and Drawings.pdf](#)

NOTE:

Ms. Debra Caldwell left the meeting at 4:51 p.m.

Ms. Lynch recused herself from participating in this petition. She is part owner of Lynch Associates Architects

Mr. Dwayne Stephens, Vice-Chair, chaired this hearing.

Ms. Jennifer Deacon was present on behalf of the petition

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for amendments to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitation, alterations, and a rooftop addition for the property located at 132 East Broughton Street [File No. 19-001564-COA]. The amendment includes adding an outdoor bar to the previously approved rooftop addition. The applicant states that the outdoor bar will consist of: a 42" high countertop for guests with a 36" high countertop area for workers that would allow for the installation of sinks, ice machines, storage, and other bar equipment. It will be located underneath the previously approved rooftop trellis which will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way; therefore, it is highly likely that the outdoor bar will not be visible at all.

The applicant is also requesting a variance from the standard that states:

Habitable space such as restrooms, bars, dining areas, etc. within a roof or structures above a roof used other than to enclose stairways or elevator machinery shall be considered a story.

to exclude an outdoor bar as a “habitable space” under this standard.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for amendments to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness to add a rooftop bar on top of the building located at 132 East Broughton Street [File No. 19-001564-COA] because the proposed amendment is visual compatible/will not be seen from a public right-of-way.

Ms. Michalak additionally reported that staff recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the standard that states:

Habitable space such as restrooms, bars, dining areas, etc. within a roof or structures above a roof used other than to enclose stairways or elevator machinery shall be considered a story.

to exclude an outdoor bar as a “habitable space” under this standard because two of the variance criteria are met.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Deacon thanked the staff for working with them on their amendment and variance request. They are in agreement with the staff recommendations. Ms. Deacon entertained questions from the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said he believes that vertical louvers were on this building at one time. He believes that the louvers aren't there now. Is there any consideration for them to be reinstalled? Mr. Carey said it appears that there is a different treatment on the eastern facade.

Mr. Jakob Von Trapp, the developer, in an answer to Mr. Carey's question, explained that this building had vertical louvers that were thought to move with the sun. In 1991, this building was acquired by the City. In early 2000, the louvers were put in storage as it was believed that they were not working. But the louvers have not been found. Mr. Von Trapp stated that he thinks what is seen is the way the bricks will look when they are cleaned. The bricks will have a blueish tone.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board was in agreement with the staff recommendation. The Board agreed to recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the standard that states: "*Habitable space such as restrooms, bars, dining areas, etc. within a roof or structures above a roof used other than to enclose stairways or elevator machinery shall be considered a story*" to exclude an outdoor bar as a “habitable space” under this standard because two of the variance criteria are met.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

Approve amendments to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness to add a rooftop bar on top of the building located at 132 East Broughton Street [File No. 19-001564-COA] because the proposed amendment is visual compatible/will not be seen from a public right-of-way.

Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the standard that states:

Habitable space such as restrooms, bars, dining areas, etc. within a roof or structures above a roof used other than to enclose stairways or elevator machinery shall be considered a story.

to exclude an outdoor bar as a “habitable space” under this standard because two of the variance criteria are met.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Scott Cook

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Debra Caldwell	- Not Present
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

[22. Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 19-003129-COA | 620 East River Street | Rescind 16-006951-COA, New Construction Hotel](#)

- 📎 [Application - 620 East River Street 19-003129-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [COA - 620 East River Street \[Hilton Hotel\] 16-006851-COA Denial.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Correspondence 5-21-19.pdf](#)
- 📎 [7-12-17 Part I Approval - Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- 📎 [2012 COA and Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Aerial.pdf](#)
- 📎 [New Franklin Ward Wharf Lots MAP B.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Photos and Mass Model.pdf](#)
- 📎 [16-006851-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Ms. Lynch stated that the applicant is requesting that the Historic District Board of Review rescind the previous decision for denial of “the petition for New Construction: Part 1, Height and Mass for an eight-story hotel building to be located on the vacant parcel at 620 East River Street based on the incompatibility of the project as outlined in the Staff Recommendation” made at the May 8, 2019 HDBR Meeting.

DECISION: The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby rescind the previous decision for denial of “the petition for New Construction: Part 1, Height and Mass for an eight-story hotel building to be located on the vacant parcel at 620 East River Street based on the incompatibility of the project as outlined in the Staff Recommendation” made at the May 8, 2019 HDBR Meeting.

Mr. Matt Lonnerstater, Development Planner and the Zoning Board of Appeals [ZBA] Secretary, gave the ZBA report. The HDBR approved the COA for Part I: Height and Mass on July 12, 2017 with four conditions, “to be submitted with Part II: Design Details.”

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

Mr. Lonnerstater stated that the HDBR approved a 12-month extension to the approved COA (Part I) on June 13, 2018. Thus, the approved COA (Part I) remains valid until its expiration in July, 2019. The conditions stated above need to be addressed in Part II. Failure to satisfy these conditions can lead to a motion of denial for Part II.

Mr. Lonnerstater said the petitioners proposed amendments to the approved COA (Part I) was held on May 8th, 2019. The HDBR subsequently voted to deny the entire COA request, essentially rescinding the previously-approved COA (Part I).

Mr. Lonnerstater stated that the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) is silent on the process for reviewing amendments to approved COAs. However, upon a cursory review of the case history, it appears that HDBR’s May 8, 2019 deliberation and motion should have pertained only to the proposed amendment, not to the previously-approved COA as a whole (i.e. “motion to approve/deny the proposed amendments to approved COA (Part I) for file 16-006851-COA.”)

Mr. Lonnerstater explained that if the proposed amendments are denied, the 12-month extension still applies to the original COA (expiring in July). If the proposed amendments are approved, the 12-month period starts anew.

Ms. Lynch explained that according to Robert Rules of Order, a petition can only be made active again by a Board member to making a motion to reconsider or/and rescind a motion. This petition would need a continuance motion or approval in order to make the petition active again.

Ms. Michalak explained, for clarity, let’s assume that the Board did not hear this petition last month, that COA would still be active until today’s deadline. After this point, it would expire with no more extensions allowed.

Ms. Lynch stated that it appears that what staff suggested the wording of the motion and the extent of the vote held on May 8, 2019 was beyond what was put before them at that meeting.

Mr. Lonnerstater explained that the four conditions that were put before the Board for Part I Height and Mass on July 12, 2017 had stipulations that had to be addressed in Part II. Therefore, the COA is still valid because Part II has not been submitted and the Board has not acted on Part II to see whether those conditions were satisfied. But, if the amendments were approved, basically, the Board would be restarting this. But if they were denied, the previous COA still applies as well as the 12-month extension from the original date of 2018.

Ms. Michalak said ultimately, the project ends up the same as expiring, but just under a different circumstance, a denial of the amendments as opposed to the denial of the COA.

Ms. Everett explained that a motion is needed to rescind the actions taken by the Board at the meeting of May 8, 2019.

Ms. Michalak stated that if the motion to reconsider/rescind is approved, then the Board will hear it and make a new decision.

Ms. Everett said the Board does not need to re-hear it. A decision would need to be made upon what they have already heard.

Mr. Dodge asked if action on this appeal has been heard by the ZBA.

Mr. Lonnerstater explained that the ZBA meeting is scheduled for June 27, 2019. Notices have been sent and the appeal has been advertised. However, since he is the secretary of ZBA and reviewing the decision, he saw where the entire COA was denied when the four conditions only applied to Part II. But, the amendments are still a valid topic for decision.

Upon motion of Ms. Isaacs, seconded by Mr. Houle, and carried unanimously, the Board rescinded the motion made at the meeting of May 8, 2019 to deny the petition for New Construction: Part 1, Height and Mass for an eight-story hotel building to be located on the vacant parcel at 620 East River Street based on the incompatibility of the project as outlined in the Staff Recommendation.”

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay came forward and introduced the persons accommodating him at today's meeting. He pointed out that when they came before the Board a couple of months ago, they came with the intent of demonstrating that they had met all four conditions that were in the original approval from 2017. A significant error was in the staff's report and recommendation. The staff recommendation and report referred to a setback from River Street but what was intended was that the setback be from the Savannah river. This is the reason he asked to be able to have more discussion on the first two items that were in the staff's recommendation. The second error occurred in the decision as it stated that he as the applicant said he would not comply with the first two items in the staff report. Mr. Shay said in fact he never said that as he does want to comply with it and wants to add in the record today that they want to comply with it. Mr. Shay said he wants to fully comply with the four conditions that were in the original decision of July 12, 2017.

Mr. Shay said staff made nine recommendations at the meeting held on May 8, 2019. They want to comply with all nine of those conditions. In a matter of fairness, they came forward a month ago with the intent to take down the information and have time to submit it for their Part II Design Details before the expiration which does not occur until July 12, 2019. The Board will have another meeting before July 12, 2019. He wanted to submit to the Board that if there is any fairness since they have cost them a month with this situation, that they should have an additional month to submit the information for the Part II Design Details. Mr. Shay said he wanted to further reinforce the statement that he made today which is included in the drawings that he has submitted that they fully intent to comply with the four conditions of July, 2017 and the nine staff recommendations of May 8, 2019. The drawings will show that the setback is not from River Street but from the Savannah river.

Mr. Shay said rather than for the Board to deny their petition again, he was asking for a continuance in order for them to correct the situation in a way that is fair and equitable to his client. He asked Attorney Harold Yellin to come and make his presentation.

Attorney Yellin came forward and said he was representing Northpoint Hospitality. He said the motion to rescind recognizes that the COA did not expire until after that meeting. Mr. Shay comes before this Board a lot. This is a complicated project. They appreciate that the denial has been rescinded. The applicant may now submit Part II. He said Mr. Shay wanted a continuation and got a denial. They have been working on this petition since 2012. Every time the petitioner got input from the Review Board, he came back with the requested information. The petitioner needs to be given back the month that was taken.

Mr. Dodge asked Mr. Shay if he was asking that he be allowed to submit Part II in August, 2019.

Mr. Shay said he was asking the Board to grant them a continuance for approval based on the information that was before them last month. They have been working on this project since 2012. They have have gone along every step of the way and presented to this Board faithfully to show that they meet the conditions. They have asked for the Board's input and the input of their predecessors over and over. Every time they have gotten input from the Board, they have done their best to come back with answers to the concerns. As he understands, they have until July 12 to come back with Part II. Mr. Shay said the Board should do what is right and give them back the month that was taken from them.

Mr. Dodge asked Mr. Shay again if he was asking to submit Part II at the August 14, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Shay answered that he was asking for a continuance and they will put Part II together soon, but within a reasonable amount of time with the consideration that they have lost time in coming back to the Board.

Mr. Dodge asked Mr. Shay if he was asking Part II be held in August, 2019 rather than July, 2019.

Mr. Shay said except for the various events, they would have had July 12, 2019 to make their submission for Part II. They came back with information from this Board showing how they intended to meet the four conditions from 2017 so they would know exactly what to do with Part II. He does not know what the Board's intentions are regarding this request. Mr. Shay said they will do their best to meet the legal requirements. But, they are asking the Board to be fair.

Ms. Isaacs said this has been before the Board since 2012. The project has come back with amendments, extensions, etc. The ordinance that they are working under is no longer in effect. The project has failed to meet the comments from the staff to the Board since 2012 to get it approved so that the building could be constructed. She believes the issue for denial from the last meeting, although it was not said properly, was justified because the project does not even meet the ordinance of 2012. The ordinance in effect now is even more strict. Ms. Isaacs said she hopes that the petitioner does not feel that the Board was mean before as what they were trying to do was to ensure that intelligent and thoughtful new construction projects are being built in the Historic District. She asked Mr. Shay since 2012, why has this not been done?

Mr. Shay answered that in 2012 they came forward with River Street East which is a four acre parcel and presented the master plan for all the parcels for River Street East. That process took a while as they were deciding what would be on each parcel of land. Eventually, the master plan was approved. This master plan included one of the parcels they are talking about now, which is 620 East River Street. Subsequent to the master plan approval, they came back with Part I and then Part II for the projects within River Street East. Homewood Suites were constructed and the next project was AC East Hotel and the parking garage. They have made very good progress and have been demonstrating over and over to the satisfaction of the previous Board that they met all the standards from the 2012 ordinance which was the ordinance that was in place during the time they were approved. He explained that in 2016 and 2017, they came forward with the petition for the Hilton Hotel and Hotel Ann. In July, 2017 they were given approval for Part I with four conditions. This meant that they met the standards, but that they needed to come back and demonstrate how they were going to meet these four conditions. The reason they came forward at that time was that they were persuaded by City Government that they would assist with the parking structure just as they had done at the west end of River Street for the Kessler project. However, the City changed their minds. Therefore, the developer moved back to the AC Hotel. It is not right for the Board to infer that they have been shirking is not true. They have been presenting the project for seven years and they will continue to do so as they go forward.

Ms. Michalak informed the Board that the only thing now in front of them is the same conditions that were before them last month which the applicant is requesting approval for amendments to New Construction: Part 1, Height and Mass for an eight-story hotel building to be located on the vacant parcel at 620 East River Street. The amendment includes:

- A reduction in height of the rooftop architectural elements and the voids eliminated;
- Reduction in the depth of the porte-cochere;
- Significant alterations to the upper building mass "to provide more continuity in setback between the west and the north facades, and the upper building mass stepped back at the northwest corner to preserve better views of the river."
- The central courtyard on the upper building mass has been reoriented to face west rather than east toward the Marriott.

Ms. Michalak said she wanted to make clear the staff's concerns as outlined in the staff report of May 8, 2019.

Either reduce the overall building mass to the 2012 volume or increase the setback from River Street further, more similar to the 54-foot (+/-) setback from the west façade.

The recommendation should have stated from the river not from River Street. But, this has been written as such for a few years.

She strongly believes that the Board understood exactly what was being asked. The correction is setback from the river as this was the Board's intention.

Ms. Michalak said the second error was not in the staff's report, but was stated in the Board's decision where staff added as they do often a paragraph about the Board's discussion which is meant to help understand what happened between the staff's recommendation for continuance and the Board's decision for denial. She said she wrote this statement afterward. It was stated in this decision that the applicant stated that he did not agree to make those changes. Mr. Shay made her aware that he did not say that and she listened to the proceedings many times and he is correct.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Keith Howington stated that he has been in the architectural world approximately 20 years and was a member of the Historic District Board of Review for six and one-half years. He served as chairman of the Board for two years. It is unprecedented to have the petitioner ask for a continuance and then gets denied. He is not speaking for or against the petition, but speaking as a concerned individual. He explained that the City Manager actually came to the meetings several times during the hearing of this petition. The petitioner has met all the criteria and followed the recommendations of the staff and Board. The petitioners are within their legal rights as long as the petition has been active since 2012.

Ms. Lynch asked staff how many amendments have been asked for this portion of the project.

Ms. Michalak, in answer to Ms. Lynch's question, provided the amendments information.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the amount of time that should be allowed for them to hear this petition again. They agreed that an offer for an extension needs to be given to a date certain.

Upon motion of Ms. Isaacs, seconded by Mr. Stephens and carried unanimously, a continuance, which included the staff's nine recommendations and showing that the setback was from the river and not River Street, was granted to the petitioner to be presented no later than December 11, 2019.

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby rescind the previous decision for denial of "the petition for New Construction: Part 1, Height and Mass for an eight-story hotel building to be located on the vacant parcel at 620 East River Street based on the incompatibility of the project as outlined in the Staff Recommendation" made at the May 8, 2019 HDBR Meeting.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Stan Houle

Debra Caldwell	- Not Present
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye

Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

[23. Petition of Studio Architects | 17-005582-COA | 601 Indian Street | Request for 12-Month Extension for New Construction](#)

📎 [17-005582-COA - 12 month extention.pdf](#)

📎 [Request for Extension.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approval a 12-month extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) issued on May 9, 2018 for New Construction Part I and Part II at 601 Indian Street [File No. 17-005582-COA] to expire on May 9, 2020.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Stan Houle

Debra Caldwell	- Not Present
Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

[24. Petition of Historic Savannah Properties | 19-002441-COA | 52 East Broad Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

📎 [COA - 52 East Broad Street 19-002441-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [20190509_161152.jpg](#)

📎 [20190509_161204.jpg](#)

📎 [20190509_161205.jpg](#)

📎 [20190509_161213.jpg](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[25. Petition of Ray Hoover | 19-002450-COA | 532 East Harris Street | Staff Approved - Shingle Roof](#)

📎 [COA - 532 East Harris Street 19-002450-COA.pdf](#)

☺ [532 E Harris - New Shingle Color.png](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[26. Amended Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 19-002456-COA | 501 Montgomery Street | Staff Approved - Beveled Roofline](#)

☺ [COA - 501 Montgomery Street - 19-002456-COA.pdf](#)

☺ [Submittal Packet - 501 Montgomery Street 19-002456-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[27. Petition of Ray Hoover | 19-002470-COA | 219 York Street | Staff Approved - Repair Gutter System](#)

☺ [COA - 219 East York Street 19-002470-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[28. Petition of Katherine Allen Culp | 19-002605-COA | 127 East Gordon Street | Staff Approved - Color Change, Stucco Repair, Eave Repair](#)

☺ [COA - 127 East Gordon Street 19-002605-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[29. Petition of Anne Pappas | 19-002642-COA | 101 West Liberty Street | Staff Approved - Color Change and Minor Stucco Repairs](#)

☺ [COA - 101 West Liberty Street 19-002642-COA.pdf](#)

☺ [Submittal Packet - 101 West Liberty Street 19-002642-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[30. Petition of Coastal Empire Habitat for Humanity | 19-002643-COA | 701 MLK Jr. Blvd | Staff Approved - Replace an Existing Gate](#)

☺ [COA - 701 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard 19-0026543-COA.pdf](#)

☺ [Submittal Packet - 701 MLK, Jr. Blvd 19-002643-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[31. Petition of Doug Patten for City of Savannah | 19-002670-COA | 200 Abercorn Street | Staff Approved - Replacing Light Poles](#)

☺ [COA - 200 Abercorn Street 19-002670-COA.pdf](#)

☺ [Submittal Packet - 200 Abercorn Street 19-002670-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[32. Amended Petition of John Hughes for LS3P | 19-002721-COA | 229 West Congress Street | Staff Approved - Stair Enclosure, Roof Mechanical Exhaust Chase, Screen Wall; Parapet Height; Rooftop Exterior Light fixtures](#)

☺ [COA - 229 West Congress Street 19-002721-COA.pdf](#)

☺ [SUBMITTAL 19-002721-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[33. Petition of Amy Schultz for Metalcrafts, a Tecta America Co., LLC | 19-002925-COA | 18 Abercorn Street | Staff Approved - Roof Replacement](#)

☞ [COA - 18 Abercorn Street 19-002925-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 18 Abercorn Street 19-002995-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. Petition of Matt Deacon for Alchemy Restoration | 19-002759-COA | 20 West Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Planters

No action required. Staff approved.

35. Petition of Sam Carroll for Carroll Construction | 19-002975-COA | 113 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Roof Repair

☞ [COA - 113 East Oglethorpe Avenue 19-002975-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. Petition of Perry Brandon for NUCO Investments | 19-002940-COA | 220 West Bryan Street | Staff Approved - Awning

☞ [COA - 220 West Bryan Street 19-002940-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 220 West Bryan Street 19-002940-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. Petition of Kevin Rose | 19-003081-COA | 611 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Color Change, Windows

☞ [COA - 611 East Bay Street 19-003081-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 611 East Bay Street 19-003081-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. Petition of Coastal Products, LLC | 19-003093-COA | 419 West Congress Street | Staff Approved - Awnings

☞ [COA - 419 West Congress Street 19-003093-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 419 West Congress Street 19-003093-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. Petition of Avant Dantis | 19-003135-COA | 207 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Color Change

☞ [COA - 207 Bull Street 19-003135-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - Exterior Finshes 207 Bull Street 19-003135-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet 1 - 207 Bull Street 19-003135-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. Petition of Donnie Rushing | 19-003146-COA | 412-B Whitaker Street | Staff Approved - Awning

☞ [COA - 412B Whitaker Street 19-003146-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 412B Whitaker Street 19-003146-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. Petition of Jason Bartek | 19-003179-COA | 317 East Jones Street | Staff Approved - In-kind Window Repairs, Color Change

☞ [COA - 317 East Jones Street 19-003179-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[42. Petition of Heritage Construction Savannah, Inc. | 19-003187-COA | 25 West Oglethorpe Lane | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

☞ [COA - 25 West Oglethorpe Lane 19-003187-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 25 West Oglethorpe Lane 19-003187-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[43. Petition of Josh Parker for Greenleaf Construction and Restoration LLC | 19-003190-COA | 322 East Harris Street | Staff Approved - Window and Siding](#)

☞ [COA - 322 East Harris Street 19-003190-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 322 East Harris Street 19-003190-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

[44. Report on Work Performed Without a COA for the June 12, 2019 HDBR Meeting](#)

☞ [Report on Work Performed Without a COA for the June 12, 2019 HDBR Meeting.pdf](#)

Ms. Lynch said the staff has given the report to the Board.

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

[45. June Report on Stamped Drawings for HDBR](#)

☞ [JUNE REPORT - Stamped Drawings.pdf](#)

Ms. Michalak explained that this item is required as stated in the Board's by-laws. Until a few years ago, staff actually created this report to include items that they stamped for approval. She explained that staff recently had a situation which caused them to go back to doing this as they were not tracking the drawings that they were approving.

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

[46. Update on Ordinance Amendments](#)

☞ [6-12-2019 - Section 8-3030 Proposed Revisions to Time Limitations.pdf](#)

Ms. Michalak said at the last meeting, the Board asked the staff to take a look at the ordinance concerning time limitations. She gave the presentation on the update on Ordinance Amendments.

Ms. Michalak said staff is proposing that another item be added under the 12 month extension which will show why the Board does not have to issue an extension. She said this would be shown as item c. The staff has added a #2.

Ms. Isaacs said she was recommending adding subsection A, showing building significantly changes such as masses or stories need to be submitted. They can say lot coverage of building orientation, number of stories/buildings height.

The Board discussed the number of continuances that could possibly be allowed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said based on their recent experiences with reviewing and amending the ordinance, they have looked at this from all angles. Smaller groups have gotten together in an attempt to work things out. Some kind of legal counseling or opinion needs to be given. He does not want to oversimplify things, but he can tell the Board from his being informed with Recorder's Court about every month, it is up to the discretion of the judge what happens with the project that is before them. Generally, they afford a 30, 60 or 90 days extension. As a judge in this case, is the Review Board. At some point in their process, the Board might feel that it is an exercise in futility. This would be at the Board's discretion.

Mr. Carey explained that when someone is present at Recorder's Court for being out of compliance, it is sort of attached to what is going on such as let's look at it. They hear from those people and if it is good, they are told that they will see them next month and are told the things that they have to do to meet the benchmarks and then come back and show them what they have done to meet it.

Mr. Shay said when the recent ordinance amendments were being presented, Brooks Stillwell who was the City Attorney at that time made it clear to all of them who had concerns with this regard that the new ordinance would not apply to projects that were already in progress. When they asked that this be placed in the ordinance, Mr. Stillwell said they did not have to because it is a matter of Georgia State Law. Mr. Shay said once a person has gotten approval, it goes not just go away unless there are reasons for it. If the Board wants developers or others to bend in their direction to the things they want and to the ordinance, then they must think of incentives to do this; not rules to make it more difficult. As long as the petitioner is making an honest effort to make their project better by the Board's standards, then they should not try to figure ways to make it more difficult for them.

Mr. Shay said going back to City Council and getting them to rule on the ordinance will be difficult. He said he has heard City Council say instead of one year extension, may be it should be three years. As long as everybody is working hard to make progress, he does not believe that the Board should try to punish them.

Mr. Howington said Brooks Stillwell made it clear that some things take longer than 12 months.

Ms. Michalak said the ordinance does not mention 12 months as a continuance since the Board can give a continuance to a date certain. The Boards have not been exercising this date certain, but they can do so.

Ms. Lynch explained that before they change wordings within the ordinance, she believes it would be worthwhile to look at other ordinances within the State of Georgia. She does not believe what they are discussing is intended to punish people so they can not do their projects, but she believes they are trying to keep it within a reasonable time. The Board wants to better serve the community. This was not coming from the petition that was before them last month, but from a preservation seminar they had in January.

[47. Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, June 13, 2019 at 3:30 p.m. in the Meyer Conference Room, MPC 110 East State Street](#)

[48. Next Pre-Meeting - Wednesday, July 10, 2019 at 12:00 p.m. in the Jerry Surrency Room, MPC, 112 East State Street](#)

[49. Next Regular Meeting - Wednesday, July 10, 2019 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur Mendonsa Room, MPC, 112 East State Street](#)

[50. Alternate Meeting Location - Location to be Determined](#)

XV. ADJOURNMENT

[51. Adjournment](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Ms. Lynch adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ms. Leah Michalak
Director of Historic Preservation

LGM: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.