



## Savannah Historic District Board of Review

---

Virtual Meeting  
April 14, 2021 1:00 PM  
MINUTES

### April 14, 2021 Savannah Historic District Board of Review

**Members Present:** Dwayne Stephens, Chair  
Nan Taylor, Vice-Chair  
David Altschiller  
Stephen Bodek  
Kevin Dodge  
Stan Houle  
Ellie Isaacs  
Becky Lynch  
Melissa Memory

**MPC Staff Present:** Leah Michalak, Director of Historic Preservation  
Ryan Jarles, Cultural Resources Planner  
Olivia Arfuso, Assistant Planner  
Aislinn Droski, Assistant Planner  
Bri Morgan, Administrative Assistant

#### I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

#### II. SIGN POSTING

#### III. CONSENT AGENDA

##### [1. Petition of GMSHAY Architecture | 17-002122-COA | 602 East River Street \(Hotel Anne\) | New Construction Part II: Design Details](#)

- 🔗 [17-002122-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Drawings and Renderings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Material Samples and Specifications.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Photos and Mass Model.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previous Submittal Packet - Hotel Anne Three as One.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previous Submittal Packet - Model, Photos, and Drawings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previous Submittal Packet - Specifications and Samples.pdf](#)

#### **Motion**

Approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details for a hotel to be located on the vacant parcel at 602 East River Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[2. Petition of Tom & Allison White | 21-001565-COA | 111 East Jones Street | Installation of Privacy Fences](#)

[☞ Staff Recommendation 21-001565-COA.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)

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

**Motion**

Approval of the installation of privacy fences at 111 East Jones Street with the following conditions, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that all work is undertaken using the gentlest means possible to avoid damage to any historic materials including the neighboring, contributing properties. Ensure that the installation of the proposed privacy fence is undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
2. Ensure that the refuse and recycling are screened from the public right-of-way.
3. Ensure that the door is made of wood, and that it is painted or stained to match the proposed wood elements. Ensure that the proposed paint colors are nonreflective and have a satin or flat finish.
4. Ensure that the sconces are constructed of metal and/or glass and that they have a white light source only.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[3. Petition of SKYLARK, LLC. | 21-001603-COA | 503 East McDonough Street | Installation of Shutters and Reconstruction of Front Porch](#)

- 🔗 [Staff Recommendation 21-001603-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Application](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Checklist](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Narrative.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Staff Research.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approval of the reconstruction of the front porch and the installation of shutters at 503 East McDonough Street with the following conditions, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that all work is undertaken using the gentlest means possible, and that the porch is reconstructed in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired. Ensure that the existing porch configuration and dimensions are not altered in any way.
2. Ensure that the proposed corbels do not create a false sense of historical development, and that they are compatible in design with the corbels on the neighboring New Construction.
3. Ensure that shutter specifications are submitted to Staff for review, and that the shutters consist of durable wood and are hinged, operable, and sized to fit the window openings. The placement of the horizontal rail(s) should correspond to the location of the meeting rail(s) of the window.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[4. Petition of Yoryos Yeracaris | 21-001609-COA | 321 Abercorn Street | Installation of Rooftop Shade Structure](#)

- 🔗 [Staff Recommendation 21-001609-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Narrative and Drawings.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal - Material Specifications \(Email\).pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approval for the installation of a rooftop shade structure at 321 Abercorn Street with the following conditions, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that all work is undertaken using the gentlest means possible to avoid damage to any historic materials, and that the installation of the shade structure is undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
2. Ensure that all final material specifications and color palettes are provided to Staff for review. Ensure that the retractable roof is constructed of canvas, an equivalent cloth, metal, or glass, and that the supports are metal or wood. The use of PVC is not permitted.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[5. Petition of Ellsworth Design Build, Andersen Resende | 21-001381-COA | 216 East Taylor Street | New Accent Window Opening](#)

[📎 Staff Recommendation - 216 E Taylor St - 21-001381-COA.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet - Narrative, Drawings, Materials.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approval of a circle accent window opening for the property located at 216 East Taylor Street as requested because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye

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

[6. Petition of The Sign Store Online Inc., Jennifer Smith | 21-001560-COA | 415 West Liberty Street | Sign Package](#)

- 📎 [Staff Recommendation - 415 W Liberty - 21-001560-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Sign Renderings.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approval of the eight (8) non-illuminated sign face changes for the property located at 415 West Liberty Street as requested because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[7. Petition of Diversified Designs | 21-001607-COA | 714-718 Montgomery Street | New Construction, Parts I and II](#)

- 📎 [Staff Recommendation - 21-001607-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- 📎 [2015 Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- 📎 [COA - 714 - 718 Montgomery Street 15-003896-COA.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approval for New Construction Parts I and II for three, 2-story townhomes at 714-718 Montgomery Street with the following conditions because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that an encroachment license is obtained for the front porch stairs that extend onto the public sidewalk along Montgomery Street.
2. Ensure that the Miratec proposed for the trim has a smooth finish.

3. Provide Staff with door material specification prior to submitting drawings to be stamped for permitting.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

**IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

[8. Adopt the April 14, 2021 HDBR Agenda](#)

**Motion**

Approve the April 14, 2021 HDBR Agenda as presented.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

**V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

[9. Approval of the March 10, 2021 Meeting Minutes](#)

📎 [03.10.21 MEETING MINUTES.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approved the March 10, 2021 HDBR Minutes

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Becky Lynch

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

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

**VII. CONTINUED AGENDA**

[10. Petition of LS3P, Emily Dawson | 21-000257-COA | 501 East Bay Street | New Construction: Part II \(Design Details\)](#)

**Motion**

Continue.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Steven Bodek

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[11. Petition of GMSHAY Architecture | 21-000792-COA | 618 Montgomery Street | New Construction: Part II \(Design Details\)](#)

**Motion**

Continue.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Steven Bodek  
Second: Ellie Isaacs  
Becky Lynch - Aye  
Dwayne Stephens - Abstain  
Melissa Memory - Aye  
David Altschiller - Aye  
Nan Taylor - Aye  
Kevin Dodge - Aye  
Stan Houle - Aye  
Ellie Isaacs - Aye  
Steven Bodek - Aye

## VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

### [12. Petition of Sottile & Sottile, Christian Sottile | 20-005548-COA | 336 Barnard Street | 6-Month Extension Request](#)

- [☞ Staff Recommendation - 6 Month Extension 20-005548-COA.pdf](#)
- [☞ Board Decision 20-005548-COA.pdf](#)
- [☞ 6-Month Extension Request \(Email\).pdf](#)

#### **Motion**

Approval for a 6-month extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) issued on December 9, 2020 for the demolition of a non-contributing building and for New Construction, Part I: Height and Mass for the property located at 336 Barnard Street [File No. 20-005548-COA] to expire on October 13, 2021.

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

Motion: Ellie Isaacs  
Second: David Altschiller  
Becky Lynch - Aye  
Dwayne Stephens - Abstain  
Melissa Memory - Aye  
David Altschiller - Aye  
Nan Taylor - Aye  
Kevin Dodge - Aye  
Stan Houle - Aye  
Ellie Isaacs - Aye  
Steven Bodek - Aye

## IX. REGULAR AGENDA

### [13. Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 21-000280-COA | 400 West Congress Street | New Construction, Part II \(Design Details\)](#)

- [☞ Staff Recommendation 21-000280-COA.pdf](#)



- ④ [Submittal Packet - Mass Model Photos.pdf](#)
- ④ [Submittal Packet - Narrative and Material Samples.pdf](#)
- ④ [Submittal Packet - Part II Photos and Drawings.pdf](#)
- ④ [Sample Panel Policy.pdf](#)
- ④ [Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- ④ [Staff Context Images.pdf](#)
- ④ [Submittal Packet - Part I Photos and Drawings.pdf](#)

**\*\* Ms. Becky Lynch recused herself from this petition. \*\***

**Ms. Leah Michalak** presented the applicant's request of approval for New Construction, Part II: Design Details for a 4-story mixed-use building to be located on the vacant parcel at 400 West Congress Street. The building is located on the southwest Trust Lot of Franklin Ward and the parcel has frontage on both West St. Julian and West Congress Streets. The building is designed to have access into the building from both streets; however, the main entrance faces St. Julian Street.

Additionally, during staff's review of the Part II submission, a number of changes to Part I: Height and Mass building components were identified. They consist of the following:

1. The overhanging eaves and string course have been eliminated from the main roof and the flat roof on the tower element has increased in depth on the front façade side of the building.
2. Architectural canopies have been added over the doors on the 4th floor of the front and rear (west) façades. These were previously integrated into the roof eaves.
3. The 4th floor windows on the south façade have been changed to square accent windows.
4. The 4th floor window on the front façade of the tower element has changed to a tall rectangular window instead of a square accent window.
5. The height of the transom window over the residential entry door on the front façade has increased.
6. The door swing and fenestration pattern have changed on the first floor on the west façade to allow for the relocation of the electrical meter.
7. The depth of the stair tower has been reduced and the roof eaves removed.

At the February 10, 2021 HDBR Meeting, the Board approved Part I: Height and Mass with the following conditions:

1. Revise the vertical material on the top floor.
2. Add brackets or another type of architectural support to the balconies.
3. Relocate the electrical equipment to the south façade.
4. Provide a sample panel per the Sample Panel Policy.

All windows are proposed to be taller than they are wide with the exception of square accent

windows on the top floor of the south façade. The facades have a regular rhythm of solids to voids which is visually compatible. The revised storefront fenestration on the ground floor of the west façade is visually compatible. All windows facing the streets meet the ratio. There are square accent windows on the top story of the south façade.

The main roof shape is flat with parapets which is visually compatible; however, there is not a string course. Staff recommends adding a string course in order to be visually compatible and to meet standards. The front eave on the tower element has increased significantly in depth and is not visually compatible. Staff recommends that its depth be reduced to the previously approved depth. The balconies are now supported by brackets, meeting the standard. The canopies proposed over the doors on the 4th floor of the east and west facades are not integrated into the design of the façade. They appear to be stuck on to the facades, thus not meeting the standard. Staff recommends that they be removed in their entirety, returned to the previous design where they were integral to the roof eaves, or be redesigned to be more like the metal awning on the first floor of the east façade. Staff recommends adding a string course in order to meet the standard. The electrical meter is now located on the south façade, which now meet the standard.

The following are the proposed materials, textures, and colors:

- Main wall material and cornice: General Shale brick in “Silverstone Velour” (mortar not provided)
- 4th floor walls, storefront base, trim, and spandrel material: smooth fiber cement horizontal shiplap siding, painted “Cityscape” (dark grey)
- Storefront: aluminum in “Charcoal”
- Doors: aluminum clad in “Charcoal” or custom Mahogany doors in “Walnut” stain
- Windows: aluminum clad in “Gun Metal”
- Tower element, projection trim, and banding: cast stone in “Buffstone”
- Coping, canopies, and handrails: aluminum or steel in “Charcoal”
- Awnings: “Sunbrella” canvas in “Safire Blue”
- Provide proposed mortar for the brick.

Staff recommends that the smooth fiber cement horizontal shiplap siding be changed to a permitted commercial exterior wall material that can be found on surrounding buildings. Smooth painted fiber cement horizontal shiplap siding is proposed for the 4th floor, which does not meet the standard. Although not listed as a prohibited material, staff could not locate (with the exception of the 2nd floor addition to Vinnie Van Go Go’s in City Market) any visually related buildings with any kind of wood or fiber cement siding. Staff recommends that the material be changed to a permitted commercial exterior wall material that can be found on surrounding buildings.

Three to four-inch insets are proposed. Aluminum clad in “Charcoal” or custom Mahogany doors in “Walnut” stain. The standards are met. Windows are proposed to be awning. “Marvin Ultimate Casement” windows are proposed which have previously been approved by the Board for new construction. SDLs with 7/8 inch muntins are proposed. Ensure that the muntin profile simulates traditional putty glazing and that there are spacer bars in between double panes of glass. The balcony railings are wood but the brackets are steel not iron. The awnings are canvas, and the canopies are metal. The storefront base is proposed to be smooth painted fiber cement horizontal shiplap siding. Staff recommends the material be revised to one permitted by the standard. The flat roof behind the parapet is not visible. A metal standing seam roof is proposed on the stair tower, not meeting the standards.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Elizabeth Schminke**, petitioner, stated they agree with and will comply with many of the recommendations. Ms. Schminke highlighted the front eave projection from the tower point will be returned to the three feet. She stated the mortar is to match the cast stone color and will provide a sample. For the muntin profile, they will use a putty glaze as requested and will provide details to staff. The fourth floor canopy was modified and lowered the overhang to visually conceal the parapet. Thus, the side was simplified, to comply with Board's comments previously. The underside of the canopy is four feet below the top of the parapet. She used 419 West Congress as support for her modification decision, as her structure is lower and minimizes the feel of the mass and height. In regard to the siding, they are open to using metal panels; the use of brick may bring more attention to the upper story, which they wanted to minimize.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

**Mr. Bob Rosenwald**, of the Downtown Neighborhood Association, stated concern with Part 1 amendments, then when Part 2 comes up, then Part 1 has been messed with. The overhang recommendation of Staff is supported by the DNA. The 419 West Congress structure is not supported by the DNA, therefore, nor is the petitioner's modification request.

**Mr. Ryan Arvay**, of the Historic Savannah Foundation, agrees with Mr. Rosenwald's comments and supports Staff's recommendation.

**Ms. Schminke** stated it is an on-going design and the changes are to be in keeping with the Board comments and design recommendations.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Ms. Isaacs** stated she agreed with Staff comments. **Ms. Taylor** agrees and supports staff's comments and is happy with the petitioner's compliance. She thinks the former design was more visually compatible. **Ms. Memory, Mr. Houle, Mr. Altschiller,** and **Mr. Dodge** agree with Staff's comments & conditions. **Mr. Bodek** had no comment.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval for amendments to New Construction, Part I: Height and Mass and for Part II: Design Details for a 4-story mixed-use building to be located on the vacant parcel at 400 West Congress Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:**

1. **Add a string course to the parapets.**
2. **Decrease the depth of the front eave on the tower element.**
3. **For the canopies proposed over the doors on the 4th floor of the east and west facades: remove in their entirety, return to the previous design where they were integral to the roof eaves, OR redesign to be more like the metal awning on the first floor of the east façade.**
4. **Provide the brick mortar sample.**
5. **Revise the smooth fiber cement horizontal shiplap siding proposed for 4th floor walls, storefront base, trim, and spandrel to permitted and visually compatible materials.**
6. **Ensure that the muntin profile simulates traditional putty glazing and that there are spacer bars in between double panes of glass.**
7. **Provide a sample panel per the Sample Panel Policy.**

### Motion

The HDBR motioned to approve the petition for the requested amendments to New Construction, Part I: Height and Mass and for Part II: Design Details for a 4-story mixed-use building to be located on the vacant parcel at 400 West Congress Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Add a string course to the parapets.
2. Decrease the depth of the front eave on the tower element.
3. For the canopies proposed over the doors on the 4th floor of the east and west facades: remove in their entirety, return to the previous design where they were integral to the roof eaves, OR redesign to be more like the metal awning on the first floor of the east facade.
4. Provide the brick mortar sample.
5. Revise the smooth fiber cement horizontal shiplap siding proposed for 4th floor walls, storefront base, trim, and spandrel to permitted and visually compatible materials.
6. Ensure that the muntin profile simulates traditional putty glazing and that there are spacer bars in between double panes of glass.
7. Provide a sample panel per the Sample Panel Policy.

### Vote Results ( Approved )

Motion: Steven Bodek

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Becky Lynch	- Abstain
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

### [14. Petition of Armor Exteriors LLC, Paul Senger | 21-000211-COA | 524 East Charlton Street | After-the-Fact Window and Door Alteration](#)

- 🔗 [Staff Recommendation 21-000211-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [February Meeting.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [524 East Charlton Application Correspondence.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Staff Site Visit Photos 3-31-2021.pdf](#)

**Ms. Leah Michalak** presented the petitioner's request of approval for an amendment to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitation work at 524 East Charlton Street issued on November 12, 2020 [File No. 20-004971-COA] to allow for an after-the-fact alteration of a rear window opening and rear door replacement to which the Board approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitation work at 524 East Charlton Street The petition was approved with the following conditions:

1. Ensure that no historic materials are removed, and that there are no alterations to the features and spaces that characterize the property. Ensure that all work (especially, power washing) is undertaken using the gentlest means possible to avoid damage to any historic materials.
2. Ensure that no ceramic based-coatings, waterproof coatings, or sealers of any kind are used on wood.
3. Ensure that all framing members are covered with appropriate trim; trim shall feature a header, surrounds, and a pronounced sill where appropriate.
4. Ensure that any remaining shutter hardware be left in place. Therefore, the action is reversible, and shutters can be added in the future; if so desired.
5. Ensure that all replacements and repairs are done in-kind. Ensure that the balusters do not exceed (4) inches on center, and that the railing does not exceed (36) inches in height. Ensure that all wood elements are painted or stained. If the porch elements are not to be painted in-kind, submit the paint color specification to Staff for review and approval.

Previously, on December 20, 2020, Staff received an email from a neighboring property owner regarding alterations that exceeded the scope of the approved Certificate of Appropriateness. A window on the rear, visible from the public-right-of-way, had been removed and sided over. Staff called the violation into Code Compliance on December 21, 2020. On January 13, 2021, an application was received by Staff for an amendment to the previous Certificate of Appropriateness [File No. 20-004971-COA] requesting approval for an after-the-fact window alteration on the rear façade of the building. During a visit to the property, Staff determined that an incompatible rear door, not reviewed or approved by Staff, was also installed.

**Per the petitioner:** The rear aluminum window was removed during an interior bathroom renovation. The removal was to allow for the repairs of rotted wall framing, which included the window framing. Since the window had been the cause of a severe leak, and the frame had been pulled out of square (due to the weight of the cast-iron tub and the deterioration of the floorboards), the window could not be reinstalled. Reinstalling the window would have led to continued leakage or the window glass would have broken from forcing a bent frame into a new opening. Also, the new acrylic insert for the shower covers 2/3rds of the pre-existing window opening. Therefore, since the neighboring home no longer retains the sister window opening, the remaining opening was closed and sided over to match.

At the February 10, 2021 HDBR Meeting, the Board continued the petition to the April 14, 2021 meeting, in order for the petitioner to address the following:

1. Ensure that the incompatible rear door is replaced with an appropriate wood door type, that is submitted to Staff for review and approval prior to installation.
2. Ensure that the wood siding is painted to match the rest of the building.
3. Ensure that the rear window opening is re-installed, adhering to the pre-existing dimensions, and that a historically appropriate wood replacement window type is submitted for review.

When staff performed monthly visits to the application sites, several issues were discovered:

1. A square fixed picture window had been installed in the location where the rear window on the bathroom extension was removed.
2. The risers on the front stairs had not be reinstalled after repairs were made.

The rear window, on the rear façade of the main building form, had been replaced (in-kind replacement was approved with a previous COA); the opening had been enlarged and the

historic header, trim, and sill removed. The applicant has applied for a Special Exception for this issue in File No. 21-001600-COA.

The historic building was constructed in 1906 and is a contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Downtown Historic District. At the February meeting, the Board determined that the bathroom extension window opening (not the window itself) was historic and must be reinstated.

The proportions of the square fixed picture window that was installed without approval is not visually compatible. The submittal packet contains a proposal for a 28-inch wide by 35-inch high wood, double-hung single pane replacement window to be installed which adheres to the dimensions of the window previously removed from this location. The proportions are visually compatible. Staff recommends that the square window be removed in its entirety and that the 28-inch wide by 35-inch high window be installed. The 28-inch wide by 35-inch high double-hung windows is proposed to be wood and painted white to match the color of the other windows which is visually compatible.

The aluminum window, and deteriorated rear window frame, were removed. The window opening was closed and sided over with wood. The wood siding is visually compatible with the predominate materials on the contributing buildings and structures to which the building is visually related. Ensure that the wood siding is painted to match the rest of the building. The historic window opening has already been removed. The window itself in that opening was not original and has been disposed of and will not be reinstated. Ensure that the that the 28-inch wide by 35-inch high window required to be installed have appropriate trim (header, surrounds, and pronounced sill) that match the trim the trim on the historic window openings.

The incomplete front stair is not visually compatible. The risers on the front stairs have not be reinstated after repairs were made. Install the risers and paint them the color to match the remainder of the front stair. Ensure that the risers on the front stair (that are yet to be installed) be painted to match the color of the remainder of the front stair. Install the front stair risers and paint them the color to match the remainder of the front stair to meet the standard.

The door on the rear façade is proposed to be replaced with a wood half-lite door with a 9-lite pattern to be painted white which is visually compatible, meeting the standards.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Paul Senger**, of Armor Exteriors, stated the windows previously brought before the Board was the rear window and a front window, not the bathroom window. However, the bathroom window was not historical, it was aluminum. He stated he misunderstood regarding replacing. There was no attempt to go around the decision or the ordinance. It will be replaced with the Victor Bilt. There is not enough room for a header trim, only the soffit. The door will be replaced as requested, as will the other recommendations.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

There were no public comments.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Bodek, Mr. Altschiller, Mr. Houle, Ms. Lynch, and Ms. Isaacs** had no comment. **Mr. Dodge, Ms. Memory and Ms. Taylor** stated they agreed with Staff recommendations.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval for an amendment to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitation work at 524 East Charlton Street issued on November 12, 2020 with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval because the proposal is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:**

- 1. Remove the square window in its entirety and install the 28-inch wide by 35-inch high window be installed.**
- 2. Ensure that the 28-inch wide by 35-inch high window have appropriate trim (header, surrounds, and pronounced sill) that match the trim the trim on the historic window openings.**
- 3. Install the front stair risers and paint them the color to match the remainder of the front stair.**
- 4. Ensure that the wood siding is painted to match the rest of the building.**

#### **Motion**

The HDBR motioned to approve the petitioner for an amendment to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitation work at 524 East Charlton Street issued on November 12, 2020 with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval because the proposal is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Remove the square window in its entirety and install the 28-inch wide by 35-inch high window be installed.
2. Ensure that the 28-inch wide by 35-inch high window have appropriate trim (header, surrounds, and pronounced sill) that match the trim the trim on the historic window openings.
3. Install the front stair risers and paint them the color to match the remainder of the front stair.
4. Ensure that the wood siding is painted to match the rest of the building.

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

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[15. Petition of Armor Exteriors LLC, Paul Senger | 21-001600-COA | 524 East Charlton Street | Special Exception](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation 21-001600-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Research.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Site Visit - February.pdf](#)

☉ [Staff Site Visit Photos 3-31-2021.pdf](#)

☉ [524 East Charlton Application Correspondence.pdf](#)

☉ [MPC Window Brochure.pdf](#)

**Ms. Leah Michalak** presented the petitioner's request of approval for a Special Exception to retain a window opening that was enlarged without a Certificate of Appropriateness for the rear façade of the property located at 524 East Charlton Street.

On November 12, 2020, the Board approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitation work at 524 East Charlton Street [File No. 20-004971-COA]. The scope of work included replacement of two windows: the window in question in this petition and the window in question for petitioner File No. 21-000211-COA. The approved replacement window was *“VictorBilt” Historic Series, wood, double-hung windows with a 6-over-6 lite configuration.*

The petition was approved with the following conditions (conditions that effect the window in question are **bolded**):

1. **Ensure that no historic materials are removed, and that there are no alterations to the features and spaces that characterize the property.** Ensure that all work (especially, power washing) is undertaken using the gentlest means possible to avoid damage to any historic materials.
2. Ensure that no ceramic based-coatings, waterproof coatings, or sealers of any kind are used on wood.
3. **Ensure that all framing members are covered with appropriate trim; trim shall feature a header, surrounds, and a pronounced sill where appropriate.**
4. Ensure that any remaining shutter hardware be left in place. Therefore, the action is reversible, and shutters can be added in the future; if so desired.
5. **Ensure that all replacements and repairs are done in-kind.** Ensure that the balusters do not exceed (4) inches on center, and that the railing does not exceed (36) inches in height. **Ensure that all wood elements are painted or stained.** If the porch elements are not to be painted in-kind, submit the paint color specification to Staff for review and approval.

However, when staff visited the site in March 2021 (with regard to the other window issue), it was discovered that the window opening had been enlarged, a larger window had been installed, and the historic window trim (including header, surrounds, and sill) had been removed. Staff contacted the contractor to discuss the issue. Staff gave the contractor his option; he opted to apply for a Special Exception to keep the altered opening.

The historic building was constructed in **1906** and is a contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District. The building is visible on the **1916 Sanborn Map** as a one-story frame, attached dwelling with a metal roof and a small one-story entry porch. The building remains unaltered on the **1955** and **1973 Sanborn Maps** and, as it currently stands, aligns with the original **1916** description. The only later addition is a small porch off the rear. This rear façade window opening was in its original/historic configuration and location; although the window itself was a 1980s replacement because the 1980s photo shows that the window was not extant in this opening (see attached).

The preservation standards are not met. A window opening and its historic trim are part of the historic character of a property and has been altered. The deteriorated window, window opening, and trim was not replaced in-kind because the opening was enlarged (therefore the window itself is larger) and the trim that has been installed does not match the old in design.



The applicant has requested a Special Exception to retain the window opening that was enlarged.

The proportions and materials of the enlarged window open are visually compatible. The replacement window, although larger than the historic window, was replaced with a window that is the same materials and lite pattern. The replacement window is also double-hung and single-paned like the historic windows.

**SPECIAL EXCEPTION REQUEST:**

The measurements of the altered window opening are very similar to the historic opening and the window is on the rear façade. It is visible from the lane; however, it is not uncommon for historic window openings on rear facades to be approved to be altered. The altered size of the opening is in conformance with the goals, policies, and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and the provisions of this Ordinance to retain as much historic material as possible; very little historic material has been removed. The change in opening size will not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, welfare, function, and appearance of the adjacent uses or general vicinity.

However, the trim that is currently installed is inappropriate and not in conformance with the goals, policies, and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and the provisions of this Ordinance. The standard is not met. The trim is the stock trim that came with the window unit. The applicant has stated his intention to remove the stock trim and install trim that matches the historic in design and materials. Staff recommends that the stock trim around the window be removed and install trim that matches the historic in design and materials.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Paul Senger**, of Armor Exteriors, stated he came in after the realtor initially came to the HDBR Board. He stated the window was ordered in November 2020 and it came in March 2021, larger than what was ordered. He stated waiting an additional four months was not an option as they've already taken a loss. The trim is temporary. From the reveal, it is larger but the wall space reduction is nominal. He believes with the proper seal and trim, it will present a historical look.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

There was no public comment.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

There were no Board comments.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval for a Special Exception to retain a historic window opening that was enlarged without a Certificate of Appropriateness for the rear façade of the property located at 524 East Charlton Street with the following condition because the Special Exception Criteria are otherwise met:**

- 1. Remove the stock trim around the new window and install trim that matches the historic in design and materials.**

**Motion**

The HDBR motioned to approve the petition for a Special Exception to retain a historic window opening that was enlarged without a Certificate of Appropriateness for the rear facade of the property located at 524 East

Charlton Street with the following condition because the Special Exception Criteria are otherwise met:

1. Remove the stock trim around the new window and install trim that matches the historic in design and materials.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Steven Bodek

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[16. Petition of Pioneer Construction | 21-001552-COA | 19 East River Street | Alterations](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation - 21-001552-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - 21-001552-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Research - Old COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Research - Photographs.pdf](#)

**Mr. Ryan Jarles** presented the applicant's request of approval for 2 balconies to be constructed on the second-story façade of 19 East River Street (36 East Bay Street on the Contributing Resources Map). On November 9, 2011, the Board approved two new balconies in the same location as the current petition on the second story with a modern decorative railing design [H-2011-1020-4540-2]; however, two new balconies were constructed on the fourth and fifth stories instead. The applicant claims these balconies were installed some time in 2016-2017; the two balconies feature railings that are a similar design to the historic railings found on River Street. Staff was unable to locate an approval for these balconies. There is no evidence that balconies ever existed historically in the proposed locations within this petition.

The historic building was constructed between 1859-1876 and is a contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District. The historic character of the building is proposed to be retained; no materials are proposed to be removed. The distinctive features and finishes of the building are proposed to be retained and preserved

The applicant is proposing the use of a railing that is designed to match that of the original railings found on historic balconies on River Street. Revise the railing design to be one that is differentiated, yet compatible, with the historic railings, such as the design found within the 2011 COA approval. Ensure that the attachment method for the new balconies is undertaken in a way to not damage the historic brick exterior; ensure all mounting is undertaken within the mortar joints between the bricks, which will also ensure reversibility.

The applicant is proposing the use of a railing that is designed to match that of the original railings found on historic balconies on River Street. Revise the railing design to be one that is differentiated, yet compatible, with the historic railings, such as the design found within the 2011 COA approval. The materiality of the proposed metal railing and brackets are compatible. The materiality for the deck of the balcony is referenced, however, is not provided within the submittal packet. Ensure the balcony decking is wood and is either painted or stained. Ensure that the balusters are placed between upper and lower rails, the railings are not more than 4 inches apart, and the railing height is no more than 36 inches. The balconies are proposed to project 3'-5" deep; however, the balconies are not proposed for residential use. The materiality of the proposed metal railing and brackets are compatible. The materiality for the deck of the balcony is referenced, however, is not provided within the submittal packet.

The addition of the balconies to the River Street facing façade, if the railing design is revised to be differentiated yet compatible in design, will be clearly seen as an appendage of the historic building and will be reversible.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Isaacs** asked if the railing would create a false sense of history. **Mr. Jarles** stated that was the reasoning behind recommending using the 2011 COA design pattern.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

The petitioner was not present.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay**, of the Historic Savannah Foundation, stated they are against the application of the balconies. They create a false sense of history as they were not a part of the original structure, thus affecting the typology of the building. The design is visually incompatible and speaks against the history of the building. They were cotton-loading openings and never had balconies.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Bodek**, **Mr. Altschiller**, and **Mr. Houle** stated he was not in favor of the balconies; they are visually incompatible with the history of the building. **Mr. Dodge**, **Ms. Memory**, and **Ms. Lynch** agrees with staff recommendation and the balconies that should be differentiated. **Ms. Isaacs** had no comment. **Mr. Stephens** stated he is in favor of demarcating time periods and using structures beyond its historical use as long as it is reversible.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval for two (2) balconies to be constructed on the second-story, River Street facing façade, of 19 East River Street (36 East Bay Street on the Contributing Resources Map), with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards: 1. Revise the railing design to be one that is differentiated, yet compatible with, the historic railings (such as the design found within the 2011 COA approval) and ensure that balusters are placed between upper and lower rails, the railings are not more than 4 inches apart, and the railing height is no more than 36 inches. 2. Ensure the balcony decking is wood and is painted or stained.

**Motion**

The HDBR motioned to approve for two (2) balconies to be constructed on the second-story, River Street facing facade, of 19 East River Street (36 East Bay Street on the Contributing Resources Map), with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the railing design to be one that is differentiated, yet compatible with, the historic railings (such as the design found within the 2011 COA approval) and ensure that balusters are placed between upper and lower rails, the railings are not more than 4 inches apart, and the railing height is no more than 36 inches.
2. Ensure the balcony decking is wood and is painted or stained.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Becky Lynch

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Nay
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Nay
Ellie Isaacs	- Nay
Steven Bodek	- Nay

[17. Petition of Coastal Canvas, Joseph Corbin | 21-001366-COA | 301 West River Street | Awning](#)

[☞ Staff Recommendation - 301 W River St - 21-001366-COA.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Aislinn Droski** presented the applicant's request of approval for three (3) new awnings for the property located at 301 West River Street. The awning, which presents as one awning connecting the two facades of the building, consists of one awning on the front façade (River Street), a second awning on the side façade (alley/stairs to Williamson Street), and a third awning connecting them at the corner. The awning is proposed to be over 10' above the sidewalk and projects 4'-0" from the building facades.

This application was initially received as an item for staff review. The submitted materials were reviewed and it was found that the awning was proposed to connect the front and side façade of the historic building and cover a large portion of each. Staff determined that this would significantly visually impact the historic facades and as such, this item could not remain a staff level review as submitted. Staff contacted the applicant to ask if they wished to separate the awnings or bring this item to the Board as currently designed. The applicant indicated that they would like to proceed with the submittal for the Board to review.

301-311 West River Street (302-310 Williamson Street) was constructed in 1850/1898 and is a contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District. The preservation standards are not met. The awning is proposed to cover 300 inches (25 feet) along the front façade and 564 inches (47 feet) along

the side façade. A corner piece shall connect the two awnings and present the awning as wrapping along both facades. The awning is proposed to be constructed of an aluminum frame and canvas cover in Sunbrella Burgundy 84031. While these materials are typically appropriate and visually compatible for an awning, in tandem with the proposed size of the awning, which wraps the corner and covers a large portion of the building, this solid material will visually impact the historic facades. As such, staff has determined that the proposed awning is not visually compatible in material or scale with the surrounding contributing buildings and structures. Staff recommends that the configuration and/or materiality of the awning be revised in order to lessen its visual impact on the historic facades. The proposed three-piece awning is to have a vertical clearance of 122", or approximately 10.167 feet, above the sidewalk. One awning is proposed to extend 300 inches (25 feet) along the front façade and another awning is proposed to extend 564 inches (47 feet) along the side façade. A corner awning shall connect the two and present the awning as wrapping the corner of the building, not meeting the standards.

The proposed awning is to wrap the corner of one building and will not connect two separate business establishment facades, meeting the intent of the standard. The awning is to be constructed of metal supports with a canvas cover.

Two awning signs are proposed; one located above the entrance providing public entrance on River Street and one located on the corner awning, which are to read "Two Cracked Eggs" with a frying pan and eggs logo underneath. The aggregate sign area for the two awning signs is to be 7.16 square feet. The standards are met for the awning sign to be located above the primary entrance is permitted, however the corner awning sign does not meet the standards and is not permitted. Staff recommends removing the sign on the corner awning in order to meet the standards. This amount of signage located on the canopy exceeds the amount of signage allowed in this district and is not visually compatible with the contributing buildings and structures to which it is visually related. Staff recommends removing the corner signage on the awning.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

The Board asked for explanation of the recommendation of denial. Staff explained it was the wrapping of the awning and the scope of coverage of historic material. Most awnings on River Street do not wrap the building, although there are several that present as running the length of the building. **Ms. Michalak** used the building at the end of River Street, across from Kessler Plant Riverside, as an example: they proposed a metal awning to wrap the building as an example of Board direction to the petitioner to deny or require significant changes or conditions. Also 311 West River Street is an example.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Joseph Corbin**, of Coastal Canvas, stated Olympia Café awning wraps the corner; his request is not precedent-setting. They requested a corner-wrap so that the tour stations that set up near the restaurant are protected from the weather. Graphics on the awning are not an issue on the corner.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay**, of the Historic Savannah Foundation, stated they support Staff's recommendation because the obscuring of the building due to the size and configuration. Each building is addressed on a case-by-case basis. An older awning should not be used as a precedent; as it itself may not look appropriate. They are not against the practicality of awnings.

**Mr. Bob Rosenwald**, of the Downtown Neighborhood Association, supports Staff recommendation. Suggests the petitioner present a more compatible design for a historic

structure.

**Mr. Corbin** stated size reduction and removal of the corner piece can be done. The intent was for outdoor protection of patrons.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Bodek** stated he does not see the justification with no entrance on the corner as Olympia Café has. **Mr. Dodge** stated he agrees with staff recommendations. **Mr. Altschiller** agrees with the comments regarding obscuring the historic facades; he believes the problem is greater in that the whole of River Street will be full of awnings. **Mr. Houle** stated he agrees with Staff's recommendation and hopes the applicant will propose something less obtrusive. **Ms. Memory** agrees with Staff's recommendations. **Ms. Taylor** stated it also obscures the spatial area, not just the building and agrees with Staff recommendations. **Ms. Lynch** stated she would have no issue if there were functioning doorways on the alley, therefore she agrees with Staff recommendations and other Board comments. **Ms. Isaacs** stated she agrees with Staff recommendation and Board comments.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Denial** of three (3) new awnings for the property located at 301 West River Street because the work as proposed is not visually compatible and does not meet the preservation or design standards.

**Motion**

The HDBR motioned for denial of three (3) new awnings for the property located at 301 West River Street because the work as proposed is not visually compatible and does not meet the preservation or design standards.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[18. Petition of Ethos Preservation, Ellen Harris | 21-001547-COA | 304 East Hall Street | New Construction, Accessory Building \(Parts I and II\)](#)

[☞ Staff Recommendation - 304 E Hall St - 21-001547-COA.pdf](#)

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

[☞ Staff Research.pdf](#)

[☞ Previous COA - 20-006230-COA - Non-Contributing Evaluation.pdf](#)

**Ms. Aislinn Droski** presented the applicant's request of approval for the demolition of a non-contributing detached garage, New Construction (Parts I and II) of a two-story carriage house, and mechanical screening for a relocated HVAC unit for the property located at 304 East Hall Street.

On February 10, 2021, the Board approved alterations and additions to the historic main building including the removal of a non-historic second story connector, in-kind repair of a standing seam metal roof, the infill of a non-historic door opening on the second floor (original leading out to the connector) [21-000243-COA]. On February 5, 2021, Staff approved a color change to the historic main building. The trim was approved to be "Frost" (white), the siding is to be "Diamonds Therapy" (eggshell), and the remaining elements were approved to be "Dark Secret" (black) [21-000660-COA].

On February 25, 2021, staff was notified that the HVAC equipment had been moved from the rear yard to the east side yard. Staff contacted the applicant, who then spoke to the owner, and they included proposed mechanical screening for the equipment with this application. On March 11, 2021, staff was notified that, without approval or review, the screening and railing on an existing side porch had been removed and replaced with a fixed picture window, effectively enclosing the side porch. The owner indicated that original railing in this location has been retained on site and was intended to be re-installed. Sanborn Maps from 1888 to 1973 indicated that this porch has historically been a two-story, open side porch with a metal roof; this side porch retained its original configuration and materials prior to the installation of the glazing.

Staff spoke with the applicant who informed that owner that, per the following standard, enclosing a side porch on a contributing building with glazing is not permitted by the ordinance, and the glazing would need to be removed and the railing reinstalled, or a Special Exception could be requested of the Historic District Board of Review.

Currently the applicant nor the owner have indicated to staff which route (removal of glazing or request for Special Exception) they intend to pursue.

On December 21, 2020, the detached garage on the lane, which is proposed for demolition, was determined by Staff to be a non-contributing building within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District due to lack of physical historic integrity [20-006230-COA]. This determination was necessary because the existing building does not appear on this district's Historic Building Map.

The applicant is proposing the demolition of the existing detached garage and its replacement with a new construction accessory dwelling unit. This meets the standard. The existing building coverage is 53.7%. The new carriage house shall cover the same footprint as the existing detached garage and will not change the building coverage, meeting the standard.

The preservation standard is not met; on March 11, 2021, it was brought to staff's attention that the screening on an existing side porch had been removed and replaced with a fixed picture window, enclosing the side porch with glazing. The owner indicated that original railing in this location has been retained on site and was intended to be re-installed. The enclosing of this porch with glazing significantly alters the historic space so that it no longer reads as a porch. Staff recommends that the glazing be removed and that all work required to return the porch to its previous configuration be submitted within a COA application to staff.

The new carriage house is proposed to be two stories and 21'-7" in height. The height is visually compatible. All window openings proposed for the carriage house are to be taller than they are wide and are visually compatible. There are two windows proposed for the façade which face East Huntingdon Lane, to be located on the second floor above two garage doors. The west façade, which shall be visible from Lincoln Street, is to have one window on the second floor. The east façade is against a neighboring garage structure and is not proposed to have any openings. The south façade of the carriage house is not visible from the public right-of-way. The rhythm of solids to voids is visually compatible.

The construction of the carriage house shall maintain the existing rhythm of structures along East Huntingdon Lane and is visually compatible. The following materials and colors are proposed for the carriage house and mechanical screening:

- Roof: Owens-Corning 30 Year Architectural Shingles in Williamsburg Gray
- Siding: Smooth Hardi with 5" exposure in SW 9145 Sleepy Hollow (a gray blue)
- Trim: Smooth Hardi in bright white
- Windows: Windsor "Legend Series", double hung 1/1, aluminum clad windows in white
- Garage Doors: Clopay – smooth steel with "elegant short panels" in white
- Human Door: Clopay – smooth steel with 6 panels in white
- Mechanical Screening (for HVAC units relocated to side yard): 6' wood fence, in white
- Access Gate: 6' wood fence in white

The materials and colors proposed are visually compatible. The roof shape for the carriage house is to be a side gable with a 6/12 pitch; the roof shape is visually compatible.

A pedestrian access gate is proposed to be located between the new carriage house and an existing accessory structure on the corner of Lincoln Street and East Huntingdon Lane. The carriage house and this gate create a wall of continuity along the lane which is visually compatible. The scale and directional expression of the building is visually compatible. The carriage house is proposed to be two (2) stories tall, meeting the standard.

Staff has determined that wood siding is appropriate for this carriage house; as such, the applicant is proposing the use of smooth finish Hardi (fiber cement) siding. The siding shall be painted SW 9145 Sleepy Hollow, a gray blue color. The remainder of the property was approved for a color change on February 5, 2021. The siding is to be "Diamonds Therapy" (eggshell) [21-000660-COA]. The color proposed for the carriage house shall be visually compatible with the siding color of the contributing main building on the property and is visually compatible with the surrounding contributing resources within Stephens Ward. The human door is to be made of steel (without wood grain simulation) and is to be located on a façade with smooth Hardi siding.

The standard is met for the lane facing façade which is the primary façade. The distance between the windows proposed for the lane-facing façade of the new carriage house is appropriate. The windows are to be aluminum clad with transparent glass. The side gable roof is to have a 6:12 pitch and the eaves shall overhang 12 inches. The roof is to be Owens-Corning architectural asphalt shingles. The new carriage house is to be two stories shall and subordinate to the primary structure. There is an existing apron on East Huntingdon Lane, which shall not be altered. Two, eight-foot, garage door openings are proposed for the carriage house. A bank of electrical equipment is proposed on the rear (lane) façade of main building addition adjacent (to the west) of the proposed carriage house. HVAC units have been relocated to the side (east) façade of the main building and are proposed to be screened from the public right-of-way with a 6' wood fence. The refuse storage area is to be located in the interior of the property and shall not be visible from the



public right-of-way. A pedestrian access gate is proposed for between the new carriage house and an existing accessory structure and is to be 6' in height and is to be painted white. The standards are met. The carriage house is to be located on the same property as the historic main building, is clearly incidental, and is in-keeping with the use of the main building. The carriage house is to be detached from the principal dwelling and is to be two stories and 21'-7" in height. No side-yard setbacks are required.

There is an existing garage building that is to be demolished. The new carriage house shall not exceed the existing building coverage on the lot. The footprint of the carriage house is 564.5 square feet; this is less than 40% of the habitable floor area of the principal dwelling. The new carriage house is to have one bedroom and more than 400 square feet of heated area. Parking is to be provided within the accessory dwelling.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Ellen Harris**, of Ethos Preservation, stated she is in agreement with Staff recommendations and will submit the requested COA for the porch enclosed without approval.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

There was no public comment.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Isaacs** stated she feels there is not much detail on the carriage house. **Ms. Lynch, Ms. Memory,** and **Mr. Bodek** stated they have no comment. **Ms. Taylor, Mr. Houle, Mr. Altschiller,** and **Mr. Dodge** stated they agree with Staff recommendation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval for the demolition of a non-contributing detached garage, New Construction (Parts I and II) of a two-story carriage house, and mechanical screening for a relocated HVAC unit for the property located at 304 East Hall Street with the following condition because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:**

- 1. Submit a COA application to staff which includes all work required to return the side porch to its previous configuration.**

**Motion**

The HDBR motioned for approval for the demolition of a non-contributing detached garage, New Construction (Parts I and II) of a two-story carriage house, and mechanical screening for a relocated HVAC unit for the property located at 304 East Hall Street with the following condition because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Submit a COA application to staff which includes all work required to return the side porch to its previous configuration.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Steven Bodek

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch

- Aye

Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[19. Petition of Ellsworth Design Build, Andersen Resende | 21-001147-COA | 405 East Gaston Street | Alterations to Non-Historic Rear Porch](#)

- 📎 [Staff Recommendation 21-001147-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Narrative and Drawings.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Staff Research - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Staff Research.pdf](#)

**Ms. Olivia Arfuso** presented the applicant's request of approval for alterations to a non-historic rear porch addition at 405 East Gaston Street. In-kind repairs will also be made to existing wood porch elements, as well as gutter repairs. The existing porch screens and railings will be replaced with *Sierra Pacific*, aluminum clad wood, double-hung, 1-over-1 and transom windows. A matching *Sierra Pacific*, aluminum clad wood, inswing door is proposed to be installed on the South elevation. All finishes will be from the *ColorStay Collection* in "Colonial White, 313".

The historic dwelling was constructed in 1892 and is listed as a contributing resource within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District. The dwelling is depicted on the 1898 *Sanborn Map* as a two-story frame building with a one-story front entry portico. The rear decreases to one-story with a one-story rear porch in the south-west corner of the building. The 1916 *Sanborn Map* shows a new one-story rear extension that runs along the east side of the yard. The extension appears to be a one-story porch with a shingle roof. A small lane dwelling also appears in the south-west corner of the property.

There are no visible changes / alterations on the 1954 *Sanborn Map*, or the 1973 *Sanborn Map*. However, the rear lane dwelling does become an auto garage after 1954. The *Georgia Historic Resources Survey* notes that there were alterations made to the property in 1977, after the building was listed as "dilapidated" in tax records and sold. Shortly after, a rehabilitation took place. The only "Porch" listed on the 1990s *Resources Survey* is a one-story front wood portico and a simple brick stoop located on the west side of the house. Therefore, Staff has determined that the current rear porch addition was constructed after the *Georgia Historic Resources Survey*, which occurred between 1996-1998.

While visiting the site, Staff determined that the proposed work has already commenced, and is close to completion.

The proposed alterations will occur to the non-historic rear porch and will not affect the principal, historic building. The historic character of the property will be retained and preserved. The alterations will occur on the South and West elevations of the non-historic

rear porch. The proposed work will be differentiated yet compatible, with the principal historic building and will not affect the historic integrity of the property and / or its environment. Ensure that the work is undertaken in such a manner that if the porch were to be removed in the future, the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The applicant is proposing alterations to the South and West elevations of the non-historic rear porch. In-kind repairs will also be made to existing wood porch elements, as well as gutter repairs.

Staff noted that specifications for *Sierra Pacific*, aluminum clad wood, tilt, double-hung picture windows were included in the submittal packet. However, has determined that the windows being considered “picture windows,” are more appropriately rectangular accent windows. These accent windows will be installed in a row, under the grouped double-hung windows. The existing porch screens and railings will be replaced with *Sierra Pacific*, aluminum clad wood, double-hung, 1-over-1 and transom windows. Although, these windows are proposed to be grouped, the individual sashes have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3. These windows will not be visible from the public right-of-way, due to the rear and side yard privacy fences. They will not be visible from the public right-of-way, due to the rear and side yard privacy fences. Ensure that the proposed windows are from the *Sierra Pacific*, Premium or Monument Double-Hung Series which have been previously approved by the Board for use on “New Construction, Additions, and Non-Historic Buildings...” Ensure that all window framing members are covered with appropriate trim, including surrounds and a continuous header and sill (where appropriate). All glass should be transparent with no dark tints or reflective effects.

The rear porch is a non-historic addition. The porch form / overall footprint is a pre-existing condition that is not proposed to be altered in any way. The proposed alterations are to occur on the South and West porch elevations. The existing porch screens and railings will be replaced with *Sierra Pacific*, aluminum clad wood, double-hung, 1-over-1 and transom windows. A matching *Sierra Pacific*, aluminum clad wood, inswing door is proposed to be installed on the South elevation. All finishes will be from the *ColorStay Collection* in “Colonial White, 313”. Staff has determined that the proposed alterations are appropriate for a non-historic rear porch addition.

**Mr. Houle** asked if the work was started before approval. **Ms. Michalak** explained the application was submitted but there was confusion within the installation department, therefore it is incomplete. The contractor stopped them when he became aware.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Anderson Resende** and **Mr. Frank Ellsworth**, of Ellsworth Design Build, stated they initially thought it was a staff level and was not initially aware they were working without approval. They stopped immediately upon recognition.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay**, of Historic Savannah Foundation, stated after-the-fact actions are increasing, although they do understand there are innocent exceptions at times. If it is an education issue, they are willing to help because they are increasing. This Board understands this project was for a non-historic porch, however, there could have been a better nuanced design and the homeowner's wishes of comfort. However, it is troubling that this keeps happening.

**Mr. Ellsworth** stated they do not have a permit because they do not have the COA. He stated they missed a part and are now holding the project until approval to move forward.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Bodek** asked what is in place regarding after-the-fact; any recourse or only to approve or deny. **Mr. Stephens** stated to approve, deny, or coordinate with Code Compliance. **Ms. Michalak** stated in this instance, if approved, Code Compliance is not necessary. If denied and they continue, then Code Compliance can take to court or other actions. **Mr. Dodge** stated he agrees with Staff recommendations. **Mr. Houle** agrees with Mr. Bodek's statements. He wishes there was more the Board could do. **Ms. Michalak** stated stop work orders can be issued by the City, and fines are a part of that. **Ms. Memory** stated she is also concerned with the increase, although the role of the Board is to encourage compatible design. But it shouldn't be allowed to stand simply because the work is complete. She supports educational outreach and reminding of the necessity of following the process. **Ms. Taylor** agrees and suggests including the HPC because all living in the historic districts are educated. Would like to pursue other effective ways to enclose porches. **Ms. Isaacs** stated it is frustrating because it has to be approved with conditions, and other options are not being considered. It's additionally frustrating because now it appears they've gotten away with it, especially as a larger company in the area. **Mr. Altschiller** stated people are doing things willingly because they know there is not punitive mechanism in place; until then, it will continue to happen. **Mr. Stephens** agrees with Mr. Altschiller, but does believe additional education is necessary to property owners, include realtors. This is a very forgiving Board. The after-the-fact issues keep occurring. There were no presentations or opportunity for better design solutions for this project, doing a disservice to the Board. It is imperative the process is adhered to by all. No one should receive exceptions and slide by.

**Mr. Bodek** asked the Board to consider the message they are sending to the public/petitioners. He stated the petition should be denied and start over. If it were ignorance on the part of the homeowner - that is not known. If it was by the contractor, that's even worse. **Ms. Taylor** stated she feels railroaded. It's not fair that everyone is not following the same rules.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval for alterations to a non-historic rear porch addition at 405 East Gaston Street with the following conditions because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:**

- 1. Ensure that all work is undertaken using the gentlest means possible to avoid damage to any historic materials, and that the work is undertaken in such a manner that if the porch were to be removed in the future, the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.**
- 2. Ensure that the proposed windows are from the *Sierra Pacific, Premium or Monument Double-Hung Series* which have been previously approved by the Board for use on "New Construction, Additions, and Non-Historic Buildings..."**
- 3. *Ensure that all window framing members are covered with appropriate trim, including surrounds and a continuous header and sill (where appropriate). All glass should be transparent with no dark tints or reflective effects.***

**Motion**

The HDBR motioned for approval for alterations to a non-historic rear porch addition at 405 East Gaston Street with the following conditions, because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that all work is undertaken using the gentlest means possible to avoid damage to any historic materials, and that the work is undertaken in such a manner that if the porch were to be removed in the future, the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
2. Ensure that the proposed windows are from the Sierra Pacific, Premium or Monument Double-Hung Series which have been previously approved by the Board for use on "New Construction, Additions, and Non-Historic Buildings";
3. Ensure that all window framing members are covered with appropriate trim, including surrounds and a continuous header and sill (where appropriate). All glass should be transparent with no dark tints or reflective effects.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: David Altschiller

Becky Lynch	- Not Present
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Nay
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Nay
Steven Bodek	- Nay

**X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS**

[20. Petition of CATHERINE COTE | 212 WEST BROUGHTON STREET | 21-001364-COA | Sign](#)

[SIGNED Staff Decision - 212 -218 W Broughton - 21-001364-COA.pdf](#)

[21. Petition of ELLSWORTH DESIGN BUILD, Andersen Resende | 216 EAST TAYLOR STREET | 21-001369-COA | Window Replacement](#)

[SIGNED Staff Decision - 216 E Taylor St - 21-001369.pdf](#)

[22. Petition of ZACK SPURLOCK | 2 EAST LIBERTY STREET | 21-001372-COA | Sign](#)

[SIGNED 21-001372-COA Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[23. Petition of LOWCOUNTRY FOUNDATION REPAIR | 511 PRICE STREET | 21-001374-COA | Foundation Stabilization](#)

[SIGNED 21-001374-COA Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[24. Petition of ROOFCRAFTERS, Kyle Conaway | 108 WEST HARRIS ST. | 21-001375-COA | In-Kind Roof Repairs](#)

[SIGNED 21-001375-COA Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[25. Petition of FELDER & ASSOCIATES, Gretchen O. Callejas | 130 HABERSHAM STREET | 21-001597-COA | Shutters](#)

[☞ SIGNED 21-001597-COA Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[26. Petition of DOUG BEAN SIGNS, Angela Bean | 19 EAST RIVER STREET | 21-001720-COA | Sign](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 19 E River St - 21-001720.pdf](#)

[27. Petition of DOUG BEAN SIGNS, Angela Bean | 120 WHITAKER STREET | 21-001721-COA | Sign Face Change](#)

[☞ SIGNED 21-001721-COA Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[28. Petition of Josh Waters | 217 EAST JONES STREET | 21-001740-COA | Mechanical Screening](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 217 E Jones St - 21-001740-COA.pdf](#)

[29. Petition of KEITH LIND | 414-420 WEST WAYNE STREET | 21-001791-COA | Amendment to Fences](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 414 - 420 W Wayne St 21-001791.pdf](#)

[30. Petition of YOUR EXTERIOR PROS, Ray Hoover | 529 EAST JONES STREET | 21-001816-COA | In-Kind Roof Replacement](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 529 E Jones St - 21-001816.pdf](#)

[31. Petition of AT&T ENGINEERING, James Coleman | 21-001965-COA | 251 EAST BROAD STREET | Small-Cell Telecommunication Equipment](#)

[☞ SIGNED 21-001965-COA Decision Packet.pdf](#)

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

[32. Report on Work Performed Without a COA for the April 14, 2021 HDBR Meeting](#)

[☞ 4-14-2021 HDBR Report on Work Without a COA.pdf](#)

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

[33. COA Inspections - April Report](#)

[☞ April 2021 COA Inspections Report.pdf](#)

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

[☞ April 2021 REPORT.pdf](#)

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

#### **XIV. OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **XV. ADJOURNMENT**

[35. Next Regular HDBR Meeting - May 12, 2021 at 1pm](#)

[36. Adjourn](#)

There being no further business to present before the Board, the April 14, 2021 HDBR adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully,

Leah G. Michalak

*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.*