



Savannah Historic District Board of Review

112 East State Street - Mendonsa Hearing Room
August 10, 2022 1:00 P..M.
MINUTES

August 10, 2022 Historic District Board of Review

A Pre-Meeting was held at 12:00 PM at 112 East State 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: Ellie Isaacs, Chair
David Altschiller
Karen Guinn
Michael Higgins
Melissa Memory
Melissa Rowan (virtually)
Dwayne Stephens
Nan Taylor
Thomas Thomson

Members Absent:

MPC Staff Present: Melanie Wilson, Executive Director
Pamela Everett, Assistant Executive Director
Leah Michalak, Director of Historic Preservation
Aislinn Droski, Assistant Planner
Ethan Hagerman, Assistant Planner
James Zerillo, Assistant Planner
Bri Morgan, Administrative Assistant
Julie Yawn, System Analyst

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

[1. Petition of Peter T. Callejas | 22-003326-COA | 220 West Lower Factor's Walk | Alterations](#)

📎 [STAFF RECOMMENDATION.pdf](#)

📎 [SUBMITTAL PACKET.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations to the rear entryway façade at 220 West Lower Factor as submitted because the work is visually compatible and

meets the standards.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: David Altschiller

Dwayne Stephens	- Not Present
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Abstain
Karen Guinn	- Aye
Michael Higgins	- Aye
Melissa H. Rowan	- Aye
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

[2. Adopt the August 10, 2022 Agenda](#)

Motion

The Historic Board of Review motioned to adopt the August 10, 2022 Agenda as presented.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Thomas L. Thomson

Second: Melissa Memory

Dwayne Stephens	- Not Present
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Abstain
Karen Guinn	- Aye
Michael Higgins	- Aye
Melissa H. Rowan	- Aye
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[3. Approve July 13, 2022 HDBR Meeting Minutes](#)

📎 [07.13.22 MEETING MINUTES.pdf](#)

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to approve the July 13, 2022 HDBR Meeting Minutes as

presented.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Karen Guinn

Second: David Altschiller

Dwayne Stephens	- Not Present
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Abstain
Karen Guinn	- Aye
Michael Higgins	- Aye
Melissa H. Rowan	- Aye
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

[4. Petition of Pantheon ADC | 22-002854-COA | 11 Jefferson Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Motion

Continue.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Michael Higgins

Dwayne Stephens	- Not Present
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Abstain
Karen Guinn	- Aye
Michael Higgins	- Aye
Melissa H. Rowan	- Aye
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

IX. REGULAR AGENDA

[5. Petition of Andrew Jones | 22-003302-COA | 41 Habersham Street | Alterations](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation - 22-003302-COA - 41 Habersham St.pdf](#)

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

📎 [Staff Research - Example of Bars Inside Windows.jpg](#)

📎 [Petitioner Presentation.pdf](#)

Ms. Aislinn Droski presented the applicant's request of approval for wooden burglar bars for the property located at 41 Habersham Street.

Per the applicant, the project proposal is as follows:

“The proposal is to add painted wooden burglar bars to the shopfront windows at 41 Habersham Street. This is a commercial storefront. It was broken into in 2019 and needs to be protected from burglars. It will serve as an antique shop. HSF has a façade easement on the building and has approved this proposal...Habersham Street is the “carriage house” for the adjacent building, the Berrien House, at 324 East Broughton Street, which currently has burglar bars on 4 ground floor windows.”

Since the adoption of the new zoning ordinance (NewZo) in 2019, staff cannot recall of an instance in which burglar bars, either wooden or metal, were approved by staff or the Historic District Board of Review to be placed on the exterior of a window. Additionally, no COA approvals for such a proposal were able to be located. Any existing burglar bars were likely installed prior to NewZo or without approvals. There are instances of burglar bars/security measures being installed within the interior of a window.

41 Habersham Street was constructed in 1852 and is a contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Downtown Historic District. Staff finds that the installation of burglar bars will cover a substantial portion of the windows, which are a distinctive feature and that their installation does not meet the intent of the preservation standards. The burglar bars are to be placed over the windows that are the first floor, facing Habersham Street. They are to be 1 ¼” square posts which will be spaced 5” on center. Staff finds that the placement of burglar bars on these windows significantly effects the rhythm of solids to voids in a front façade and are not visually compatible. The bars are to be constructed of wood and will be painted *Benjamin Moore Ivory Tower* in a satin finish, which will match the color of the trim on 41 Habersham Street and 324 East Broughton Street. Staff finds the materials and color to be visually compatible.

The windows in the openings are not proposed to be replaced. While exterior burglar bars are not listed as prohibited for windows, it is a prohibited feature for new storefronts. The windows will serve as the ‘storefront’ for the proposed business. Staff finds that the installation of exterior burglar bars in this location does not meet the intent of the standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Andrew Jones, represents Carmac Realty, stated the property is an accessory building to John Berrien House. He stated his request follows the Oglethorpe Plan. There are existing bars on other structures currently. The zoning treats/applies only to new buildings. MPC does not have authority to rewrite the Ordinance. He addressed Staff's objections, and feels Staff is creating its own standards, as he does not see this language in the Ordinance. This is not new construction; the Ordinance does not apply to his request.

Ms. Taylor asked if interior bars were considered. **Mr. Jones** replied yes, he does not like look of it. He stated he would like equal treatment that was provided to others.

Mr. Thomson asked what is the fire escape provision for structures with bars on window. **Mr. Jones** stated the door and the breakage of the bars; he selected wood for that purpose.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Ryan Jarles, HSF, sated his agency holds an easement on this property and supports

the request.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Ms. Taylor stated she thinks iron is more appropriate and regrets the amount of existing bars. **Mr. Thomson** stated they should be metal not wood for external; he is concerned that there is no escape plan. **Ms. Memory** stated exterior bars are more compatible. **Mr. Altschiller** stated he understands the precedent, thus, every building in Savannah could have bars, which would not be good. **Ms. Memory** stated there are better options for providing security.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Denial of the wooden burglar bars for the property located at 41 Habersham Street because they are not visually compatible and do not meet the intent of the standards.

OR

Staff recommends that the applicant install bars or another security device inside the windows, where they will be minimally visible, yet still provide the protection the owner desires.

Motion

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for wooden burglar bars for the property located at 41 Habersham Street because they are visually compatible and meet the standards.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Melissa Memory

Second: David Altschiller

Dwayne Stephens	- Not Present
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Nay
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Abstain
Karen Guinn	- Aye
Michael Higgins	- Nay
Melissa H. Rowan	- Aye
Thomas L. Thomson	- Nay

[6. Petition of Sawyer Design, Jonathan Leonard | 22-003325-COA | 301 West York Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation - 22-003325-COA 301 W York St.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Research .pdf](#)

Mr. Ethan Hageman presented the applicant's request of approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for three townhouses and for a third-floor addition to the existing

building for the property located at **301 West York Street**.

The project description per the applicant, is as follows:

“The project is to build six (6) new single family residential town homes. Three (3) of the new units are to utilize the existing two-story office structure currently built on site.”

“Over the existing structure a third level will be added with three (3) new units to be constructed down the Jefferson Street side.”

301 West York Street was constructed in 1979 and is not a contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District. The 1916 Sanborn Map shows three (3) brick structures on Jefferson Street, where the rear parking lot currently exists. The map shows the three structures being used as stores and the one in the middle specifically for furniture. The 1955- 1966 Sanborn Maps shows a similar configuration of the buildings and same material used on Jefferson Street. The footprint of 301 West York Street was vacant in the 1955- 1966 map. Staff finds the addition of three (3) townhomes on this block of Jefferson Street would restore the historic urban fabric that this block of Jefferson Street has been missing for decades.

The lot dimension standards are met. The Development Standards for D-CBD are met. The proposed project will have a total height of 37 feet. The project meets the building height standards, with the parcel being allowed to have up to four (4) stories in height. It is worth noting the parcel directly south of the proposed site, 150 Montgomery Street (SpringHill Suites) falls into the five-story (5) zone on the height map. The building coverage of the lot will be 75% of the 100% allowed by the standards.

Staff finds the height of the proposed townhomes to be visually compatible. See the above comments for development standards regarding height. The proposed project will be three (3) stories which is visually compatible with the surrounding contributing buildings of the Downtown Historic District. 305 West York Street which is directly to the west of the front façade is three (3) stories tall. 127 Barnard Street which is on the northeast corner of York and Jefferson Street stands five (5) stories tall. 136 Jefferson Street which lies directly east of the front façade stands two (2) stories tall. Staff finds the proportion of openings to be visually compatible. The proportion of openings on all facades will be visually compatible with the surrounding contributing properties in the Downtown Historic District.

Staff finds the rhythm of structures on streets to be visually compatible. The existing rhythm of structures on streets are rowhomes which exist west of the front façade (305 West York Street). The property located directly east of the front façade (136 Jefferson Street) is a two-story building which frontage takes up the entire block. Staff finds the rhythm of entrances to be visually compatible. The proposed project will not have porches. 136 Jefferson Street directly east of the front façade showcases six (6) front façade entrances on Jefferson Street. The proposed Jefferson Street façade of the property will feature three (3) entrances.

Staff finds the roof shape to be visually compatible. The proposed project will feature a flat roof shape with parapet walls similar to the contributing surrounding properties on Jefferson Street. 305 West York Street features a pitched roof shape. Staff finds the walls of continuity to be visually compatible. The proposed project will create a stronger wall of continuity than what currently exists. Through raising the West York Street façade to three stories, the height of the wall of continuity will continue at three stories. Currently a small parking lot exists in the rear of the property, ending the wall of continuity. Through building the three (3) story townhomes on the existing parking lot, a wall of continuity will be created on Jefferson Street. Staff finds the scale of building and directional expression of front elevation to be visually compatible. The proposed project fits the scale of contributing buildings and

structures surrounding the property in the Downtown Historic District.

The Streets and Lanes standards are met, as well as the Height standards. The proposed parapet wall height will be 3'-7". The exterior expression of the proposed buildings first floor will be 11' 1" for the first-floor, floor to ceiling height. The floor to ceiling height will be 9' 1" on both the second and third floor of the proposed building. The floor truss will be approximately 16", making the exterior expression greater than 10 feet.

West York Street is a connecting street. Per the ordinance, Building Form is defined as: "The physical shape of a building resulting from its mass, height, and envelope." Staff finds that the proposed project will utilize the form of the existing contributing buildings currently within West York Street. See the visual compatibility criteria comments above regarding height of the proposed building and surrounding contributing buildings. The building form of the proposed building will emulate 136 Jefferson which has multiple entrances and a flat roof. No setbacks are proposed.

The Doors standards are met. The proposed windows on all façades will be rectangular and have a vertical to horizontal ratio of 2:1. . Staff finds the centerline of the windows and doors on the front façade to align vertically on the primary façade. The distance between the windows will not be less than adjacent contributing buildings within the Downtown Historic District. The proposed shutters on the existing building will be sized to fit the window opening with the horizontal rails corresponding with the location of the meeting rails of the window. Shutters are not proposed on the new construction.

The Roof standard is met, the parapet walls will have a stringcourse and coping. According to the site plan submitted by the applicant, the meter boxes will be placed behind the townhouse units facing the courtyard and will be minimally visible from view. Roof mounted equipment and HVAC units are proposed on the roof and the parapet walls will screen them from view. The proposed refuse storage areas will be in the rear yard and screened from the public right-of-way. Alternative energy source devices are not proposed for this project. Parking is not proposed for this project, the zoning district does not require a parking minimum. The rear of the property will be used as a common space for the units.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Jonathan Leonard, petitioner, said the exterior to the existing building is to remain; they want to add the third floor.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Ryan Jarles, HSF, stated there is a lack of detail of Jefferson Street facade. Recommends larger lentils, shutters on all facades, and true stucco over masonry, particularly for Part II.

Mr. Andrew Jones, stated a tithing block requires entrance to be on an east entrance according to the Ordinance.

Ms. Ardis Wood, asked about the mock up of the building and asked it to be shown to her.

Ms. Kim Daughtery, neighbor at 305 W York , requested preservation of architectural integrity and access to their AC.

Mr. Leonard replied to the neighbor's concerns regarding height and AC access. Tried to keep the horizontal lines to match with buildings across the street. Want to differentiate from primary building.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Ms. Memory asked is it a tithing lot. **Ms. Michalak** stated it is a tithing block to what used to be Liberty Square. There are non-contributing buildings on either side. **Mr. Thomson** asked was tithing lot issue answered; precedent regarding access points. **Ms. Michalak** stated this a standard all over the historic district. Hundreds of buildings would have to be torn down to be in compliance with this. Many do not conform to this code. **Ms. Michalak** showed the Ordinance to state "a building on the tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street." It's six townhouses on the north-south streets.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for three townhouses and for a third-floor addition to the existing building for the property located at 301 West York Street.

Motion

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for three townhouses and for a third-floor addition to the existing building for the property located at 301 West York Street.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Michael Higgins

Second: Nan Taylor

Dwayne Stephens	- Not Present
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Abstain
Karen Guinn	- Aye
Michael Higgins	- Aye
Melissa H. Rowan	- Aye
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

[7. Petition of Sottile & Sottile | 20-005548-COA | 336 Barnard Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

- 📎 [Staff Recommendation 20-005548-COA 336 Barnard St.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Part II, Design Details.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Staff Research.pdf](#)
- 📎 [WINDOW BROCHURE.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Public_Comment_COMBINED.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Previous Submittal Packet - Drawings - For Part I, Height, Mass.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Previous Submittal Packet - Photos - For Part I, Height, Mass.pdf](#)
- 📎 [SIGNED , PT I Board Decision 20-005548-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Public_Comment_2.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Public Comment_3.pdf](#)

Ms. Leah Michalak, stated per the Ordinance, this project qualifies as large scale development. Staff does not think this standard should be applied to a single family home in a residential location. Thinks a Special Exception is warranted.

Mr. James Zerillo presented the petitioner's request of approval for New Construction (Part II: Design Details) for a single-family residence at 336 Barnard Street. The building is a three-story single-family home with a two-car integrated garage. The Part I (height & mass) of this project was proposed and approved on December 9th, 2020 with the condition that the proposed baluster height be approved. In addition to new construction, demolition of the existing non-contributing structure was proposed and approved under this COA. *Per the Part I board review context:* "Recently subdivided from the main historic building at 123 West Charlton Street, the existing building at 336 Barnard Street is listed as a non-contributing building on the Historic Building Map. Currently used as rental apartments, the building was originally two or more buildings that have evolved over time. Originally constructed c.1900, the buildings were first used as sheds and stables in 1916, garages in 1954, and dwellings in 1973. The first maps show the building constructed from wood and brick; later maps show concrete block and brick. It is likely that this building has been heavily altered over time, hence the reason for its non-contributing status."

The primary materials of brick, stucco, and marble are visually compatible with the historic context of Pulaski Square. There are several neighboring structures constructed primarily of brick with masonry ornamentation. The proposed colors for hardware such as doors, windows, and architectural ornamentation is appropriate within the historic context. The structure is not a wood frame building and does not have foundation piers. The primary exterior materials are proposed to be brick, stucco, and marble. Metal accents are proposed on ornamental exterior details. No prohibited materials are proposed. The proposed finishes are visually compatible with the surrounding context on Pulaski Square.

No sliding glass doors are proposed. All proposed doors are wooden with glass, rectangular insets. No vinyl or steel-pressed doors are proposed. All glass insets are individual rectangular lights, French door lights, or transom windows. Sierra Pacific clad Carmel Series double-hung windows are not a previously approved window specification. Staff recommends that the applicant reselect from the approved windows for new construction on the windows brochure or provide staff with a full-sized sample to determine whether the window standards are met.

A covered, second story porch is located on the façade facing Charlton Street. Balconies are located on the second story of the primary façade facing Barnard Street and the third story facing Charlton Street. The second story porch on the Charlton Street façade has four wood columns with proper cap and base molding. This information was not provided with the submittal packet. Provide a railing detail and the depth of the balconies. Painted wood is proposed for the porch columns. A 3 foot wrought iron railing is proposed, with a decorative baluster. The proposed awning is a mixture of wood bracketing and metal roofing.

A standing seam metal roof with a proper drip edge is proposed. Dimensions were not provided for the width between seams and the height of the seams. Two metal sconce types are proposed, one being placed in the courtyard and the other being placed above each garage door. The sconces are metal and scaled appropriately. The color of the light source was not indicated. The front façade fencing does not extend beyond the façade. The standard is met. The height of the front yard fence was not provided. An iron fence is proposed in the front yard. The rear yard wood fencing is proposed to be painted. A masonry base is proposed for the front yard iron fencing; no prohibited materials are proposed.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Christian Sottile, petitioner, stated it is a local structure with a focus on the city. Addressed staff comments: would like to use an alternate window, Colby line of Sterling series. Will ensure all light sources and will provide additional details for fence; 42" tall. The balcony & porch iron not more than 3 feet deep; not more than 4 " between pickets. The roofing, seams to be 1 inch in height; 12" panels, 18" panels in rear. Agrees with Staff recommendations.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Andrew Jones, stated this building should not be built in this area. Tithing block guidelines should be adhered to. This is putting the City at risk. The lanes are being destroyed, which is an important part of the Oglethorpe Plan. The east-west entrance standards are not met. The Board appears to not follow the law, by taking an arbitrary position regarding four story buildings. This structure is about money; a self-created hardship. None of this should have been approved.

Ms. Emma Wright, Chatham Square, stated this is appalling. It is in the wrong spot and will upset the rhythm. Respecting existing structures are not being upheld.

Ms. Ardis Wood, stated it is a lovely building in the wrong place, must not dilute the way the Landmark district works. Look at the zoning that is allowed; how would it look if everyone did this. May threaten the national historic designation.

Mr. Ryan Jarles, HSF, reiterates support and agrees with Staff's conditions.

Ms. Ellen Harris, DNA, expressed concern with the placement of larger buildings on the lane. This should be considered thoughtfully regarding precedent. She suggested a review of subdivision regulations; make sure consistency in in place. **Ms. Harris** stated a Special Exception should be requested, allow staff review and Board to consider. She suggested the petition be continued.

Ms. Kathy Ledvina, stated a lane building should have been designed there, not a McMansion. It should be moved it to absolve encroachment. It is dangerous to allow builders to enlarge structures.

Mr. Anthony Koncul stated he feels this project will be a source of pride. He stated the immediate neighbors are excited about the project.

Mr. John Brown stated he has lived downtown since 1974. Alarmed the tithing lots: it is inappropriate to divide and sell off, encroach on next house to it. This structure should be in another place. What prohibits others from splitting off their properties and building four story structures.

Mr. Sottile stated he appreciates yet respectfully disagrees with some comments. Will honor area with height and design.

Mr. James Hundricker, addressed the windows. He stated there is no precedence in design. He has concerns with trash storage; the narrow gate.

BOARD COMMENTS

Ms. Taylor asked what exactly are we discussing. **Ms. Michalak** stated there are plenty of parcels that face north-south streets. Suggests Special Exceptions. **Ms. Taylor** stated she thinks details are appropriate. When does the precedence start/end. **Mr. Thomson** stated

infill combats the reduction of living. **Ms. Isaacs** asked can a condition be applied for Special Exception. **Ms. Wilson** suggested the Board continue and have applicant apply for Special Exception. **Mr. Higgins** stated visual compatibility there is no visual compatibility; it stands out. **Mr. Stephens** stated parking is not in HDBR purview. From height and mass standpoint, the neighboring structures are comparable. He agrees that subdividing should be reviewed to eliminate precedence. It is a well thought out building. **Ms. Guinn** agrees with the Board and recommends continuance. **Ms. Memory** stated it should be continued. She asked is this appropriate for subdividing. **Ms. Michalak** stated many requirements to subdivide a lot. Thinks Historic Preservation should be more involved when subdivisions occur within historic districts. **Ms. Wilson** stated she will speak with City to be more involved in subdivisions. **Mr. Altschiller** stated this should be continued regarding the Special Exception, but approve design. **Ms. Rowan** stated she agrees with Mr. Stephens and Ms. Guinn. Will stand out in an exceptional way and keep the integrity of the neighborhood. **Mr. Thomson** asked staff to address the issue of subdivisions and tithing lots. **Mr. Stephens** stated he is agreeable for a continuance, but only to a time that gives public notice so the all know the Board is serious about correcting inappropriate requests. **Ms. Memory** stated she is in agreeance to a continuance. Manipulating the Oglethorpe has detrimental consequences.

Mr. Sottile requested a finding of fact as Part I was approved as visually compatible. The continuance would be to notice the public of the Special Exception.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval for New Construction (Part II: Design Details) for a single-family residence at 336 Barnard Street 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. **Provide a full-size sample of the proposed window or choose one which has been previously approved by the board / listed on the MPC's window brochure.**
2. **Utilize a white-light source for all exterior lighting fixtures**
3. **Provide the height for the front-yard iron fence.**
4. **Provide a dimensioned detail drawing for the porch and balcony railings, ensure they meet the standards for porch and balcony railings, and ensure that the balconies are not more than 3 feet deep.**
5. **Provide dimensions for the standing seam metal roof detailing seam height and panel width.**

Motion

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition for New Construction, Part II (Design Details) at 336 Barnard Street to the September 14th Historic District Board of Review meeting with the following conditions

because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Provide a full-size sample of the proposed window or choose one which has been previously approved by the board / listed on the MPC's window brochure.
2. Utilize a white-light source for all exterior lighting fixtures.
3. Provide the height for the front-yard iron fence.
4. Provide a dimensioned detail drawing for the porch and balcony railings, ensure they meet the standards for porch and balcony railings, and ensure that the balconies are not more than 3 feet deep.

5. Provide dimensions for the standing seam metal roof detailing seam height and panel width.
6. Apply for Special exceptions to be heard with Part II (Design Details).

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Thomas L. Thomson

Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Abstain
Karen Guinn	- Aye
Michael Higgins	- Aye
Melissa H. Rowan	- Aye
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

[8. Petition of J. Elder Studio | 22-001843-COA | 302 East Oglethorpe Avenue | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

- 🔗 [Staff Recommendation - 22-001843-COA 302 E Oglethorpe Ave.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Photos, Drawings, and Renderings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Staff Research.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previous Submittal Packet - Photos, Drawings, Renderings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [MPC Policy for Documenting Buildings Prior to Demolition or Relocation.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [5-9-2022 Public Comment #1.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [1812 Wesley Chapel Historical Marker.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [H-197601-371-2.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [5-9-2022 Public Comment #2.pdf](#)

Ms. Leah Michalak presented the applicant's request of approval for demolition of a non-contributing building and for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 4-story building for the property located at 302 East Oglethorpe Avenue. The west side of the building has the exterior visual expression of 5-stories; however, it contains a mezzanine within the mansard roof and not a 5th floor.

Because this building is 4-stories (or greater) in a D-R zoning district, it qualifies as Large-Scale Development. The building is a non-contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District. The building was severely altered with an approved COA in 1976 [File No. H-197601-371-2]. Per the COA, "... interior and exterior renovation of an existing concrete block and steel frame building which was erected sometime in the early 1960's. It was used as an automobile glass and sliding-glass-door shop and sales office. Exterior renovation will consist of covering exterior walls on Lincoln and Oglethorpe with stucco finish ... New arched windows will be added ..." Photographs of the building prior to this work could not be located. Prior to the current building, the site contained the 1812 Wesley Chapel: Savannah Methodism's first church building. This church is commemorated near the site with a Georgia Historical

Society marker (see attached).

This project was first heard at the July 13, 2022 HDBR Meeting and was continued. In addition to demolition and new construction, the applicant also requested two (2) Special Exceptions and a Variance Request Recommendation as follows:

Special Exceptions from Large-Scale Development standards that state:

Recess Standard. Incorporate recesses within the wall plane. Building frontage shall be limited to 30 feet with recesses of at least 12 feet in width and four (4) feet in depth (Fig. 7.8-10). Recesses shall extend to the ground or begin immediately above the ground floor.

Maximum height shall not exceed two (2) stories within 20 feet of a lane

In order to allow for the recesses to be 9'-4" wide and 2'-8" deep and for the building to be 5 and 4-stories within 18 feet of the lane because the Special Exception criteria are met. Recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals for an increase of 5% to the maximum permitted building coverage of 75% in the D-R zoning district to allow for 80% building coverage because the variance criteria are met with the following condition:

1. The request for the Special Exception standard which reads: *Maximum height shall not exceed two (2) stories within 20 feet of a lane* must be resolved prior to the applicant applying for the variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

With this revised proposal, neither Special Exception nor the Variance Request Recommendation are sought.

This building is listed as non-contributing and is evaluated for contributing status below. The district's Period of Significance is from 1733-1960. Information obtained indicates that the building was constructed in the 1960s which, likely, indicates the building was constructed after 1960. Additionally, the building was significantly altered in 1976. In addition to lacking integrity, its one-story scale (later 2nd story addition is set back) and lack of fenestration and, therefore, pedestrian level interaction do not make it eligible for contributing status. Staff recommends approval of the demolition with the conditions that the building be documented per the *MPC Policy for Documenting Buildings Prior to Demolition or Relocation* and that the building be deconstructed, and all materials salvaged for resale or for use in the new construction (rather than traditional demolition and materials landfilled).

The lot dimensions are an existing condition. The coverage has been reduced to 75%; the standard is now met. A lane setback is proposed to be 20 feet to accommodate required off-street parking. The Height Map permits 5-stories and staff finds the height visually compatible. The height has been reduced from 57'-2" to 53'-4"; additionally, the context drawing has been expanded to show the 4-story contributing building on the adjacent block face which is mid-block and the same height. Although taller than the adjacent contributing buildings, this is a corner lot facing a major, wider street which can support taller buildings.

The building is taller than it is wide which is visually compatible. Openings are taller than they are wide with a regular rhythm of punched openings which is visually compatible. The proposed building is attached to the contributing building to the east and spans the full width of the lot which is typical along Oglethorpe Avenue. The ground floor entrances are at grade level without porches which is typical for a mixed-use building. The east half of the building is proposed to have a flat/parapeted roof and the west half is proposed to have a mansard roof. Mansard roofs, within the district, are not plentiful but they do exist and are visually compatible particularly along major streets and on corner lots such as the grand Second Empire building at Liberty and Bull Streets (see staff research). The proposed building has a

more modern interpretation of a mansard roof where it does not have overhanging eaves that are supported by brackets. The roof sits atop a parapet-type wall with straighter mansard lines (see staff research).

The building forms a wall of continuity. The vertical directional expression of the front elevation is visually compatible. This project, due to its height within the D-R zoning district, qualifies as Large-Scale Development. The building exceeds 2-stories and the mezzanine (above the 4th floor on the west side of the building) does not constitute a story. The exterior expression of the ground floor has been reduced from 14'-8" to 11'-4"; the building is residential; the amenity on the ground floor is for the residences. A lane setback is proposed to accommodate required off-street parking. The building fronts two streets: Oglethorpe to the south and Lincoln to the west; both widths exceed 60 feet; the standard is met. This building is located on a tything block, and its primary entrance (into the building's lobby) faces the east-west street (Oglethorpe). The height of the flat roof that is attached to the mansard roof has been lowered, the cornice removed, and the mansard roof now has four sides. The mansard roof contains the habitable mezzanine for the top floor residential units. The roof deck is on top of the 4th floor and will not be visible. The intent of the standard is met.

Electrical meters are indicated at the rear of the building on the site plan. The equipment is indicated on the roof plan to be on top of the mansard roof which does not have a parapet to screen the equipment. Provide screening for the rooftop HVAC equipment or provide information indicating that the equipment is not visible from a right-of-way without additional screening. Some of the parking is located in the rear yard; the remainder is inside the building. Vehicular access is from the lane. An amenity space and residential units on the ground floor are set back from the streets. A fence/wall is proposed, along Lincoln Street, aligning with the façade to screen the parking in the lane. The height is proposed to be 8 feet; the standard is met.

The footprint is 5,060sf. The building spans with full width of the lot. A one-story height change is provided. This project qualifies as Large-Scale Development because it is 4-stories (and greater) within a D-R zoning district. The contributing building adjacent to the east of this site is 3-stories and the proposed building is 4-stories within 30 feet of the contributing building. The property is eligible for an additional story; however, one is not being sought.

The Window and Doors standards are met for all levels. 4.5" insets Window sashes and Door frames are proposed.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Jerome Elder proposed an Oglethorpe Avenue entrance, to break up the facade. Changed from commercial to residential which allowed to reduce height, eliminate storefront windows with punch windows\ . He stated he is happy with the new presentation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Bertha Godley, area resident, still prefers three townhouses with garden, but can live with current presented plans.

Mr. Ryan Jarles, HSF, met with Elder, whom listened to HSF's suggestions. New suggestion: a raised stoop or stoops to lead to a secondary for cohesiveness to blockface.

Mr. Simeon Corsovich stated he feels confused. The scale is misleading in terms of scale. It will stand out and is not visually compatible. Thinks there is still more work to

done, s it is overpowering. It can fit definitions, but we owe more than that. It is surrounded by historic properties. Drayton and Oglethorpe already has an accident.

Ms. Ellen Harris (virtual), DNA, stated she is pleased with current presentation and supports HSF comments regarding stoops.

BOARD COMMENTS:

Ms. Memory commended petitioner for working in suggestions of Board and neighbors.

Ms. Guinn agreed. **Mr. Stephens** stated he is impressed with the collaborative efforts. He stated he was on the fence regarding the stoops, but understands it. **Ms. Taylor** stated the mansard roof should have a modern look to differentiate; structure seems compatible. **Mr. Altschiller** stated it is less massive, in keeping with the neighborhood. **Mr. Stephens** recommended the stoop be on the shorter building closest to the residential structures.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval for demolition of a non-contributing building and for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 4 and 5-story building for the property located at 302 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted for review by the HDBR with Part II, Design Details because the proposed project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. **The existing building must be documented per the *MPC Policy for Documenting Buildings Prior to Demolition or Relocation* and that the building be deconstructed, and all materials salvaged for resale or for use in the new construction (rather than traditional demolition and materials landfilled).**
2. **Railing balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between balusters shall not exceed four (4) inches on center.**
3. **The balconies shall not extend more than three (3) feet in depth from the face of a building and shall be supported by brackets or other types of architectural support.**
4. **Provide screening for the rooftop HVAC equipment or provide information indicating that the equipment is not visible from a right-of-way without additional screening.**

Motion

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for demolition of a non-contributing building and for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 4 and 5-story building for the property located at 302 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted for review by the HDBR with Part II, Design Details because the proposed project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1.The existing building must be documented per the MPC Policy for Documenting Buildings Prior to Demolition or Relocation and that the building be deconstructed, and all materials salvaged for resale or for use in the new construction (rather than traditional demolition and materials landfilled).
- 2.Railing balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between balusters shall not exceed four (4) inches on center.
- 3.The balconies shall not extend more than three (3) feet in depth from the face of a building and shall be supported by brackets or other types of architectural support.
- 4.Provide screening for the rooftop HVAC equipment or provide information indicating that the equipment is not visible from a right-of-way without additional screening.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Melissa Memory

Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Abstain
Karen Guinn	- Aye
Michael Higgins	- Aye
Melissa H. Rowan	- Aye
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

[9. Petition of Hansen Architects | 22-002279-COA | 220 East Bryan Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation - 22-002279-COA 220 E Bryan St.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Drawings, Photos, Renderings.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Structural Information.pdf](#)

📎 [1954 and 1973 Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

📎 [Previous New Construction Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

📎 [220 E Bryan St_22-002394-ZCL.pdf](#)

📎 [Petitioner's Presentation - 1.pdf](#)

📎 [Petitioner's Presentation - 2.pdf](#)

Ms. Leah Michalak presented the applicant's request of approval for the petition of New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass to construct a 7-story hotel on the property located at 220 East Bryan Street. The project qualifies as Large-Scale Development, and the applicant has requested an additional story above the Height Map; they propose to utilize Criterion B which requires “multiple ground floor active uses” and “exterior building walls incorporate 100% modular masonry materials on all sides with the use of granite, marble, or other natural quarried stone over a minimum of 30 percent of all street fronting facades”. The existing building on the site, built in 1970, has already been approved for demolition (see PROJECT CONTEXT below).

Historically, this site contained 2 and 3-story wood and brick dwellings and accessory structures; there were multiple small buildings that faced both Bryan and Lincoln Streets. It wasn't until the 1916 Sanborn Map that several of the small buildings were replaced with a concrete block machine shop that covered the width of approximately two tything lots. The proposed building covers the width of six tything lots – more than half the width of the entire tything block. By 1973, the existing building had been constructed with a 2nd floor passage extending over Bryan Street into the Corps building on the southern Trust Lot. The surrounding historic context consists of the United Ministries of Savannah building abutting this site on the west, small (1, 2, and 3-story) residential and commercial buildings and the Lucas Theater.

This building was first approved by the Board for demolition on May 11, 2016 [File No. 16-

002194-COA], with the following conditions:

1. The building is documented per the MPC's Documentation Policy.
2. A building permit for the demolition is not issued until the new construction has received approval from the HDBR.

On March 8, 2017, the Board approved a 12-month extension. The COA subsequently expired on May 11, 2018.

The Board again approved this building for demolition on March 14, 2018 [File No. 18-000793-COA] with the same conditions as the previous approval. On April 10, 2019, the Board approved a 12-month extension. The COA subsequently expired on April 10, 2020. On November 21, 2018, staff approved a COA [File No. 18-006312-COA] for the installation of temporary fencing to secure the property until demolition could occur. It is not clear if this fencing was ever installed since the demolition never occurred. In 2019, the same applicant and owner submitted applications for three projects for this and adjacent parcels to the east. 19-005943-COA was for Contributing Building Relocation for 226 East Bryan Street. 19-005944-COA was for Contributing Building Relocation for 9 Lincoln Street. 19-005945-COA was for New Construction Hotel: Part I, Height and Mass and Special Exception Request for 220 East Bryan Street; this new hotel's footprint proposed to cover all three of these parcels with a footprint that exceeded the maximum permitted in this portion of the district. However, upon receipt of the staff recommendations associated with the Preliminary Agenda, the applicant requested a continuance and the applications expired 90 days later.

Per a Recorder's Court Order, the HDBR was required to approve the demolition of 9 Lincoln Street on February 9, 2022 [File No. 21-006808-COA]. The Board included the following conditions:

1. The owner shall provide documentation of the building, per the attached MPC Documentation Policy, prior to deconstruction.
2. The owner shall retain a deconstruction contractor and the building be "demolished" in a manner as to salvage all historic materials.

On December 8, 2021, the Board again approved the demolition of this building [File No. 21-006258-COA]. It was approved with the following conditions:

1. Document the building per the MPC's Documentation Policy.
2. Demolition permit drawings not receive a COA stamp until the new construction has received COA approval from the HDBR.

This COA is still valid.

On June 8, 2022, the HDBR actions were as follows:

Continue the petition of New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass to construct a 7-story hotel on the property located at 220 East Bryan Street to the July 13, 2022 HDBR Meeting in order for the project to be redesigned as follows:

1. Reduce the height of the building, including: remove the bonus story, reduce the first floor to a maximum of 14'-6", reduce the height above the 7th floor above the string course, and reduce the height of the access structure above the 7th story.
2. Step the mass of the building back from the 3-story contributing building to the east and add fenestration to this façade where it steps back.
3. Set the building back from the west and east property lines a minimum of 5 feet.
4. Revise the parapeted flat roof shape to a shape that is compatible with visually related contributing building roof shapes.
5. Redesign the rooflines to meet the roofline variation massing standard.

6. Add architectural interest to the west and east façades.
7. Remove the drop off lane.
8. Revise the door and window insets to be a minimum of 4 inches.

AND

Continue both Special Exception requests to the July 13, 2022 HDBR Meeting in order for the petitioner to redesign the project as described above.

The applicant has changed the design and no longer requires the two Special Exceptions as previously requested. The building is within a 6-story height zone per the Height Map; an additional story is requested.

The overall height of the building, to the top of the penthouse, is not 90 feet – reduced from 96 feet. The 6th and 7th stories are now set back creating a visual expression of 61 feet at the top of the 5th story. Additionally, the revised roof form, which has various slopes, visually decreases the height of the building. However, staff recommends further reducing the visual expression of the height of the 5-stories abutting the 3-story contributing building (Abe's on Lincoln) to the east.

The opening proportions are visually compatible. The rhythm of the solids to voids on the front, west, and rear facades is visually compatible. Although a significant amount of fenestration has been added to the side facades, staff recommends additional architectural articulation/interest on the east facade to further soften the transition (and show deference to the contributing building) from 5-stories to the 3-story contributing building.

The side yard setbacks have not been increased as was a condition of the continuance. Staff concerns regarding the damage to and obscuration of the historic buildings on either side remain. Although not in the Board's purview, with recent projects where a new building abuts a historic building the historic building has been required by city departments to be fire-rated. It is also likely that portions of the historic buildings would have to be altered or cut off to accommodate the proposed 0-foot setback. Staff requires clarification regarding fire-rating requirements and/or required changes to the contributing buildings to accommodate the new construction's proposed zero setbacks. Additionally, staff requires that the applicant provide engineering reports regarding as-is condition reports, proposed proactive measures to ensure the integrity of the surrounding buildings with regard to soil testing and foundation systems, foundation and building stabilizations measures for adjacent contributing buildings, vibration monitoring and pile driving during demolition and foundation construction.

The center main entrance is visually compatible. The reduced depth of the sidewalk, to allow for a drop off lane, has been removed. The roof shape has been revised. The 7th floor roof has an overhanging eave with brackets which is compatible with the religious building to the west. The proposed building creates a wall of continuity. The ground floor expression has been reduced from 18 feet to 16 feet which is compatible with the contributing building to the west. The exterior expression of the second floor is proposed as 12 feet. The exterior of the height of each story is proposed as 10 feet.

Bryan Street is an east-west connecting street. Per the ordinance, Building Form is defined as: "The physical shape of a building resulting from its mass, height, and envelope". There are two other buildings on this block face, and they are both contributing. The building to the east is 3-stories high with a hipped roof and a raised stoop on the front (Bryan) façade; the proposed building does not match this building form. The building to the west is an institutional religious building. It is 3 and 4-stories high with storefront along Bryan Street

and a main entrance with punched openings on Abercorn Street. It has a pitched roof with parapet walls on the side facades and deep bracketed eaves; the proposed building now matches this building form. The standard is now met.

The applicant provided drawings indicating that, although the masonry openings do not meet the ratio, the paired windows within the openings do meet the ratio. The standard is met. The standard is met for the front façade. The applicant provided drawings indicating that, although the masonry openings do not meet the ratio, the paired windows within the openings do meet the ratio. A hotel is considered a commercial building and the ground floor is designed as a storefront. The base is proposed to be 24" high; the materials and/or design will be reviewed with Part II: Design Details. The inset is proposed to be 4". A, significantly reduced, roof deck is proposed at the northeast corner of the building and is screened to meet the standard. The deck itself will not be visible. 12 feet clear above the sidewalk is proposed. The roof deck is not on the street façade. Electrical meters are proposed on the rear façade; the drawings indicate (internal). No on-site parking is proposed; therefore, the standards do not apply. This property is in a parking exempt zone. The drop off lane has been removed from the project. The building footprint is proposed to be 13,262sf reduced from 13,434sf. The 6th and 7th floors are set back, and the roof form changes above the 7th story creating roofline variation along Bryan Street.

This project qualifies as Large-scale development; it is in a 6-story height map area within a D-CBD zoning district. The 6th and 7th floors are set back, and the roof form changes above the 7th story creating roofline variation along Bryan Street. The standard does not apply; the only zoning district across the lane to the north is D-CBD. D-CBD districts are eligible for an additional story. One stair extends to the roof above the bonus story. From west to east, the active use spaces proposed are: "Blue Stone Lane Café", Lobby, and Retail; each maintains an individual primary exterior entrance. The lobby occupies less than 30% of linear frontage, less than 60 linear feet (45 feet) and less than 60 feet of the building width. Staff received a determination from the Zoning Administrator that the active use spaces do not have to be accessed ONLY from the exterior; their PRIMARY ENTRANCE must only be accessed from the exterior. Therefore, the standard is met. (See attached Zoning Administrator determination.) This information will be provided with Part II, Design Details; however, a Special Exception for thick brick is no longer requested.

From west to east, the sections measure 52'-8", 47'-8" and 52'-8". The applicant is requesting the Board vary this spacing requirement to allow bay spacing that vary from 15'-2" to 11 feet wide. The contributing building directly adjacent to the west has bay spacings that vary from 22 feet to 11 feet wide; staff recommends approval because of the historic precedent and because the proposed bay spacing is visually compatible. Three (3) entrances are proposed on the Bryan Street façade which is the only street frontage. The distance between entrances, from west to east, is 27'-6", 50'-2", 50'-2", and 26'-2". All upper levels meet or exceed the standards. 4 inch windows insets are proposed. The refuse storage standard is met.

Ms. Michalak stated some projects required fire rated walls.

Mr. Thomson asked is there a suggestion for reducing east facade. **Ms. Michalak** stated she would suggest that front mass would come down a story or two.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Phelps, Hansen Architects, addressed staff concerns. Minimized the first floor and moved second floor up to meet the 12 foot height; reduced from 96 feet to 90 feet; out of line of visibility. They recessed the sixth & seventh floors by seven feet.

Mr. Higgins asked where does the doorway go on eastern part of property go. **Mr. Phelps** responded the owner owns all; they are connected.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Andrew Jones stated the building is too large, as well as the signage at top of building.

Mr. Ryan Jarles, HSF, stated eaves will create a differentiation. Vent features on Bryan St facade are incompatible.

Mr. Nathan Godley asked where is guest loading zone so the whole street is not absorbed by the hotel, as Perry St Hotel took all of Perry St. He was notified this is not the forum for this type of requirement.

Ms. Kim Daughtery (virtually) stated it is impractical for a hotel this size to have no parking. Extremely difficult to find a parking space for residents.

Ms. Ellen Harris, DNA (virtually) feels the design needs more work. Visual compatibility criteria still needs to be met.

Mr. Phelps stated there are no parking requirements. Parking & Mobility would be the agency to discuss parking.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Ms. Memory stated it is visually hostile. **Mr. Stephens** agrees more work is needed. Acknowledged what has been done thus far. **Mr. Higgins** stated it is not sympathetic to the buildings or context. Very suburban. **Ms. Taylor** stated the scaled, height and mass is out of proportion and visually incompatible. **Mr. Altschiller** stated it feels like a hotel. Worn out by hotel feel in Savannah. **Mr. Higgins** stated he has concerns with what the petitioner's ownership of the neighboring properties. **Ms. Taylor** stated it is close to property lines and historic buildings. Not appropriate because of size, scale, and mass. **Ms. Isaacs** stated they still have ways to go. The height is not visually compatible in relation to the buildings to the east and west, though allowed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the petition of New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass to construct a 7-story hotel on the property located at 220 East Bryan Street with the following conditions to be submitted to the HDBR for review with Part II, Design Details because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1. Further reduce the visual expression of the height of the 5-stories abutting the 3-story contributing building (Abe's on Lincoln) to the east.**
- 2. Add architectural articulation/interest on the east facade to further soften the transition (and show deference to the contributing building) from 5-stories to the 3-story contributing building.**
- 3. Provide clarification regarding fire-rating requirements and/or required changes to the contributing buildings to accommodate the new construction's proposed zero setbacks.**
- 4. Provide engineering reports regarding as-is condition reports, proposed proactive measures to ensure the integrity of the surrounding buildings with regard to soil testing and foundation systems, foundation and building stabilizations measures for adjacent contributing buildings, vibration monitoring**

and pile driving during demolition and foundation construction.

Motion

Approve the petition of New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass to construct a 7-story hotel on the property located at 220 East Bryan Street with the following conditions to be submitted to the HDBR for review with Part II, Design Details because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

Further reduce the visual expression of the height of the 5-stories abutting the 3-story contributing building (Abe’s on Lincoln) to the east.

Add architectural articulation/interest on the east facade to further soften the transition (and show deference to the contributing building) from 5-stories to the 3-story contributing building.

Provide clarification regarding fire-rating requirements and/or required changes to the contributing buildings to accommodate the new construction’s proposed zero setbacks.

Provide engineering reports regarding as-is condition reports, proposed proactive measures to ensure the integrity of the surrounding buildings with regard to soil testing and foundation systems, foundation and building stabilizations measures for adjacent contributing buildings, vibration monitoring and pile driving during demolition and foundation construction.

Vote Results (Rejected)

Motion: Thomas L. Thomson

Second: David Altschiller

Dwayne Stephens	- Nay
Melissa Memory	- Nay
David Altschiller	- Nay
Nan Taylor	- Nay
Ellie Isaacs	- Abstain
Karen Guinn	- Aye
Michael Higgins	- Nay
Melissa H. Rowan	- Nay
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

Motion

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass to construct a 7-story hotel on the property located at 220 East Bryan Street to the September 14, 2022 meeting so that the petitioner and staff can continue to work to reduce the height and mass of the overall project.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Michael Higgins

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
-----------------	-------

Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Abstain
Karen Guinn	- Aye
Michael Higgins	- Aye
Melissa H. Rowan	- Aye
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

[10. Acknowledge and approve of Staff-approved decisions as presented.](#)

[11. Petition of AAA SIGN COMPANY, Bobbie Stephens | 22-003534-COA | 120 DRAYTON STREET | Color Change](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-003534-COA 120 Drayton St..pdf](#)

[12. Petition of ELLSWORTH DESIGN BUILD, Frank Ellsworth | 22-003323-COA | 321 EAST YORK STREET | In-kind repair/replacement of siding and trim](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 22-003323-COA 321 East York Street.pdf](#)

[13. Petition of ROOFCRAFTERS, Johnny Girard | 22-003308-COA | 510 EAST SAINT JULIAN STREET | Roof replacement](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 22-003308-COA 510 E Saint Julian Street.pdf](#)

[14. Petition of KELLI J. KUNKEL | 22-003418-COA | 701 WHITAKER STREET | Stucco repair](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-003418-COA 701 Whitaker St.pdf](#)

[15. Petition of J. ELDER STUDIO, Martin Ronaszegi | 22-003439-COA | 306 EAST LIBERTY STREET | Window replacements with conditions](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-003439-COA 306 E Liberty St.pdf](#)

[16. Petition of KARL S. TAYLOR | 22-002931-COA | 207 EAST HALL STREET | Decorative gate for existing front-yard fence](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-002931-COA - 207 E Hall St.pdf](#)

[17. Petition of GIVE ME LIBERTY, Ross Sheppard | 22-003309-COA | 411 ABERCORN STREET | Color change and window repair of carriage house](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-003309-COA 411 Abercorn St..pdf](#)

[18. Petition of ROOF HUNTERS, Rusty Hunter | 22-003320-COA | 457 MONTGOMERY STREET | In-kind roof replacement](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-003320-COA 457 Montgomery Street.pdf](#)

[19. Petition of LYNCH & ASSOCIATES, Andrew Lynch | 22-003172-COA | 606 ABERCORN STREET | AMEND 21-000281-COA: parapet design and round window to a pair of windows to Building A](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-003172-COA 606 Abercorn St.pdf](#)

[20. Petition of STEVEN A. SILVER | 22-003257-COA | 318 WEST TAYLOR STREET | Downspout addition](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 22-003257-COA 318 W Taylor.pdf](#)

[21. Petition of HANSEN ARCHITECTS, Patrick Phelps | 22-003084-COA | 609 AABERCORN STREET | AMEND 20-005539-COA](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-003084-COA - 609 Abercorn.pdf](#)

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

[22. Report on Work Performed Without a Certificate of Appropriateness for the August 10, 2022 HDBR Meeting](#)

[☞ Work Performed without a COA - August Report 2022.pdf](#)

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

[23. Items Deferred to Staff - July Report](#)

[☞ Items Deferred to Staff - July Report.pdf](#)

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

[24. Stamped Drawings - August Report](#)

[☞ August 2022 - REPORT STAMPED DRAWINGS.pdf](#)

[25. Report on Work Inconsistent With Issued Certificate of Appropriateness for the August 10, 2022 HDBR Meeting](#)

[☞ Inconsistent with Issued COA Violation August Report 2022.pdf](#)

[26. Report on Work That Exceed the Scope of Issued Certificate of Appropriateness for the August 10, 2022 HDBR Meeting](#)

[☞ Exceeds Scope of Issued COA Reports August 2022.pdf](#)

[27. Inspections Completed by Staff - August 2022 Report](#)

[☞ August 2022 - REPORT INSPECTIONS.pdf](#)

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

[28. Vote Vice-Chairperson Nomination - Nan Taylor](#)

[29. Parcel Subdivision Regulations](#)

How to be addressed going forward?

Wilson: subdivision different criteria. Will not happen overnight. Subdivision regulations should be different for landmark district. The subdivision regulations should be amended.

Isaacs stated she would draft a letter to request review of subdivisions regarding the landmark district in relation to the Oglethorpe Plan. Appropriate setbacks and FAR.

Michalak: will provide the subdivision summary

XV. ADJOURNMENT

[30. Next HDBR Pre-Meeting - Wednesday September 14, 2022 at 12pm - 112 East State Street, Mendonsa Hearing Room](#)

[31. Next HDBR Regular Meeting - Wednesday September 14, 2022 at 1pm - 112 East State Street, Mendonsa Hearing Room](#)

[32. Adjourn](#)

There being no further business to present before the Board, the August 10, 2022 Historic District Board of Review adjourned at 6:11. p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Leah G. Michalak
Director of Historic Preservation

/bm

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.