



## Savannah Historic District Board of Review

---

Chatham County Commission Chambers  
September 11, 2017 1:00 P.M.  
Meeting Minutes

### SEPTEMBER 11, 2019 SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

A Pre-Meeting was held at 12:00 PM in the Chatham County Green Room, 124 Bull Street. Items on the Agenda were presented by Staff, as time permitted, and the Board asked questions. No testimony was received and no votes were taken.

Members Present:                   Becky Lynch, Chair  
                                          Dwayne Stephens, Vice-Chair  
                                          Debra Caldwell  
                                          Scott Cook  
                                          Stan Houle  
                                          Ellie Isaacs  
                                          Melissa Memory  
                                          Nan Taylor

Members Absent:                   David Altschiller  
                                          Kevin Dodge

MPC Staff Present:               Leah Michalak, Director of Historic Preservation  
                                          Ryan Jarles, Cultural Resources Planner  
                                          Alyson Smith, Historic Preservation Planner  
                                          Bri Finau, Administrative Assistant  
                                          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 Bloomquist Construction | 19-004633-COA | 9 West York Street | Roof Trellis](#)

📎 [19-004633-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

📎 [Street Views.pdf](#)

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

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a rooftop trellis over an existing roof deck for the property located at 9 West York Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Stan Houle

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

[3. Petition of Signs by James LLC | 19-004689-COA | 3 East Perry Street | Sign](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet - 3 East Perry Street 19-004689-COA.pdf](#)

[☞ 19-004689-COA Recommendation.pdf](#)

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the installation of a new projecting principal use sign with the following conditions because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards;

1. Reduce the size of the sign to 5 square feet;
2. Ensure that the work is undertaken using the gentlest means possible;
3. Ensure that an encroachment license is obtained from the City of Savannah.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Stan Houle

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present

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

[4. Petition of LS3P Associates Ltd. | 19-004728-COA | 110 Ann Street | Amendments to New Construction](#)

- [19-004728-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet - Narrative.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- [Mass Model Photographs.pdf](#)
- [Previously Approved Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for amendments to the previously approved new construction hotel for the property located at 110 Ann Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Stan Houle

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

[5. Petition of Alchemy Restoration | 19-004734-COA | 318 W Taylor Street | Addition](#)

- [318 WEST TAYLOR HDBR SUBMITTAL - DRAWINGS.pdf](#)
- [318 WEST TAYLOR HDBR SUBMITTAL - MATERIALS.pdf](#)
- [19-004734-COA Recommendation.pdf](#)

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a covered porch addition to the rear of 318 West Taylor Street as requested because the work meets the standards and is visually compatible.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Stan Houle

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

[6. Petition of Gillian Wagstaff | 19-004735-COA | 19 Jefferson Street | Sign](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[📎 19-004735-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a color change and a principal use fascia sign for the business located at 19 Jefferson Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Stan Houle

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

Ellie Isaacs - Aye

[7. Petition of David B. Kelley Historic Preservation Consulting | 19-004731-COA | 41 Habersham Street | Rehabilitation, Alterations](#)

- [☞ Site Plan - 41 Habersham Street 19-004731-COA.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - 41 Habersham Street 19-004731-COA.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet 2 - 41 Habersham Street 19-004731-COA.pdf](#)
- [☞ 19-004731-COA Recommandation.pdf](#)

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a new covered porch and staircase at the rear of 41 Habersham Street with the following conditions because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

1. Ensure the work is undertaken utilizing the gentlest means possible.
2. The porch roof be revised to be below the historic rafters but remain above the historic string course.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Stan Houle

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

**IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

[8. Adopt September 11, 2019 Agenda](#)

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby adopt the September 11, 2019 HDBR Agenda as presented.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Melissa Memory

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

**V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

[9. Approve August 14, 2019 Briefing Minutes and August 14, 2019 Regular Meeting Minutes](#)

[☞ August 14, 2019 HBR Briefing Minutes.docx](#)

[☞ 08.14.19 Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the August 14, 2019 HDBR Briefing and Meeting Minutes as presented.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Not Present
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Scott Cook	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Not Present
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Not Present
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 Architects | 16-006851-COA | 620 East River Street | Amendments to New Construction, Part I: Height Mass and Part II: Design Details](#)

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the request to continue petition to the October 9, 2019 HDBR Meeting.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Ellie Isaacs

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

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

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the request to continue petition to the October 9, 2019 HDBR Meeting.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Ellie Isaacs

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

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

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the request to continue petition to the October 9, 2019 HDBR Meeting.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Ellie Isaacs

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

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

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the request to continue petition to the October 9, 2019 HDBR Meeting.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Ellie Isaacs

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



[14. 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 approve the request to continue petition to the October 9, 2019 HDBR Meeting.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Ellie Isaacs

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

[15. 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 approve the request to continue petition to the October 9, 2019 HDBR Meeting.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Ellie Isaacs

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

[16. Petition of J. Elder Studio | 19-003464-COA | 513 East Jones Street | New Construction: Part II: Design Details](#)

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the request to continue petition to the October 9, 2019 HDBR Meeting.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Ellie Isaacs

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

[17. Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 19-004089-COA | 313-316 West River Street | Rehabilitation and Alterations](#)

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the request to continue petition to the October 9, 2019 HDBR Meeting.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Ellie Isaacs

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

[18. Petition of Ethos Preservation | 19-004724-COA | 219 East Charlton Street | Amendments and Alterations](#)

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the request to continue petition to the October 9, 2019 HDBR Meeting.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Ellie Isaacs

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

[19. Petition of Steven Bodek | 19-004739-COA | 446 Price Street | Porch Addition](#)

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the request to continue petition to the October 9, 2019 HDBR Meeting.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Ellie Isaacs

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

## IX. REGULAR AGENDA

### [20. Petition of Niles Bolton & Associates | 19-001562-COA | 415 East Oglethorpe Avenue | New Construction, Part II: Design Details](#)

- 🔗 [19-001562-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Narrative.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Materials and Specifications.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Photos and Drawings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Box Window Examples.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [HDBR Sample Panel Policy 080917.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 II, Design Details to construct apartment buildings (four buildings per building code) on the vacant property located at 415 East Oglethorpe Avenue. Ms. Michalak stated that Part I was reviewed by the Board on April 10, 2019 and 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.

**Ms. Michalak** additionally stated that 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).*

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** explained that on June 12, 2019, the HDBR reviewed Part I: Height and Mass for the second time. They voted to continue the project 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 permitted the applicant to return to a future meeting with both Parts I and II for review by the Board. However, they've only returned with Part I.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that on July 10, 2019, the HDBR reviewed and approved Part I: Height and Mass with no conditions. The applicant did not return to this meeting with Part II: Design Details. On August 14, 2019 the HDBR continued Part II: Design Details in order for the petitioner to:

Provide missing/clarify information:

1. Clarify window color selection.
2. Provide specifications and color selections for all door types.
3. Provide materials and details for the brackets and cornice between the 4th and 5th floors on Building 1 West.
4. Provide materials and colors for stair enclosures, elevator hoist ways, etc. above the roof surface.
5. Provide details, materials, and colors for each awning type/size on the buildings.
6. Provide details and sections of each balcony, porch, and stoop type.
7. Provide details, materials, and color selections for each stair type.
8. Provide a full size sample of the PlyGem 400 Series window for the Board to review to ensure it is an appropriate window for this large-scale project.

Revise the following design elements:

1. Revise window details. No molding, brick or otherwise, shall be around the windows that are within stuccoed areas. The stucco shall return back to the window frame which is to be inset 4 inches from the face of the building.
2. Fiber cement siding on projecting box windows, on predominately masonry buildings, is not visually compatible. Replace with a more appropriate material.
3. The texture proposed for the stucco is not visually compatible; revise to be a sand or smooth finish.
4. The “Old Pearl River” brick and mortar are not visually compatible; reselect to be less pink and beige.
5. The gray aluminum, stucco, and siding are all the same color; the monochromatic color palette is not visually

compatible. Provide more variation in color, including: darker aluminum railings and lighter stucco on the 5th floor of Built 1 West.

6. The lite pattern and the transom above the windows are not visually compatible. Simplify and vary the lite patterns on each building and remove the transom for larger double-hung windows that fill the openings.

**Mr. Smith** stated that they have reviewed the staff's comments regarding Part I. He explained that the question regarding the tongue and groove material below the box phase under the window can be a more monolithic piece of wood. They will do as requested regarding the main building entrances. These doors will be more public entrances. They can change the rectangular windows and eliminate the arch. Or if the Board will consider allowing for arched windows only. But a transom exists at these locations.

**Ms. Lynch** stated that the drawings that the Board are seeing now in the revised configuration shows that the upper story windows not have transoms and are six feet. She asked if these will be seven feet windows.

**Mr. Smith** answered that all the windows are seven feet.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Bob Rosenwald of the Downtown Neighborhood Association [DNA]**, expressed their appreciation for the restoration of the lane. Mr. Rosenwald said legally this is four buildings, but people will see two physically large buildings. He believes this contributes to Savannah's Landmark District being in a threatened status and hopes it does not happen again. They need to look at changing the ordinance to eliminate firewalls as a footprint separation.

**Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Savannah Historic Foundation [HSF]** agrees with the DNA that the footprint of the building is large. He stated his organization would like for future projects to have smaller massing. As the HSF had not seen the materials, he reviewed them on site at the meeting today.

**Mr. Smith** did not wish to comment on the public's comments.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board's discussion centered around the transoms above the windows and that the material be stucco and be a lighter color for all stair enclosures, elevator hoist ways, etc. above the roof surfaces. They were in agreement with the staff recommendations numbers 1, 2, 5, and 6. The Board was in agreement with staff recommendation #3, but modified that the French doors be more compatible with main entry doors on contributing buildings (**at main entrances only; excludes doors into individual units**). The Board also modified staff recommendation #4 that the transoms above all windows (**except at all arched window locations**); the windows are to remain the same size, but large double-hung windows are to be used to fill the openings.

#### **Motion**

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for New Construction: Part II, Design Details to construct apartment buildings on the vacant property located at 415 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Provide a sample panel per the Sample Panel Policy.
2. Change the tongue-and groove on the box windows to a wood panel design to be compatible with wood box windows on contributing masonry buildings.
3. Redesign the French doors to be more compatible with main entry doors on contributing buildings (at main entrances only; excludes doors into individual units).
4. Remove the transoms above all windows (except at all arched window locations); the window openings are to remain the same size, but larger double-hung windows are to be used to fill the openings.
5. Revise the material to be stucco and to be a lighter color for all stair enclosures, elevator hoist ways, etc. above the roof surface.
6. Ensure that each awnings type provides a minimum vertical clearance of eight feet (8') above the sidewalk.

7.Ensure that an encroachment license is obtained for any building components within the right-of-way.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Melissa Memory

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

[21. Petition of Homeline Architecture | 19-003463-COA | 109 East Jones Street | Addition and New Construction](#)  
Part II: Design Details

- 📎 [19-003463-COA Part II Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Sample Board for 19-003463-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [19013\\_HDBR II Packet\\_2019-08-14.pdf](#)
- 📎 [aerial map.pdf](#)
- 📎 [19013\\_HDBR Site Model\\_2019-06-12.pdf](#)
- 📎 [19-003463-COA Drawings Part II and Addition.pdf](#)
- 📎 [COA 19-003463 109 E JONES ST Part 1 Board Decision.pdf](#)

**Mr. Josh Bull** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Mr. Ryan Jarles** gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part II: Design Details for a 2-story carriage house and for an addition to the rear of the main building at 109 East Jones Street. A privacy fence is proposed on top of an existing courtyard wall. Two sections of existing brick walls on the east and west property lines will be demolished. A trellis will be constructed on the existing second story porch of the historic main structure. On July 10, 2019 the Board approved Part I: Height and Mass for the 2-story carriage house at 109 East Jones Street [19-003463-COA] with the following conditions to be provided with Part II: Design Details:

1. Provide locations for electric meter and refuse storage areas.

*The condition has been met. The refuse storage area is proposed to be within the garage. No new electric meter is proposed.*

2. Locate aprons within the garage.

*The condition has been met.*

3. Reduce the height of the fence to 11'-0".

*The condition has been met.*

4. Inset the doors and windows 0'-3".

*The condition has been met.*

5. Ensure that the distances between the balusters not exceed 4 inches and the height of the railing does not exceed 36 inches.

*The condition has been met.*

**Mr. Jarles** reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction, Part II: Design Details for a 2-story carriage house and for an addition to the rear of the main building at 109 East Jones Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because otherwise the work meets the standards and is visually compatible:

1. Increase the side inset of the addition to 1'-0";
2. Lower the height of the addition or create a hyphen between the addition and the historic structure to expose the string course;
3. Provide history of window opening that is proposed to be infilled;
4. Ensure that "Snap-in" or between-the-glass muntins are not used;
5. Revise brick to be less tumbled and be more refined.
6. Ensure that the work is undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Bull** stated they presently have a two-inch offset. As an example, he pointed out that a construction on the corner of Jones and Drayton Street has been approved. He pointed out further that they are also working on the addition at the back of 107 East Jones Street, which is directly west of this project. He showed the Board a drawing that was approved with a three inch setback to expose the corner. This addition covers up a string course. A new elevator addition is here and a control joint was approved for this condition. He believes that one foot is alot based on what has been approved in the past. They were only following things that have been already been approved. Mr. Bull said they are willing to go to four inches to give it a little more offset. He said going back to the neighboring addition that was approved and they are working on 107, 109 and 111, they are trying to keep the additions consistent across the board. This one was approved with a new parapet one foot below the existing parapet. This is the condition that they are providing with the neighboring addition as well so that there will be consistency between the two. Mr. Bull said they are not removing the string course and are not altering it at all. They are simply encapsulating it with the new addition. He explained that the problem of lowering it is that the overrun of the elevator pushes them up against the string course. Therefore, they cannot get a lower roof.

**Mr. Bull** showed the Board a picture of the window opening that is proposed to be infilled. They will ensure that "snap in" or between-the-glass muntins are not used. Their specification is for simulated divided light. He said the condition regarding revising brick to be less tumbled and be more defined - they have used a similar brick on Drayton Street between Macon and Charlton Streets. They are using the same manufacturer and this is a tumbled-type brick, but slightly different in color. The sample boards show the tumbled corners, but when they are put together they become more uniform. Mr. Bull said regarding the condition to ensure that the work is undertaken using the gentlest means possible, the contractor of this project has extensive experience working in the historic district and will use the gentlest means possible.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

All members of the Board echoed each other's comments that the staff's recommendation for 1' - 0" inset to retain the historic corner was too large of an inset and they agreed that a 0" -4" inset would be more appropriate. The Board agreed with the petitioner that if the historic string course is preserved, they would be comfortable approving the height of the addition as is, and they would remove the second condition to "lower the height of the addition or create a hyphen between the addition and the historic structure to expose the string course."

#### **Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for New Construction, Part II: Design Details for a 2-story carriage house and for an addition to the rear of the main building at 109 East



Jones Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because otherwise the work meets the standards and is visually compatible:

1. Increase the side inset of the addition to four inches;
2. Provide history of window opening that is proposed to be infilled;
3. Ensure that Snap-in or between-the-glass muntins are not used;
4. Revise brick to be less tumbled and be more refined.
5. Ensure that the work is undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Stan Houle

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

[22. Petition of Wubbena Architects | 19-004726-COA | 217 East Charlton Street | Design Amendment](#)

- 📎 [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Specifications.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Previously Approved Drawings 17-00712-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Violation Report.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Staff Site Visit Photo - September 2019.pdf](#)

**Mr. Henry Butler** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Alyson Smith** gave the staff presentation. The petitioner is requesting approval for an amendment to a previously approved COA to construct a front covered stoop at 217 East Charlton Street. The previous approval included the demolition of the non-historic front porch and the reconstruction of the original front porch using historic photographic documentation. The covered stoop was incorrectly constructed and has been a pending violation case with the MPC and City since the construction commenced in the beginning of 2018. The petitioner proposes to construct a new portico with a simplified design that does not seek to reconstruct the original historic covered stoop as previously approved. The existing roof is proposed to be maintained; however, the columns, balustrade, stoop piers and wood stairs will be demolished. Wood columns, brick stoop piers and simplified wood pickets are proposed.

**Ms. Smith** stated that on May 10, 2017, the HDBR approved the demolition of the existing front stoop and the reconstruction of historic stoop with conditions [File No. 17-000712-COA]. Prior to the May hearing, the request had been previously heard and continued at the March 8, 2017 hearing. In March of 2018, while work was in progress at 217 East Charlton Street, staff received multiple complaints from the public and noted the following inconsistencies at the site:

- The portico's columns & support posts did not match the design or proportions as approved and would need to be removed. The columns and posts are square & the columns lack the turned detailing.
- The balusters do not match the design or proportions as approved & would need to be removed.
- The newel post that was added to the center portion of the staircase would need to be removed. The newel post would need to be revised to match the drawing.
- The height of the balustrade would need to be reduced to 36 inches.

**Ms. Smith** explained that numerous meetings were held with the owner, architect and contractor to work towards a solution; however, the owner continued to work with a stop-work-order and finished the covered stoop. By the winter of 2019, no contact or response of intended compliance was made by the owner or owner's agents. The City's Code Compliance Officer summoned the owner to Recorder's Court and the case was first heard in court on January 16, 2019. The case was heard in court three additional times, until on June 5th the Judge dismissed the case with the understanding that the owner would submit a new COA application for an amendment to the previous design, as the owner had indicated was his intent and would apply for the June 12th deadline. The owner's petitioner submitted the COA application on July 30th. [A record of the violation report is attached to the agenda.]

**Ms. Smith** reported that staff recommends approval of the amendment to a previously approved COA to construct a covered stoop at 217 East Charlton Street with the following condition:

1. Provide a mortar sample to staff for review and approval.

### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Butler** came forward and said he was reared in the house next door at 219 East Charlton Street. His family moved here in the early 1960s. He said in 1980, he bought the house next door. His house was built in 1891 and 219 East Charlton in 1899. Mr. Butler said during his entire life when he would come out the house, he could see the outline of the entire porch. He realized that something was missing and he said to himself that one day he would do something about this. They have been working on this endeavor for almost three years and have done everything by "the book."

**Mr. Butler** showed the Board an image and said it is not a picture, but a photo shoppe image. This picture cannot be digitized. They have tried to do so. It is almost impossible to replicate it. The original set of plans they were given had no conditions on them. A stop work order was issued. The color that was used was the color of 219 East Charlton Street, which is the original color. He said just before he entered the door to this meeting today, he received a call from the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] and they informed him that they would like to go back and help him accomplish his original intent. All of them have rotted over the years and have been replaced. Mr. Butler said he wants to work with the HSF and take a noble effort of trying to preserve history. Air conditioning was just put in the house next door and the house on the corner is still not air conditioned.

**Mr. Butler** said he was told that he would need to make an easement and he would be happy to do so. He wants the history of the house to be preserved the right way. His building is probably the only building in the area close to its originality as when it was built. A hold was put on his vacation rentals that he does not believe is right. He has been working on his building trying to preserve history the right way. He met Mr. Arvey of HSF when he entered the meeting today who wants to speak to the Board regarding this matter. He entertained questions from the Board.

**Ms. Taylor** asked Mr. Butler if he was withdrawing his application and will resubmit at a later time.

**Mr. Butler** said they were at an impasse and the attorney told him that the only way to move forward was for him to withdraw the original application. He said this is all flawed because of micro-managing this photo shopped image. As he has stated, the picture cannot be digitized.

**Ms. Lynch** asked staff to give some input on this matter as it appears that the proposal before the Board today is being withdrawn. The Board is not able to evaluate things that are not before them.

**Mr. Butler** said something has to be done as this has been going on for three years and he has paid a ton of money trying to get the situation resolved. He has purchased some columns and there is still no guarantee that they can use them because they cannot get approval to do so.

**Ms. Michalak** said today is the first time that staff has heard about the image being photo shopped. She said that the petitioner is here today because he has not done what he needed to do. The petitioner is present today because of a court order.

**Ms. Lynch** said the Board will follow their regular procedure relative to this petition. She will ask for public comments and allow the HSF to make comments regarding this matter.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay of HSF** stated that it was not their intent to put a "monkey wrench" into this situation at the last second. Their Architectural Review Committee meets on the Tuesday before the Historic Review Board meeting on Wednesdays. They met yesterday morning and the offer of assistance comes from approval of their Revolving Fund Committee who met this morning. He said he knows that the staff is busy on Wednesday and, therefore, they were unable to talk with staff prior to the meeting. He met with Mr. Butler just moments before the start of today's meeting. He can confirm what Mr. Butler said as every once in awhile [it is rare] they can offer an easement on the property to protect it. This seems like an ideal situation to accomplish two things. One is the easement on the property and two, the reconstruction of an original porch.

**Mr. Arvay** said he was not putting words in Mr. Butler's mouth, but he believes he understands what he is saying. He does not believe that Butler is not saying that this is a "doctored image." He believes that Mr. Butler is saying that he has enhanced it.

**Mr. Butler** stated again that the original photo could not be digitized.

**Mr. Arvay** said the HSF would need to sit down with Mr. Butler and get their own bids. They believe they can help Mr. Butler get this back to what he intended to do. The design that was based on this image was approved. The only thing they are asking is that Mr. Butler be approved so they can help him. The finished project will be what is approved by the Historic Board of Review.

**Mr. Arvay** said the HSF has been aware of this project and supports the staff's assessment that the porch was deviates from the approved design. They believe the work could have been much closer to what was approved. They also believe that the designed as submitted is not right.

**Ms. Lynch** asked the petitioner if he wanted the Board to vote on what has been submitted or he can withdraw his petition. However, the Board cannot vote on something that has not been submitted. They will have to vote on what is in front of them.

**Mr. Butler** said he wanted to work with the Historic Savannah Foundation.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

A couple HDBR members were concerned that the brick portico posts might evoke a false sense of history. Wood columns were proposed as a revision.

#### **Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition of the amendment to a previously approved COA to construct a covered stoop at 217 East Charlton Street with the following condition:

Remove brick.

#### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Scott Cook

Second: Stan Houle

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

Kevin Dodge	- Not Present
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

[23. Petition of LS3P Associates LTD. | 19-004727-COA | 111 Ann Street | Amendment to New Construction](#)

- 📎 [Mass Model Photographs.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Previously Approved Packet 1.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Previously Approved Packet 2.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Specifications.pdf](#)
- 📎 [19-004727-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Public Comment - Ardis Wood.pdf](#)

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

**Mr. Bryan Harder** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Alyson Smith** gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for amendments to the previously approved new construction multi-family building for the property located at 111 Ann Street. The proposed amendments are as follows:

1. A change in type to all operable windows, from awning to casement. There is no change to the window specification, appearance and color.
2. A change in window spacing at the following locations: East Elevation (Ann Street), at bays indicated on the attached drawings. South Elevation (Youmans Street), at bays indicated on the attached drawings. West Elevation (landscape deck courtyard), at bays indicated on the attached drawings.
3. The removal of doors (replaced with windows) at the top floor roofline recess on the East Elevation (Ann Street) and South Elevation (Youmans Street).
4. A change in vehicular access door type to an overhead rolling steel door with fenestrated slats. The coiling box shall be mounted on the inside and will not be visible from the public right-of-way. The color will be bronze, to match the aluminum-clad window color.
5. A change in the window type next to the vehicular exit at the South Elevation (Youmans Street) from aluminum-framed storefront to aluminum-clad wood window.
6. A change to the effective footprint area from 44,632 SF to 30,175 SF. The landscape deck has been lowered one floor, to approximately 3 feet above grade, with parking on two subterranean floors below. This change would allow the project to be within the allowable footprint area for Large Scale development outside the National Historic District Landmark and would remove the need to separate the building into two buildings, per building code. There is no change to the approved height and mass, materiality and detailing.
7. The removal of wall louvers and an added row of windows at the North Elevation.

**Ms. Smith** explained that the non-contributing building located on this site was approved by the Board for demolition on February 8, 2017 [File No. 17-00053-COA]. The demolition permit subsequently expired as well as the COA for demolition. The Board initially reviewed New Construction, Part I: Height and Mass on October 10, 2018 and continued the petition in order for the petitioner to consider making revisions to the design. On November 14, 2018, the HDBR approved New Construction, Part I: Height and Mass with conditions [File No. 18-005088-COA]. At the April 10, 2019 HDBR meeting the Board approved demolition of the non-contributing building (the previous approval had expired), amendments to Part I, and Part II (with conditions). On July 29, 2019, staff received the required documentation for the demolition of the non-contributing building.

**Ms. Smith** reported that staff recommends approve the petition for amendments to the previously approved new

construction multi-family building for the property located at 111 Ann Street with the following condition because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the garage door to a more decorative rolling door.

**Mr. Harder** thanked the Board for hearing their petition. He was in agreement with the staff recommendation. He entertained questions from the Board.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Ardis Wood said** she believes that most of them would say that the Cay Building is an absolutely wonderful addition to the downtown area. Yet, there is a lack of tree lawns and trees. She was hopeful that all of us would spend some time walking the area carefully. Ms. Wood wanted us to please remember that Savannah is still a most desirable place to build, especially in and around the Landmark Historic District, but that the charm does not need to be diluted.

**Ms. Lynch** thanked the public for their comments, but reminded them that the only part of the project within the Board's purview is the amendments. The Board is only evaluating the changes that have been made. Items such as trees, etc, are not the purview of the Historic Review Board.

**Mr. Harder**, in response to public comments, came forward and thanked Ms. Wood for her comments.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board was in agreement with the staff recommendation.

#### **Motion**

Approval for amendments to the previously approved new construction multi-family building for the property located at 111 Ann Street with the following condition because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the garage door to a more decorative rolling door.

#### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Debra Caldwell

Second: Ellie Isaacs

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

☉ [Layla Lane HDBR Narrative 8.14.19.pdf](#)

☉ [Traffic Study.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Lynch recused herself from participating in this petition. Mr. Stephens chaired this hearing.**

**Mr. Neil Dawson** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Alyson Smith** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for an amendment to a previously approved COA for new construction at 303 Tattnall Street. The amendment seeks to satisfy previous Part II conditions and address design revisions due to changes with the structural system, mechanical systems and façade detailing.

**Ms. Smith** stated that Part I Height and Mass was originally heard by the HDBR on January 11, 2017 and was continued; however, the HDBR approved the demolition of the two-story non-contributing building and surface parking lot. [File No. 16-006855-COA]. A revised Part I Height and Mass was heard by the HDBR on February 8, 2017 and was approved with conditions. Part II Design Details was heard by the HDBR on April 12, 2017 and was approved with conditions. On April 27, 2017 the Zoning Board of Appeals heard an appeal of the HDBR's February 8th decision (17-001346-ZBA) by the Beehive Foundation. The ZBA approved the appeal based on a procedural error and remanded the petition back to the HDBR for "reconsideration of any elements of the application that were affected by the error." On May 10, 2017 the HDBR heard arguments from attorneys representing the Beehive Foundation, the petitioner, and the City of Savannah. Additional public testimony was not received. Based on the advice from the City Attorney, Board members Keith Howington, Jennifer Deacon, and Kellie Fletcher supplemented the public record and confirmed that they voted for approval of the petition in February and they understood that the award of a bonus story was discretionary.

**Ms. Smith** explained that the Beehive Foundation appealed the May 10, 2017 HDBR decision to not hold a public hearing as procedural error and abuse of discretion (17-003109-ZBA). The ZBA approved the appeal on July 27, 2017 and directed that the case be "returned to the Historic District Board of Review for reconsideration of all elements of 16-006855-COA." On September 20, 2017, the HDBR reheard the request for Part: 1 Height and Mass for new construction of a hotel and heard the variance request from the exterior height expression which requires that the exterior expression of the height of the second story not be less than 12 feet and that the exterior expression of the height of each story above the second shall not be less than 10 feet. The proposed floors above the first level did not meet the minimum permitted heights. The HDBR re-approved Part 1: Height and Mass for new construction with the condition that the drawings reflect the sidewalk along Jefferson Street will serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration and height. The HDBR also recommended approval to the ZBA for a variance from the following standard:

*The exterior expression of the height of each story above the second shall not be less than 10 feet.* – because the existing exterior expression of the height of each story above the second story as proposed will result in an overall reduced building height that is visually compatible, and the variance criteria have been met.

**Ms. Smith** stated that the COA received a 12-month extension on September 12, 2018. The COA expires on September 20, 2019. On July 10, 2019, the HDBR approved a request to revise a condition that was applied to the approval of the demolition when it was approved on January 11, 2017. The condition stated that a demolition permit not be issued until a new construction permit is issued. The petitioner requested that the condition be revised to state that a demolition permit shall not be issued until a COA for new construction is approved. Staff determined that the requested revision was consistent with discretionary conditions placed by the HDBR for the demolition of non-contributing buildings and the HDBR approved the request.

**Ms. Smith** explained that below are the findings for the previous Part II conditions:

1. Remove the metal panels located on the east elevation along the window bays in the north-facing mass, because the panels change the solid-to-void pattern and are not visually compatible;

*The condition has been met. The Metal panels have been replaced with glass.*

2. Ensure the cladding is metal and not fiber cement;

*The condition has been met. Cladding has been revised to metal.*

3. Revise the windows to be double or triple hung, awning, or casement to meet the windows standard. Provide details on the windows; profile and mullion dimensions;

*The condition has been met. Operable windows have been added to meet the standard.*

4. Ensure all doors, windows and storefront glazing is inset a minimum of four inches from all façade surfaces;

*The condition is met.*

5. Provide material specifications for the base of the canopy at the Tattnall Street entrance;

*The condition is met. The design of the canopy has been revised. The canopy will be constructed with a stone base.*

6. Provide additional details on the service and garden gates;

*The condition is met. Details have been provided.*

7. Provide additional details to ensure that the sidewalk along Jefferson Street will serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration and height;

*Ensure the standard is met.*

8. The petitioner has commissioned a traffic study to measure the potential traffic impact of the hotel within the block. Pending the outcome of the study, if City staff should require a pull through/service drive at the southern end of the parcel, the petitioner must submit revised plans to staff for review and approval prior to construction;

*The condition is met. A traffic study was completed. A pull through/service drive at the southern end of the parcel is proposed.*

**Ms. Smith** reported that staff recommends to continue the request for an amendment to a previously approved COA for new construction at 303 Tattnall Street [File No. 16-006855-COA] for the petitioner to consider/revise the following:

1. Revise the primary entrance at Tattnall Street. The storefront entrance and glazing should be centered within the façade. The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically on the façade.
2. Revise the proposed lobby/office corridor along the Jefferson Street façade to meet the active use standard.
3. Mechanical or Access structures shall be contained within the bonus story.
4. Ensure the two-over-two windows at the southernmost mass are operable.
5. Provide specifications for the awning windows and two-over-two windows.
6. Submit material specifications for the Tattnall Street canopy roof and columns.
7. Signage must be submitted for review.
8. Ensure that the sidewalks will serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration and height;
9. Provide additional details and specifications for the aluminum and brick fencing.
10. Submit specification for the revised storefront doors for review.

### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Dawson** came forward and introduced the persons accompanying him at today's meeting. Mr. Dawson said as stated in the staff's report, there is quite a history to this project. He said for clarity, the initial architect was Lynch Associates Architects and now LS3P has now assumed the role. He explained that LS3P's role is to take the eight conditions that staff mentioned from the Part II approval of the Review Board and address the eight comments. He said also as a part of this, they realize that there are some things in the project that could be changed to benefit not only the project, but also the context with the neighbors. Therefore, they have endeavored to make a few changes beyond those that were stated in the condition. He explained that this is why they are before the Board today.

**Mr. Dawson** said he was looking at the first three comments on the staff's recommendations. He said previously double doors were proposed. But, they have now gone to single doors off Tattnall Street. The address will be changed to Liberty Street. Rather than retail, they will have a library in the back. He believes that a part of the staff's concern is that it was not centered in line with the base. He believes the staff's concern with the mechanical or access structures was that it would be on the roof. They have fundamentally changed the mechanical system.

**Mr. Dawson** said the remaining comments four through ten have already been met. They intend to request the

continuance for a couple of reasons. They met yesterday with members of the Beehive Foundation, Downtown Neighborhood Association and the Historic Savannah Foundation. He believes they had a very positive meeting. They have tried to address some of the comments they heard in this document. This is what they will come back with at the next meeting. One thing they heard in the meeting was that the signage be moved. Previously, it was on Tattnell Street at the front of the building on Liberty Street. Another was add signage and some type of entry canopy to Tattnell Street. They believe this is a great idea. It was suggested that the renderings be adjusted. He said they will try to do this between now and the next meeting. The context will be adjusted also. Another comment was about street trees and brick sidewalks. They believe this is a great comment and they will do so. The Tattnell Street entrance will be played down. He said as the Board can see, they have tried to create a brick wall of continuity so that it becomes somewhat a sitting porch for the guests although it is a public entrance and not a primary entrance. They respect the neighborhood and, therefore, will not have much traffic on that side.

**Mr. Dawson** said they have had discussions about what constitutes the active use. Some discussion was that the library is a nice try. A coffee shop is next door and retail, but they did not feel that these functions were good and would probably create more street traffic than the library. He said they would like to have a continuance today so they will have another chance to meet with the neighbors. He said the only thing that is an issue is the mechanical units on the roof. This has been approved and, therefore, they believed this was still in effect. The unit is pushed to the middle of the roof and is not visible from the right-of-way. They feel the criteria for a variance is met.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Tom Colgrove** stated that the developers and architects have continuously asked for numerous variances. This has created a lot of controversy over several years. If the architects and applicant cannot meaningfully provide retail on the first floor then they should not have the sixth floor. They are having a tough time providing the retail. The retail space that they want to provide here is meaningless. Mr. Colgrove believes the Board needs to reconsider this. He said the ordinance to provide the utility equipment on the sixth floor will not happen. He believes the petitioner needs to revise the proposal, particularly in the two areas that he has mentioned. He appreciates that the petitioner has now moved the loading and unloading to the Liberty Lane area. Mr. Colgrove said he wanted to be sure that Tattnell Street would not be used for loading and unloading.

**Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF]** said they met with the Mr. Dawson yesterday. It was a productive, positive meeting. The HSF continues to have concerns about the Tattnell Street elevation because it is a small residential street. He believes they will continue to see a lot of congestion here. The recommend single doors. They believe that additional signage is needed to direct the people to the rear of the building. The canopy is commendable, but the HSF believes the rear elevation needs to be better activated. The HSF believes that additional signage is needed for the front of the building not the Tattnell Street side, but perhaps a blade sign on the Liberty Street side refocusing that the front facade is the primary entrance. Mr. Arvay said the HSF agrees with the public's comment regarding the active use. They are hopeful that the many doors on all four facades of the building will truly be public access.

**Mr. Bob Rosenwald of the Downtown Neighborhood Association [DNA]** said that they met with representatives yesterday and it was a useful meeting. However, there are still some issues. Mr. Rosenwald said he is aware that the old ordinance would be used for this project. The DNA is concerned about having another Perry Lane. The area where there is to be a restaurant has a couple doors that he imagines will not be used. He agrees with the notion of the retail; the fitness center versus a library. Therefore, he does not see a lot of public activation here. Mr. Rosenwald said he believes that a lot of effort has been made to de-emphasize Tattnell Street, but at the end of the day, Tattnell Street will still be the "big fish" as this is where the big facade is located. His belief is that this hotel could have been built anywhere; there is nothing unique to Savannah about this, it is just a hotel. He said it may meet the letter of the law, but it does not fit the neighborhood. Therefore, they need to work harder in the future to make these hotels more unique.

**Mr. Dawson**, in response to public comments, said they appreciate the public comments. He, too, believes that they have had a productive meeting. This Board has approved this for Part II. This project was also approved under the old active uses. Now, rather they go to retail, they could do it on another floor, but they believe that it would be a better neighbor to have the functions that are less intensive. They will talk with them about this. However, they have Part II approval and have met all eight conditions. They are making the changes voluntarily beyond those eight comments to try to make it better for the neighborhood. However, they have some things that they have no control over such as active use from 2017.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the active uses. Some members were concerned about the entrance to the hotel and the mechanical units being located on the roof. Ms. Taylor asked staff for clarification on recommendation #2. Staff read the standards and explained that Jefferson Street should have an active use.

**Mr. Dawson** said this project has been through the courts, ZBA and the Historic Review Board. The active use was not one of the eight conditions with the Part II approval. All changes they are making are done voluntarily to try to improve the project. Mr. Dawson asked for a continuance.

**Mr. Stephens** stated that they have concerns about some of the issues, but the Board is bound only to reviewing the amendments.



**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve to continue the petition the October 9, 2019 HDBR Meeting.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Melissa Memory

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

[25. Petition of Greenline Architecture | 19-004730-COA | 112-114-116 West Congress Street | Variance and After-the-fact Request](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation .pdf](#)

📎 [Narrative.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Site Visit Photos.pdf](#)

**Mr. Keith Howington and Mr. Harley Krinsky** were present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Alyson Smith** gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for an after-the-fact alteration at 112-114-116 West Congress Street. The petitioner previously received a COA approval for rehabilitation and a rooftop addition at the site. During construction, a large electrical box and additional electrical equipment and conduit were installed without approval on the sidewalk along St. Julian Street. The equipment has been installed in front of a historic storefront.

**Ms. Smith** stated that the applicant is also requesting a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the following standard:

*-Additions shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features of the building, including, but not limited to, rooflines, cornices, eaves, brackets.*

To allow the after-the-fact amendment (electrical box) to remain in place as currently installed.

**Ms. Smith** reported that staff recommends after-the-fact approval for amendments to the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitation and a rooftop addition at 112-114-116 West Congress Street [File No. 17-005984-COA].

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

*Additions shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features of the building, including, but not limited to, rooflines, cornices, eaves, brackets.*

To allow the after-the-fact amendment to retain the electrical box in its place as currently installed because the variance criteria have been found to be met.

**Ms. Caldwell** asked where was the equipment previously located.

**Ms. Smith** answered that the equipment was not shown when the COA was approved. They had no idea that the equipment needed to be updated. Staff went on site to review a material panel. They saw that the equipment was there, but it was not a part of the drawings.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Howington** stated that for clarification, he pointed out that the red box and everything across the top is existing electrical service that was already there and was a 400 amp service. Due to the renovations, they had to increase the services to 1600 amps which is the reason for the huge tower. He said he was as shocked as staff when he saw this. They were unaware that Georgia Power needed a box that large. When staff came to look at the wall, he pointed this out to them and asked what could they do about it. Mr. Howington explained that a panel, meter and the silver box on the right was put there by Georgia Power and feeds into the larger box that is required due to the upgrade of the building. Unfortunately, the electrical service comes to the left and had to be put where it is because the pilaster and footing for the building is located here. It goes all the way to the sidewalk and is completely full with utilities and all kinds of things that run there. He said on the north of the sidewalk is the parking garage foundation wall.

**Mr. Howington** said they met with Ms. Michalak and Ms. Smith. He said that Ms. Michalak asked if they can get the equipment away from the building and put it out to the edge of the sidewalk. They investigated this with Georgia Power and the city inspector. They were told that the equipment could not be moved. The reason is that all of the services for Georgia Power comes in the silver box and comes under here. There is a disconnect and everything is required by code and the fire marshal. Therefore, this is an unfortunate necessity and he regrets that it is where it is. The good thing about this is it was the electrical service and all of it was on the pilaster and all the conduits were running across here. All of this can be consolidated into the big box. They are agreeable to painting this, screening it or whatever the Board suggests that they do. He does not know how they can screen it, but they are willing to look into it.

**Mr. Howington** said because of the garage, the utilities, and because it is a four sided lot with the amount of electricity going into this building, this is the way it has to be.

**Ms. Memory** asked if Georgia Power came in and did the work without consulting them.

**Mr. Howington** answered that Georgia Power was about this, but he can not totally put the blame on them as this was a total necessity.

**Ms. Lynch** believes it would have been better to put the box in front of the pilaster instead of the window it would have been less intrusive.

**Mr. Howington** explained that it could not have been installed in front of the pilaster because of the footing that goes all the way down to the sidewalk. This is solid concrete. This is why they chose to put it where it is.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF]** said it is difficult to get all the systems to fit when working with an old building, especially a masonry building. He said that on plans that have been submitted before mechanical plans have always been required to be specified. He was wondering how things such as important as power can be overlooked. This building is one of the oldest buildings in this section of town. The Architectural Review Committee believes it is unsightly and not compatible. They believed the equipment could be located indoors.

**Mr. Harley Krinsky**, owner, came forward and stated that he wanted to reiterate that where the equipment is located. They knew it had to be in that location and position. They tried to put it on many places. They exhausted many options. They are in close to the parking garage and there is no available room for the size vaults that Georgia Power would allow. After working with the fire marshal and the electrical inspector, they were confined to are where the equipment is located. Mr. Krinsky does not believe that it was nobody's intention to have it as large as is, but this is what they were left with.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion centered around the location where the equipment is installed. They believe that going forward something like this needs to be worked out prior to being installed. This is an unfortunate situation. Some members

believe the equipment was placed at the best possible location, especially that the underground parking is here. They believe that painting it would help. The Board discussed the variance.

### Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the after-the-fact approval for amendments to the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitation and a rooftop addition at 112-114-116 West Congress Street [File No. 17-005984-COA].

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the following standard:

Additions shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features of the building, including, but not limited to, rooflines, cornices, eaves, brackets.

Remove existing extraneous electrical service equipment and repair exterior damages using the gentlest means possible.

### Vote Results ( Approved )

Motion: Scott Cook

Second: Ellie Isaacs

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

## X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

### [26. Petition of Tim Geiken | 19-004472-COA | 317 Lorch Street | Staff Approved - Replacing/Repairing Windows](#)

📎 [COA - 317 Lorch Street 19-004472-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 317 Lorch Street Window Picture Index 19-004472-COA.docx](#)

No action required: staff approved.

### [27. Petition of Charles Padgett for T-Mobile South, LLC | 19-004572-COA | 133 Montgomery Street | Staff Approved - Antenna Modification](#)

📎 [COA - 133 Montgomery Street 19-004572-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [9SA0930A\\_A E\\_Anchor\\_SA\\_Pass\\_20190626.pdf](#)

📎 [9SA0930A\\_A E\\_Anchor\\_SSCD\\_20190716.pdf](#)

No action required: staff approved.

[28. Amended Petition of Lissette Garcia Arrogante for City of Savannah | 19-004609-COA | 201 Montgomery Street | Staff Approved - Sign](#)

☞ [COA - 201 Montgomery Street 19-004609-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [SUPP INFO 19-004609.pdf](#)

No action required: staff approved.

[29. Amended Petition of Shelby Bruning for Alchemy Restoration | 19-004615-COA | 20 West Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Railing for Roof Deck](#)

☞ [COA - 20 West Taylor Street 19-004615-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [SUPP INFO 19-004615.pdf](#)

No action required: staff approved.

[30. Petition of D. Rushing for Coastal Canvas | 19-004695-COA | 10 Whitaker Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

☞ [COA - 10 Whitaker Street 19-004695-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [SUPP 19-004695.pdf](#)

No action required: staff approved.

[31. Petition of Tony Hensley for SCAD | 19-004700-COA | 713 Barnard Street | Staff Approved - Siding Replacement and Paint In-kind](#)

☞ [COA - 713 Barnard Street 19-004700-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [SUPP INFO 19-004700.pdf](#)

No action required: staff approved.

[32. Petition of James Beasley for Sign Mart, Inc. | 19-004825-COA | 255 Montgomery Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Change](#)

☞ [COA - 255 Montgomery Street 19-004825-COA.pdf](#)

☞ [Submittal Packet - 255 Montgomery Street 19-004825-COA.pdf](#)

No action required: staff approved.

**XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

[33. Work Performed Without a COA September 11, 2019 HDBR Meeting](#)

☞ [9-11-2019 HDBR Report on Work Without a COA.pdf](#)

**Ms. Lynch** encourage the Board to review the report on the work performed without a COA.

**XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF**

[34. Stamped Drawings - September Report](#)

☞ [September Report.pdf](#)

**Ms. Lynch** encouraged the Board to review the report on the stamped drawings.

**XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

**XIV. OTHER BUSINESS**

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS

### [35. Revisions to HDBR Procedural Manual and Bylaws](#)

[HDBR PROCEDURAL MANUAL and BYLAWS-2013.pdf](#)

[8-14-19 HDBR PROCEDURAL MANUAL and BYLAWS - Proposed Revisions.pdf](#)

**Ms. Michalak** said the Board needs to appoint a nominating committee to nominate a chair and vice-chair for 2020. The Board's first vote will be at the November, 2019 meeting and the second vote at December 2019 meeting. The new chair and vice-chair will begin serving at the January 2020 meeting.

\*\*\*

**Ms. Michalak** said today is the second reading of the Revisions to the HDBR Procedure Manual and Bylaws. She explained that the revisions are to cleanup and change any references to the NewZO section from the old section. The NewZO section changes the Board's quorum from 6 to 5 and the Board members from 11 to 9. The public notice posting signs have been changed. NewZO has added a new item to the Staff Decisions.

#### **Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the revisions as recommended.

#### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Stan Houle

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

## XV. ADJOURNMENT

[36. Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, September 12, 2019 at 3:30pm in the Meyer Conference Room, MPC 110 East State Street](#)

[37. Next Pre-Meeting - Wednesday, October 9, 2019 at 12:00pm in the Chatham County Commission Chambers, 124 Bull Street - 2nd Floor](#)

[38. Next Regular Meeting - Wednesday, October 9, 2019 at 1:00pm in the Chatham County Commission Chambers, 124 Bull Street - 2nd Floor](#)

[39. Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the HDBR, Ms. Lynch adjourned the meeting at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Leah Michalak  
Director of Historic Preservation

LGM:mem:bri

***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.***