



Savannah Historic District Board of Review

112 East State Street - Meeting Room
June 8, 2022 1:00 PM
MINUTES

June 8, 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
Nan Taylor
Thomas Thomson

Members Absent: Melissa Rowan
Dwayne Stephens

MPC Staff Present: Melanie Wilson, Executive Director
Pamela Everett, Assistant Executive Director
Leah Michalak, Director of Historic Preservation
Olivia Arfuso, Assistant Planner
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 GM Shay Architects, Patrick Shay | 22-002255-COA | 611 East River Street | Addition](#)

[☞ Staff Recommendation 22-002255-COA 611 E River St.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to approve an elevator addition for the property located at 611

East River Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Nan Taylor

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	- Not Present
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

[2. Petition of South Coast Inc., Greg Alfonso | 22-002386-COA | 608 Lincoln Street | Rehabilitation and Alterations](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation - 22-002386-COA - 608 Lincoln St.pdf](#)

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

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

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to approve the alterations to the front portico and rear decking for the property located at 608 Lincoln Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval, because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Provide a sheet which indicates where the colors proposed will be located on the building.
2. The balusters on the rear deck railing must not exceed four inches on center nor be more than 36 inches in height.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Nan Taylor

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	- Not Present
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

[3. Adopt the June 8, 2022 Agenda](#)

Motion

Adopt the June 8, 2022 HDBR Agenda as presented.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Thomas L. Thomson

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	- Not Present
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[4. Approve the May 11, 2022 Meeting Minutes](#)

[📎 05.11.22 MEETING MINUTES.pdf](#)

Motion

Approve the May 11, 2022 Meeting Minutes as presented.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Thomas L. Thomson

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	- Not Present
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

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

[5. Petition of LS3P Associates | 22-000171-COA | 3 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard | Roof Addition](#)

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

[6. Petition of González Architects | 22-000178-COA | 215 Whitaker Street | Demolition of Non-contributing Building and New Construction \(Part I\)](#)

Motion

Continue.

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	- Not Present
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

[7. Petition of ELEVATE Architecture Studio | 22-001268-COA | 114 West Bay Street | Rehabilitation, Alterations, and Additions](#)

Motion

Continue.

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	- Not Present
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

[8. Petition of Array Design | 22-001326-COA | 412-416 East Gwinnett Street | Alterations](#)

Motion

Continue.

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	- Not Present
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

[9. Petition of J. Elder Studio | 22-001843-COA | 302 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Non-Contributing Demolition, New Construction Part I Height and Mass, and Variance Recommendation](#)

Motion

Continue.

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	- Not Present
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

[10. Petition of Eli Lurie | 21-006813-COA | 113 East Gordon Street | New Construction, Accessory Building \(Parts I and II\)](#)

Motion

Continue.

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	- Not Present
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

IX. REGULAR AGENDA

[11. Petition of SHEDDarchitecture | 22-000643-COA | 413 East Jones Street | Demolition of a Non-contributing Building and New Construction, Accessory Building \(Parts I and II\)](#)

- 🔗 [Staff Recommendation 22-000643-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Revised Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Revised Submittal Packet - Material Specifications.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previous Board Decision_April 13 HDBR Meeting.pdf](#)

Ms. Olivia Arfuso presented the petitioner's request of approval for *New Construction, Accessory Buildings (Parts I and II)* at **413 East Jones Street**. A two-story, carriage house is proposed to be constructed in the rear of the property. The carriage house will have a footprint of 305-square-feet and will be 14 feet wide and 19'-10" in depth. The first floor will consist of (1) off-street parking spot, while the upper floor will house an accessory dwelling unit. An existing one-story garage is proposed to be demolished to allow for the construction of the carriage house.

The petition was originally on the docket for the April 13th HDBR Meeting. Due to the impact that condition #1 of Staff's Recommendation would have had on the overall design of the proposed carriage house, the Board voted to adopt the agenda with petition **22-000643-COA** moved to the 'Continued Agenda.' Therefore, the petition was *continued* with the following conditions:

1. A determination from the Zoning Administrator must be submitted regarding the maximum allowed accessory building footprint. *If necessary*, a variance must be requested *or* the overall square footage of the carriage house shall be reduced so that it does not exceed 233.6-square-feet, prior to returning to the HDBR.
2. Revise the roof shape to be covered on both sides by the stepped parapet.
3. Revise the depth of the carriage house so that it is aligned with the contributing carriage houses to which the new construction will be visually related.
4. Provide a site line drawing showing the visibility of the proposed carriage house from Habersham Street. *If visible*, all exterior walls shall be finished in a brick veneer, since that is more appropriate and compatible with the contributing carriage houses on East Jones Lane. *If visible*, the design of the covered walkway and overhanging second

story shall be revised to be more appropriate and compatible with the adjacent, contributing carriage houses. Any wood posts and / or columns shall have cap and base molding. *If visible*, the design of the courtyard elevation shall be revised to be in a similar architectural style as the principal dwelling.

5. The window sashes along the lane shall be inset a minimum of (3) inches from the façade of the building.
6. Provide information regarding the height and mass of the primary building.
7. Provide the garage door design.
8. Provide the location(s) of all mechanical equipment and refuse, and include appropriate screening methods.
9. All wood elements must be painted, and a color scheme must be provided.

On May 12th, a revised submittal packet was received by Staff.

413 East Jones Street was constructed in **1875** and is a contributing structure within the *Savannah National Historic Landmark District* and the *Savannah Local Historic District*. The existing one-story garage is, also, listed as contributing; however, Staff believes that that is likely an error. **413 East Jones Street** does not have an outbuilding noted on either the **1916 Sanborn Map** or the **1955 Sanborn Map**, with paste-ins through **1973**.

The existing garage is noted as being contributing on the *Savannah Historic Building Map* and the associated supplement. However, Staff determined that this is likely an error on the surveyor's part. **413 East Jones Street** does not have an outbuilding noted on either the **1916 Sanborn Map** or the **1955 Sanborn Map**, with paste-ins through **1973**. The existing garage appears to be less than 50 years old; therefore, it was constructed outside of the *Period of Significance (1733-1960)* for the *Savannah Downtown Historic District*. Additionally, the building is not associated with significant historic events or associated with a significant person. It does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. It does not represent the work of a master or possess high artistic values. The garage does not represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction, and it is not likely to yield information important in history or prehistory. Therefore, Staff has determined that the resources shall be identified as "non-contributing" for purposes hereunder. Although the garage is not contributing, plans have been submitted for the replacement building. Please reference the Staff Report, below.

The lot dimensions are pre-existing conditions that are not proposed to be altered in any way. The existing lot coverage is **59%** and the proposed is **59%**. The new construction, carriage house is proposed to be two-stories in height; therefore, the height will be compatible with the contributing carriage houses to which it will be visually related.

On the lane elevation, the first floor is proposed to have (1) garage opening that is 9-feet in width. The second story is proposed to have (2) windows. The courtyard elevation's first floor is proposed to have a 5-feet-wide void, which is proposed to remain "open." The second floor will be accessible via a single-run staircase, that provides access to a second-floor entrance portico. While the design of the courtyard elevation is proposed to be unique, Staff does not believe this façade will be visible from the public right-of-way. However, it is possible that the single-run staircase will be visible from Habersham Street, due to the central courtyard at **401 East Jones Street**. Vegetation is not considered a method of screening.

The carriage house's courtyard elevation is proposed to have a second floor that will be accessible via a single-run staircase, that provides access to a second-floor entrance

portico. While the design of the courtyard elevation is proposed to be unique, Staff does not believe this façade will be visible from the public right-of-way.

The following materials are proposed to be used:

Exterior walls: “Savannah Gray” brick by *Cherokee Brick*

Horizontal Hardi-Plank Siding

Windows: *Marvin*, “Ultimate Double-Hung G2” in a 2-over-2 configuration

Doors: *TruStile*, “Traditional” single (6-panel) door system by Marvin in “Clear Pine”

Garage Door: *Overhead Door*, “Thermacore” flush panel in the color “Terra Bronze”

Roof: Single-ply membrane with W.P. Hickman Company coping

Porch: 6x6 wood columns

Staff determined that the garage door is proposed to be made of “...a continuous layer of foamed-in-place CFC free polyurethane insulation between two layers of corrosion-resistant steel.” Staff determined that the proposed garage door is not appropriate for this contributing resource or compatible with the contributing resources to which it will be visually related. **An appropriate wood or wood composite garage door shall be submitted to Staff for review. All wood elements must be painted, and a final color scheme must be provided to Staff for review.**

The carriage house is proposed to have a low-pitched, side-gable roof shape that will be covered along the East and West elevations, by a brick parapet. The fascia and soffit of the gable roof will overhang on the North and South facades. Staff determined that the proposed roof shape is compatible with the contributing building and structures to which the new construction will be visually related. The standard is met.

The 22'-4" tall carriage house will help to form a more continuous wall of enclosure along East Jones Lane. The intent of the standard is met.

The carriage house is proposed to be 22'-4" in height, 14'-0" in width, and 19'-10" in depth with an entrance portico that extends 4'-5" from the North façade of the building. Staff determined that the proposed scale of the carriage house aligns with the adjacent, contributing carriage houses to which the new construction will be visually related.

The directional expression of the carriage house's front facade (lane elevation) will be compatible with the adjacent, contributing carriage houses.

The proposed carriage house will not negatively impact the historic ward pattern of streets and lanes within the *Oglethorpe Plan Area*.

The tallest point of the carriage house is proposed to be 22'-4" in height. The first floor is proposed to have an exterior expression of 9-feet, and the second story will, also, have an exterior expression of 9-feet. Staff determined that the exterior expressions are proposed to be compatible with the contributing carriage houses that will be adjacent to the new construction. Therefore, the intent of the standard is met.

The foundation is proposed to be slab-on-grade. Staff determined that this is an appropriate foundation for new construction carriage houses; therefore, the standard is met.

The lot is less than 60-feet in width; therefore, the front face (lane elevation) is proposed to have a brick veneer that forms a visually continuous plane with the adjacent, contributing carriage houses.

The carriage house's exterior walls are proposed to be finished in a brick veneer. The brick veneer is proposed to be "Savannah Gray" by *Cherokee Brick company*. Staff determined that the brick finish is appropriate and compatible with the adjacent, contributing carriage houses.

The courtyard elevation's second floor is proposed to have (1) door that will be accessible via a single-run staircase, that provides access to a second-floor entrance portico. Staff believes that the doors will likely not be visible from the public right-of-way. However, the door is proposed to be a traditional, 6-panel, *TruStile* by Marvin door.

The garage door is proposed to be a "Thermacore" flush panel *Overhead Door* in the color "Terra Bronze" per the material specifications submitted to Staff. Staff determined that this garage door type is made of "...a continuous layer of foamed-in-place CFC free polyurethane insulation between two layers of corrosion-resistant steel." However, the drawings submitted to Staff note the door as being a "flush wood garage door." **Provide clarification regarding the garage door material, to ensure that an appropriate wood or wood composite door that meet the standards is proposed.**

On the carriage house's lane elevation, the second story is proposed to have (2) windows. The windows are proposed to be *Marvin*, "Ultimate Double-Hung G2." This window type has been previously approved by the Board for use on "New Construction, Additions, and Non-Historic Buildings" in the *Savannah Downtown Historic District*.

The windows along the lane will have a brick sill and header, while the grouped windows along the courtyard will have continuous trim. The window sashes are proposed to be inset 5-inches from the façade of the building.

The courtyard elevation's second floor will be accessible via a single-run staircase, that provides access to a second-floor entrance portico. The portico is proposed to consist of (2) square, wood columns with cap and base molding. The portico roof will be flat and a 3-foot-tall, stainless steel cable rail system is proposed as the railing for the porch and the wood stairs.

While Staff does not believe this façade will be visible from the public right-of-way, no site line drawing was submitted to Staff. However, it is possible that the single-run staircase will be visible from Habersham Street, due to the central courtyard at **401 East Jones Street**. Vegetation is not considered a method of screening. **Revise the railing to be painted or stained wood or wood composite.**

The carriage house is proposed to have a low-pitched (2:12), side-gable roof shape that will be covered along the East and West elevations, by a brick parapet. The fascia and soffit of the gable roof will overhang on the North and South facades. **The roof eaves shall overhang at least eight (8) inches, and the parapet shall have a stringcourse and coping.**

The height and mass of the primary building will not be exceeded by the proposed accessory building. The carriage house is proposed to be two-stories tall. The carriage house is proposed to have a low-pitch, side gable roof that is partially hidden by a parapet on the East and West elevations. Staff determined that this roof shape is compatible with the adjacent, contributing carriage houses. Therefore, the intent of the standard is met.

Per the drawings, it appears that the apron is proposed to be within the city lane (see the elevation where the grade increases to meet the garage door). **Revise the design to apron inside of the garage. Provide clarification regarding the garage door material and**

design to Staff for review. The garage opening is proposed to be 9-feet-wide. A mini-split compressor unit is proposed to be installed adjacent to the North façade of the carriage house, and an electrical meter will be located along the lane. All refuse storage is proposed to be located within the garage. No lighting information was provided to Staff for review. The parking is proposed to be located in the rear yard, within the first floor of the carriage house. The rear carriage house is proposed to be accessory, and clearly incidental and subordinate, to the permitted principal use. Carriage houses are in keeping with the character of the principal use. Carriage houses / accessory dwelling units are permitted in the D-R Zoning District. **A building permit must be obtained from the City of Savannah.**

The carriage house is proposed to be located in the rear yard of the principal building, and is proposed to be two-stories in height and it is Staff's understanding that the accessory building will not exceed the height of the principal building. The carriage house is proposed to have a 305-square-foot footprint. The principal building is 584-square-feet; therefore, the accessory building cannot exceed **233.6-square-feet**. However, *per the petitioner*, the "40% allowable footprint" is **488 GSF**. **Revise the carriage house's footprint to meet the standards.**

The unit is proposed to be located on the second floor of the carriage house. The carriage house is proposed to be located separated from the rear of the principal building by at least 10-feet. The carriage house is proposed to be 22'-4" at its tallest point. The unit is proposed to contain only (1) bedroom but will have a gross area of **305- square-feet**. **Revise the ADU's heated area to meet the standards.**

Staff determined that the architectural style of the carriage house is similar to the principal dwelling and the adjacent, contributing accessory buildings. The carriage house is proposed to have an off-street parking spot located on the first floor.

Mr. Thomson asked if the apron is inside the garage. Ms. Michalak responded they are not sure. They do have to make sure it is inside as the City will not allow it outside.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Shedrick Coleman, petitioner, stated based on Staff recommendation there is no path forward. The footprint precludes the opportunity to build additional. Habitable space should be 488 sq feet, which is not feasible with Staff recommendation. **Mr. Coleman** stated they did try to make the new building fit the footprint of the garage. Otherwise, no other issues with Staff recommendation.

Ms. Michalak stated they should apply for a variance from the 40% footprint standard. There is still discussion about the interpretation of the standard. They cannot go lower than **440 square feet**.

Mr. Coleman stated the language of Ordinance does not support the need for a variance.

BOARD COMMENTS:

Mr. Thomson asked about habitable space versus footprint. **Ms. Michalak** highlighted what the Ordinance states. Floor area constitutes each level of the building; not the same as footprint. This is not how the area has been applied in the past; not a good idea or consistent. Does not impact the design. Can be worked out with Zoning and Permitting. Ms. Guinn, Ms. Taylor, and Mr. Altschiller agreed with Staff recommendation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the petition for *New Construction, Accessory Buildings (Parts I and II)* at 413 East Jones Street with the following conditions to be submitted to Staff, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

1. **Provide clarification regarding the garage door material and design, to ensure that an appropriate wood or wood composite door that meet the standards is proposed. Revise the railing to be painted or stained wood or wood composite. All wood elements must be painted, and a final color scheme provided.**
2. **Revise the apron location to be inside the garage and not on the public right-of-way.**
3. **Revise the carriage house's footprint, and ADU's heated area to meet the standards.**
4. **The roof eaves shall overhang at least eight (8) inches, and the parapet shall have a stringcourse and coping.**

Motion

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for New Construction, Accessory Buildings (Parts I and II) at 413 East Jones Street with the following conditions to be submitted to Staff, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

1. Provide clarification regarding the garage door material and design, to ensure that an appropriate wood or wood composite door that meet the standards is proposed. Revise the railing to be painted or stained wood or wood composite. All wood elements must be painted, and a final color scheme provided.
2. Revise the apron location to be inside the garage and not on the public right-of-way.
3. The roof eaves shall overhang at least eight (8) inches, and the parapet shall have a stringcourse and coping.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Thomas L. Thomson

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	- Not Present
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

[12. Petition of Gerald Chambers | 22-001795-COA | 222 East Gwinnett Street | Entrance Alteration](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation 22-001795-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Property History.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Context Images.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal - Interior Doors.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Research.pdf](#)

Ms. Olivia Arfuso presented the petitioner's request of approval for an entrance door alteration at **222 East Gwinnett Street**. MINUTES

Per the petitioner, the existing 36" entry door and sidelites are proposed to be replaced with two entry way double doors. The new doors will measure 59-inches-in-width and will be constructed of oak. The doors will be stained with *Verathane* in the color "Jacobean."

The petition was first presented to the Board at the **April 27th HDBR Meeting**. The Board voted to approve the petition for the replacement of the existing fence and the installation of a new masonry / aluminum fence at 222 East Gwinnett Street with the following conditions, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. The fence shall not extend beyond the facade of a building, and a minimum of five (5) feet must be provided between a fence and a building where they are parallel.

AND

Continue the alteration of the front entrance to the June 8th HDBR Meeting, so that the petitioner can address the following:

1. Submit additional information regarding 222 East Gwinnett Street's original door configuration, including the information that was presented verbally during the petitioner's presentation.

On April 27th, the petitioner provided additional photographs and an informal history of the property that was written by the owner of a neighboring property.

222 East Gwinnett Street was constructed in **1884** and is a contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District. The existing single door with sidelites is proposed to be replaced with a pair of double doors. Both single and double-door entrances are apparent on the adjacent, contributing resources. While there is no photographic evidence of the original exterior entrance configuration, an image was provided to Staff of a pair of interior doors located just beyond the front entrance, in the vestibule. Staff believes that it is highly likely that the original front door mirrored the remaining, historic interior double doors. Additionally, the informal historical narrative that was provided to Staff does support the existence of two doors; however, due to the lack of cited information, Staff decided not to solely use the oral history as the basis of the determination. **The replacement front doors must match the design, materiality, dimensions, and other visual qualities, of the interior doors. Plans must be submitted to Staff for the revised double doors.**

Staff could not locate any definitive evidence that the existing sidelites and/or surround have been replaced. While the informal historical narrative that was provided to Staff does support the existence of two doors, none of the information is cited and no photographic documentation of the exterior was provided. Staff determined that, regardless, the sidelites / surround are likely older than 50 years. **Therefore, the existing transom and entrance surround / frame must remain intact, while the sidelites shall be appropriately salvaged.**

The entrance width at **222 East Gwinnett Street** is quite limited. Although similar in overall style, the Queen Anne at **214 East Gwinnett Street** does not have sidelites. This allows for a double-door entrance configuration. While there is no photographic evidence of the original exterior entrance configuration, an image was provided to Staff of a pair of interior

doors located just beyond the front entrance, in the vestibule. Staff believes that it is highly likely that the original front doors mirrored the remaining, historic interior double doors. **The replacement front doors must match the design, materiality, dimensions, and other visual qualities, of the interior doors. The existing transom and entrance surround / frame must remain intact, while the sidelites shall be appropriately salvaged.**

Per the petitioner, the following materials are proposed:

Entrance Doors: Oak wood with a *Varathane* stain in the color “Jacobean”

Staff determined that the proposed materials, textures, and colors are appropriate and compatible with the adjacent, contributing resources.

The existing single-entry configuration with sidelites is proposed to be replaced with a pair of double doors. While there is no photographic evidence of the original exterior entrance configuration, an image was provided to Staff of a pair of interior doors located just beyond the front entrance, in the vestibule. Staff believes that it is highly likely that the original front doors mirrored the remaining, historic interior double doors. However, Staff could not locate any definitive evidence that the existing sidelites and/or surround have been replaced. Regardless, Staff determined that the sidelites / surround are likely older than 50 years. Additionally, the informal historical narrative that was provided to Staff does support the existence of two doors; however, due to the lack of cited information, Staff decided not to solely use the oral history as the basis of the determination. **The replacement front doors must match the design, materiality, dimensions, and other visual qualities, of the interior doors. Plans must be submitted to Staff for the revised double doors. The existing transom and entrance surround / frame must remain intact, while the sidelites shall be appropriately salvaged**

PETITIONER'S COMMENT:

Mr. Michael Groenbaum, petitioner, stated they cannot go with height of the existing inner doors; it would require transom removal. Was able to obtain from historic preservationist and original owners were double doors. They will mirror other homes built the same year as his. Presented information previously of neighboring structures with same doors as what he is presenting; all on same street side have them.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There was no public comment.

BOARD COMMENT:

Mr. Thomson asked about the frame around the existing door to be preserved, was staff referring to the outside. **Ms. Arfuso** that was verified as correct.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the entrance door alteration at 222 East Gwinnett Street with the following conditions, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. **The replacement front doors must match the design, materiality, dimensions, and other visual qualities, of the interior doors. Plans must be submitted to Staff for the revised double doors.**
2. **The existing transom and entrance surround / frame must remain intact, while the sidelites shall be appropriately salvaged.**

Motion

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for an entrance door alteration at 222 East Gwinnett Street with the following conditions, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. The replacement front doors must match the design, materiality, dimensions, and other visual qualities, of the interior doors. Plans must be submitted to Staff for the revised double doors.
2. The existing transom and entrance surround / frame must remain intact, while the sidelites shall be appropriately salvaged

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Michael Higgins

Second: Karen Guinn

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	- Not Present
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

[13. Petition of Greenline Architecture, Keith Howington | 22-002282-COA | 129-131 East Broughton Street | Alterations and Rooftop Addition](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation 22-0022682-COA.pdf](#)

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

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

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

📎 [Submittal Packet - Preservation Briefs.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Research.pdf](#)

Ms. Olivia Arfuso presented the petitioner's request of approval for the rehabilitation of, with alterations to, the building located at **129-131 East Broughton Street**. A rooftop addition is, also, proposed.

Per the petitioner, the “scope of work includes addition of windows on East Broughton Lane; addition of rooftop for 2nd and 3rd floor users only; cleaning and repair of existing façade.”

The existing brick veneer is proposed to be cleaned, and the existing windows are proposed to remain and be repaired in-kind so that they are, once again, operable. The proposed rooftop covered patio / leisure area will be centrally located, and only an enclosed vestibule is proposed to be visible in the south-east corner.

129-131 East Broughton Street was constructed in **1954** as the “Woolworth’s” department store and is a contributing structure within the *Savannah National Historic Landmark District* and the *Savannah Local Historic District*.

The overall historic character of the building is proposed to be retained and preserved. It is Staff's understanding that the proposed work is to occur primarily on the 2nd and 3rd floors and will not impact the first-floor storefronts or the historic "Woolworth's" terrazzo entrance in any way. The standard is met.

The existing windows are proposed to remain and be repaired in-kind so that they are, once again, operable. An existing aluminum storefront door along the Abercorn Street frontage is, also, proposed to be replaced in-kind. The existing brick veneer is proposed to be cleaned using the gentlest means possible.

Most of the openings on the south-facing elevation are proposed to be altered. Fourteen new windows are proposed and the (2) existing, louvered openings are proposed to be infilled with brick that is compatible with, yet differentiated from, the historic brick façade. An extensive number of alterations are proposed, historic materials removed, and new window openings proposed which does not meet the preservation standards. The lack of windows, or smaller / undersized windows, can be considered a character defining feature of this building. It was common for department stores constructed during the 1950s/1960s (such as *Sears*, *JCPenney's*, *Macy's*, etc.) to lack large fenestrations, other than first floor storefronts which were often used as advertisement through decorative window displays. The displays were strategically created to entice consumers and lure them into the department store. Once inside, the lack of windows allowed for flexibility in floorspace and for the consumer to solely focus on the merchandise. **The installation of (14) new window openings will result in the removal of an extensive amount of historic material and will, ultimately, lead to the alteration of character defining features and spaces of this historic department store. Reduce the number of new openings to the minimum quantity and size necessary for the proposed interior use. Additionally, retain all existing openings in their current configuration (i.e.: two existing louvered openings).**

A rooftop covered patio / leisure area is proposed to be added atop the building. Its location will limit the visibility of the addition; however, a small portion of the vestibule in the south-east corner will be minimally visible from the east side of Abercorn Street. It is Staff's understanding that the new addition is proposed to be constructed in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired. **129-131 East Broughton Street** is located in a four-story height zone, as indicated on the *Height Map*. Currently, this building is three-stories tall, and a one-story rooftop addition is proposed for a total of four-stories. The standard is met. Five openings are proposed to be punched into the stucco wall that will be located towards the south; however, most of the addition will consist of a covered, open leisure space. The standard is met.

Per the petitioner, the following materials are proposed:

Exterior Finish (Rooftop Addition): True Stucco (*per the petitioner* this will consist of "3-part stucco on metal lath; smooth sand finish to simulate concrete")

New Windows: *Marvin*, "Coastline" casement windows in "Gunmetal Gray"

Retractable Awning: Canvas awning by *Corradi USA*, frame will match "Gunmetal Gray"

The definition of true stucco in the ordinance is "Exterior plaster applied as a two- (2) or three- (3) part coating directly onto masonry." Therefore, **the stucco proposed on the addition must be revised to meet the definition or an alternative exterior finish must be submitted for review.**

Marvin, "Coastline" casement windows are not listed as a previously approved window type

for New Construction in Savannah's local historic district. **A full-size sample must be submitted for review, or a previously approved window type must be submitted per the window brochure.**

The addition is only proposed to be 8'-8" in height. Staff has determined that the proposed leisure space will be visually compatible with the contributing buildings to which it will be visually related (specifically, **132 East Broughton Street**). The standard is met.

The existing brick veneer is proposed to be cleaned using the gentlest means possible. The standard is met.

The exterior walls of the addition are proposed to be finished in true stucco. *Per the petitioner*, this will consist of, "3-part stucco on metal lath; smooth sand finish to simulate concrete." The definition of true stucco in the ordinance is "Exterior plaster applied as a two- (2) or three- (3) part coating directly onto masonry." Therefore, **the stucco proposed on the addition must be revised to meet the definition or an alternative exterior finish must be submitted for review.**

It is Staff's understanding that no door openings are proposed to be altered in any way. However, an existing aluminum storefront door along the Abercorn Street frontage is proposed to be replaced in-kind. **Material specifications for the replacement storefront door shall be submitted for review.** Doors located on the addition are not proposed to be visible from any public right-of-way; however, they will be painted, steel.

Most of the openings on the south-facing facade are proposed to be altered. Fourteen (14) new windows are proposed and the (2) existing, louvered openings are proposed to be infilled with brick that is compatible yet differentiated from the historic brick façade. An extensive number of alterations are proposed, historic materials removed, and new window openings proposed which does not meet the preservation standards. The lack of windows, or smaller / undersized windows, can be considered a character defining feature of this building. It was common for department stores constructed during the 1950s/1960s (such as *Sears, JCPenney's, Macy's*, etc.) to lack large fenestrations, other than first floor storefronts which were often used as advertisement through decorative window displays. The displays were strategically created to entice consumers and lure them into the department store. Once inside, the lack of windows allowed for flexibility in floorspace and for the consumer to solely focus on the merchandise.

The installation of (14) new window openings will result in the removal of an extensive amount of historic material and will, ultimately, lead to the alteration of character defining features and spaces of this historic department store. Reduce the number of new openings to the minimum quantity and size necessary for the proposed interior use. Additionally, retain all existing openings in their current configuration (i.e.: two existing louvered openings).

Additionally, the new windows are proposed to be *Marvin*, "Coastline" casement windows in "Gunmetal Gray." *Marvin*, "Coastline" casement windows are not listed as a previously approved window type for New Construction in Savannah's local historic district. **A full-size sample must be submitted for review, or a previously approved window type must be submitted per the window brochure. Material specifications (including a brick-and-mortar sample) for the proposed louver opening infill on the rear facade must be provided.**

It is Staff's understanding that the existing first-floor storefront systems are not proposed to

be altered in any way.

A rooftop deck is proposed to be added atop the building. The space is proposed to be centrally located and will consist of a stucco wall with punched openings towards the south. The open walls will house a patio / seating area that will be partially covered by a flat roof, while a section towards the east will be covered by a retractable awning. A new stair shaft is, also, proposed towards the west, and a new vestibule towards the south-east. A railing system is proposed behind the existing parapet; however, per the site lines provided to Staff, the outdoor space will not be visible from the public rights-of-way. A small section of the vestibule will, however, be minimally visible (from east side of Abercorn Street). The awning is proposed to be a canvas fabric awning by *Corradi USA*. The frame is proposed to match the "Gunmetal Gray" color of the new windows.

The awning is proposed to be integrated structurally and architecturally into the design of the façade, and it is Staff's understanding that the frame / supports will consist of metal. **Provide a canvas fabric sample, including color selection, for review and clarify whether solar screens are, also, proposed to be incorporated into the awning.** The covered portion of the open-wall addition is proposed to be flat, and skylights are proposed to be integrated into the new roof plane. Due to the central location of the deck, per the site lines provided to Staff, the outdoor space will not be visible from the public rights-of-way. A small section of the vestibule will, however, be minimally visible (from east side of Abercorn Street). Therefore, Staff has determined that the intent of the standards are met.

The rooftop addition is proposed to be centrally located, so that it is as minimally visible as possible. The addition will be subordinate in mass and height to the principal building, and will not obscure any character-defining features. Per the site line drawings provided to Staff, the addition will not be visible from Broughton Street. The addition will be clearly an appendage and distinguishable from the contributing building, allowing for it to be reversible with minimal damage to the principal building. The standards are met.

An open mechanical area is proposed to be located at the existing roof height. This area will be concentrated to the south/west sections of the roof. **All mechanical equipment shall be screened from the public rights-of-way (including Broughton Lane).** No light specifications were provided. The rooftop addition is proposed to be one-story in height, and will be located as to be as minimally visible as possible. The addition will be subordinate in mass and height to the principal building and will not obscure any character-defining features. Per the site line drawings provided to Staff, the addition will not be visible from Broughton Street. The addition will be clearly a contemporary appendage and distinguishable from the contributing building, allowing for it to be reversible with minimal damage to the principal building. The standards are met.

Ms. Memory asked about 'the minimum size and quantity necessary for the proposed interior use'; it seems subjective. Is this according to code? **Ms. Arfuso** stated Code requires residential use, however, 14 was an excessive number of windows

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Keith Howington, petitioner, agrees with Staff recommendation. The true stucco is appropriate on metal, the precedent of stucco on wood stud and wood lath on this building exists. (He gave a visual presentation of stucco on wood). He requested the Board to accept stucco on a metal lath. He stated he will submit material specifications. The awning sample is just a sunshade; there will not be solar screens. The existing parapet is 3 feet high. The lane openings are based on precedent, the buildings in the lane behind'; keeping the rhythm and spacing. If the window numbers are reduced, will not meet the spacing

requirements. He would like to keep openings as shown. All metal windows; will change if necessary. Applied for tax credits. He stated the windows are only 4' x 5'; just wanted to get natural light in.

Mr. Thomson asked if the second and third floor will be residences. **Mr. Howington** stated it will be a small hotel. Some rooms have more than one window; trying to maximize the light.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There was no public comment.

BOARD COMMENT:

Mr. Thomson asked about true stucco. **Ms. Isaacs** explained the stucco definition was just updated to be that stucco is to be two or three part stucco on masonry. This may need to be amended. **Ms. Memory** expressed concern about the period of significance not being adequately represented and additional concerns about modifying. **Ms. Taylor** would like to see windows reduced in number or size to retain historic material and integrity of original building. She stated she can see the value of having stucco on metal frame. **Mr. Altschiller** would like to reduce the number of windows, though not sure of what is appropriate. Stucco will be an on-going issue. **Mr. Higgins** stated he also has concerns regarding representation of mid-century buildings. The SCAD Library is devoid of fenestration. The window issue should be considered seriously. **Ms. Memory** asked how would staff interpret the window recommendation. **Ms. Arfuso** stated the windows are to return to the Board.

Mr. Howington stated he will defer to Staff to come to an agreeable solution. The structure is almost void of light; would like to work with Staff. He thinks the stucco is appropriate for a Special Exception.

Ms. Michalak stated she is not sure a Special Exception is needed. This is not a residential building, it is commercial. Stucco is not prohibited, the Board can allow it. If the Board wants Staff to decide about the windows, provide definitive instruction.

Ms. Isaacs stated this has a lane facade, understand staff's determination of character-defining feature.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the rehabilitation of the building located at 129-131 East Broughton Street including a rooftop addition, 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. The addition shall consist of "true stucco" as defined in the ordinance or an alternative, permitted exterior finish must be submitted.
2. Material specifications for the replacement storefront door shall be submitted.
3. Material specifications (including a brick-and-mortar sample) for the proposed louver opening infill on the rear facade must be provided.
4. Provide an awning fabric sample (including color selection) and clarify whether solar screens are, also, proposed to be incorporated into the awning.
5. All mechanical equipment shall be screened from the public rights-of-way (including Broughton Lane).

AND

Continue the addition of (14) window openings, the alteration of the existing openings, and the new window specification on the south-facing façade to the July 13th HDBR Meeting, in order for the petitioner to address the following:

- 1. Reduce the number of new openings to the minimum quantity and size necessary for the proposed interior use and retain all existing openings in their current configuration (i.e.: two existing louvered openings).**
- 2. A full-sized sample of the “Marvin, Coastline” window must be submitted for review, or a previously approved window must be submitted per the window brochure.**

Motion

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the rehabilitation of the building located at 129-131 East Broughton Street including a rooftop addition, 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. Material specifications for the replacement storefront door shall be submitted.
2. Material specifications (including a brick-and-mortar sample) for the proposed louver opening infill on the rear facade must be provided.
3. Provide an awning fabric sample (including color selection) and clarify whether solar screens are, also, proposed to be incorporated into the awning.
4. All mechanical equipment shall be screened from the public rights-of-way (including Broughton Lane).

AND

Continue the addition of (14) window openings, the alteration of the existing openings, and the new window specification on the south-facing façade to the July 13th HDBR Meeting, in order for the petitioner to address the following:

1. Reduce the number of new openings to the minimum quantity and size necessary for the proposed interior use and retain all existing openings in their current configuration (i.e.: two existing louvered openings).
2. A full-sized sample of the “Marvin, Coastline” window must be submitted for review, or a previously approved window must be submitted per the window brochure.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Thomas L. Thomson

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	- Not Present
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

[14. Petition of Barnard Architects, Bob Portman | 22-001785-COA | 115 East Bay Street | After-the-Fact Roof Structure](#)

- ☉ [Staff Recommendation - 22-001785-COA - 115 E Bay St.pdf](#)
- ☉ [SIGNED Board Decision - 22-001785-COA - 115 E Bay St.pdf](#)
- ☉ [Revised Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- ☉ [Submittal Packet - Additional Photos.pdf](#)
- ☉ [Submittal Packet - Before and After Photos.pdf](#)

Ms. Leah Michalak presented the applicant's request for approval of an after-the-fact retractable roof structure long the lane for the property located at 115 East Bay Street.

The description of the structure is as follows:

"This canopy was installed approximately at the end of March 2022. It was designed, fabricated, and installed by Roll-A-Cover International Bethany, CT. Their shop drawings are attached behind Drawing Sheet A4. It covers the existing metal roof (over the bar) extending over the seated area. It connects at its high point to an existing steel frame mechanical screen and low point over a masonry/stucco wall. Slope of the canopy is West (high) to East (low). There are no portions of the awning canopy projecting into a right-of-way and adjacent property.

The awning canopy consists of 5 main aluminum frames measuring approximately 2" x 8", spaces ~6" on center. These frames support four fixed canopy panels and four retracting panels. The division of closed to open is half of the frame length. The fixed closed panels are above the existing standing seam metal roof; retractable open panels are above the seating area. All the canopy frame material is extruded clear anodized aluminum. The inset panels are 10mm grey tinted multiwall polycarbonate."

At the May 11, 2022 meeting, the Historic District Board of Review voted to continue the petition as follows:

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the after-the-fact retractable roof structure long the lane for the property located at 115 East Bay Street in order for the applicant to address staff's original condition for approval (see below) and amend additional details to make the roof structure more visually compatible:

1. **Revise the east end of the roof to feature a gutter and a soffit which is perpendicular to the stucco wall.**

115 East Bay Street was constructed in 1853 and is a contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Downtown Historic District. The existing stucco rear wall and mechanical screening were approved between 2012 and 2013, with the final amendment approval for the project occurring on September 26, 2013 [File No. 13-004983-COA]. No additional work beyond the after-the-fact structure being applied for in this submission was completed without approvals. The structures to which the structure is attached were constructed sometime after 2013 and are non-historic; no portion of the historic building has been touched or altered by this work.

There is no maximum building coverage for this district.

The roofing structure is to be a slight shed roof, which is connected to existing mechanical screening and sits above an existing stucco wall. The roof slopes down to connect to another stucco wall on the eastern side of the property and features a break metal end

which is perpendicular to the frame. A stopper will be installed to allow the paneling to stop within the property, for water drainage. Staff finds the roof shape and overall structure to be visually compatible.

Per the applicant, the roof structure is custom, and fabricated out of “*extruded clear anodized aluminum. The inset panels are 10mm grey tinted multiwall polycarbonate.*” Staff finds the tinted polycarbonate and aluminum to be visually compatible materials for the lane roof.

Though the applicant referred to the structure as an awning/canopy, staff finds that the structure does not fall under a ‘prefabricated shade structure’, as it was a custom built roof for the property. However, staff does find that it is integrated structurally and architecturally into the design of the existing structures, as it will connect to an existing metal screening mechanism. See staff’s continued comments regarding the structure under **Roofs**. The applicant has revised the metal framing of the roof to have a break metal end which forms a perpendicular soffit to the building wall (stucco wall) and to have a gutter beneath the stopped paneling within. Staff finds the standards to be now met, as the roof is pitched 4:12 and is not attached to the primary building. Staff finds the intent of the roof material standards to be met.

Mr. Higgins asked about the visual compatibility of the bays; it is jarring to view in a very prominent area. It is also an entrance to the business. **Ms. Michalak** stated Staff does find it visually compatible.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Robert Portman, petitioner, stated they cannot see other modifications to make. The existing beer garden was made in 2012; the attachment is to a non-historic structure. The eye will catch the aluminum. They addressed the concern of the water management.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Ms. Sue Adler, HSF, stated this is not visually compatible; it is an awkward detail.

BOARD COMMENT:

The Board had concerns with the visually compatibility; could have been done better if the process was followed and come before the Board prior to installation. There does not appear to any attempts to make visually compatible as directed. Expressed concerns with after-the-fact approvals.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the after-the-fact retractable roof structure long the lane for the property located at 115 East Bay Street as requested because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

Motion

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the after-the-fact retractable roof structure long the lane for the property located at 115 East Bay Street as requested because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Karen Guinn

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

[15. Petition of Brown Design Studio, Eric Brown | 22-001277-COA | 222 West Gwinnett Street | New Construction, Part II: Design Details](#)

🔗 [Staff Recommendation - 22-001277-COA - 222 W Gwinnett.pdf](#)

🔗 [Submittal Packet - Part II Drawings Packet.pdf](#)

🔗 [Submittal Packet - Drawings & Project Description.pdf](#)

Ms. Leah Michalak presented the petitioner's request of approval for New Construction, Part II, Design Details, for a new two and half story main building with an attached carriage house for the property located at 222 West Gwinnett Street.

The description of the project, per the applicant, is as follows:

"222 W. Gwinnett is a proposed single family detached structure built on existing small lot. The site is within the Downtown Historic District and is zoned D-R. Located at the corner of W. Gwinnett and Jefferson St., the site is vacant and consists of 2,970 sq. ft. of gross area.

The proposed building is a single family house of 2 and a half stories with an attached small carriage house off of Jefferson St. The front of the building matches the setback of it's Victorian era neighbor, as does the general height and roofline. The roughly 20' setback is proposed to be treated as a formal forecourt, edged with brick piers and continuous low boxwood hedges. A formal landscape plan will be prepared for future submissions. The building is set off the rear property line 14' with an access easement of 13' running across the property. Trash and utilities will be located on the east side of the house behind wood fencing.

The proposed building is brick with siding in the roof gables. The home also features bay windows which would be painted trim work. The roof has a pair of small dormers. The east dormer is a small, shed dormer which is required for elevator clearance and will not be seen from the ROW. The west or Jefferson Street dormer is a single gable dormer."

On May 11, 2022, the Historic District Board of Review approved Part I: Height and Mass for the new construction, two-story building, with the following conditions:

1. Revise the triple windows within the gable to be symmetrical paired windows.
2. Revise the front portico project further from the building, so as to read as a projecting element.
3. The gable end rakes must overhang at least eight (8) inches on both the main building and the attached building.
4. Provide information regarding the curb cut.
5. Provide the fencing information.

Staff reviewed the new drawings against the conditions that were included within the Part I: Height and Mass approval. Most of the conditions were determined to be met; see below for staff's comments and remaining/additional conditions.

The parcel for which this building is proposed, 222 West Gwinnett Street, as well as the lot/building to the rear, were historically one parcel under the address 220 West Gwinnett Street. The historic building at 220 West Gwinnett Street and the one-story building to the rear were parceled off sometime after 1973, the Sanborn Map for which still depicts the site as one property. The parcel for which the new construction building is proposed was not historically developed and served as the side yard for the historic building at 220 West Gwinnett Street.

The property located at 222 West Gwinnett Street is a vacant lot within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District. The proportion of the front façade is visually compatible. The applicant revised the windows within the gable to be symmetrically paired windows, which staff finds to be visually compatible. No other openings were altered following Part I. The front portico was revised to project from the building 5'-0", with stairs that project out another 5'-3". Staff finds the condition within Part I, regarding increasing the projection of the front portico, to be met and the projection to be visually compatible.

The following colors and materials are proposed to be utilized (where different, materials utilized for the main house versus the attached carriage house will be differentiated):

- Exterior Walls: *Belden* brick in Alaska White Velour with a 3/8" extruded white mortar
 - Roof: *McElroy Metal* Medallion-Lok metal roof panels with a 1.75" rib in Slate Gray
 - Siding Within Gable: *James Hardie* shiplap, fiber cement siding, 9" exposure in SW 6258 Tricorn Black
 - Trim: *James Hardie* fiber cement trim and paneling in SW 705 Pure White
 - Windows: Double hung and fixed *Sierra Pacific Architect* series, aluminum clad wood windows in Black
 - Garage Door: *OCS Garage Doors and Hurricane Protection*, Wilmington Residential Custom Door (beadboard or wood) in Black
 - Main Entrance Door and Door within Connector: *GlassCraft WoodCraft* Collection true divided lite doors, constructed of wood, painted Black Both doors are to be solid wood, with no lites
 - Porch Elements: The columns are to be 8x8 box columns (furthest from main entrance door) and 10x10 box columns (closest to the main entrance door) and painted Black, with the steps and *Hardie* trim of the roof to be painted Black as well. **The front portico elements must be constructed of wood; provide clarification for final review by staff.**
 - Foundation and Water Table: *Belden* brick in Alaska White Velour with a 3/8" extruded white mortar
 - Lighting: *Hinkley Lighting Inc.* Walker 2100BK – aluminum with clear glass in Black (attached to wall) and the Walker 2101BK – aluminum with bound clear glass in black (hanging)
- With the exception of the above condition, staff finds the colors and materials proposed to be visually compatible.

The foundation standard is met. The building's foundation is to be constructed of brick; however, the foundation does not feature piers. The building will appear to feature a slab on

grade foundation with a water table height of 4'-8". Staff finds the intent of the standard to be met. However, a foundation plan was not provided to staff within the drawing packet. **A foundation plan must be included in the final drawing packet for permitting for staff to evaluate prior to stamping. Additionally, revise the front portico to feature foundation piers.** The majority of the structures will feature brick, with fiber cement siding featured in the gable roofs, which staff finds to be appropriate.

Staff finds the finishes and treatments standard to be met. The Board has previously approved the *Sierra Pacific* Architect series windows and determined that the above standards are met. All windows will feature trim or paneling of some kind. The window sash standard appears to be met but is not indicated on the drawing. **The window sash must be inset a minimum of three (3) inches from the façade of the building.**

Staff finds the window standards to be met. **Staff recommends revising the portico foundation to be piers with recessed infill, and finds the standard to be met.** The material standard is met. **The front portico must be constructed of wood; provide clarification for final review by staff.** The roof standards are now met with the updated drawings, and its materials. Staff finds the lighting standards to be met. The parking and paving information was still not provided within the updated drawing packet for Part II: Design Details. **Provide staff with the curb cut information for final review and approval; the curb cut must not exceed 20 feet in width.**

The site plan and 3-D drawings indicate the presence of the following fences:

- 30" decorative metal gate in the side yard (facing Jefferson Street)
- 30" box wood fence with 40" brick piers in the front yard
- Two (2) 42" wood gates, located on the interior side yard

The front yard fence is located on a property with a building setback on an east-west street (West Gwinnett Street) with a front garden. The two gates, which sit behind the front façade, are to be 42" in height. The standards are met. Staff does not find that enough information was provided for the front yard fence, decorative metal gate, and wood gates, as they are only featured in the site plan and roughly in the 3-D images – therefore, not allowing staff to see what how they would appear as built. **Staff requests that the applicant depict all fences and gates, as they will be built, on the elevations for final review and approval.**

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Ms. Liv Garcia, petitioner, will send updated packages for review.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There were no public comments.

BOARD COMMENTS:

Mr. Thomson asked if the driveway dimensions were revised? **Ms. Garcia** responded that it was not; will update.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of New Construction, Part II, Design Details, for a new two and half story main building with an attached carriage house for the property located at 222 West Gwinnett Street with the following conditions for staff's final review and approval, because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. **The front portico elements must be constructed of wood; provide clarification.**
2. **A foundation plan must be provided for evaluation and included in the final drawing packet for permitting.**
3. **Revise the front portico to feature foundation piers.**

4. **The window sash must be inset a minimum of three (3) inches from the façade of the building.**
5. **Provide the curb cut information on the drawings; the curb cut must not exceed 20 feet in width.**
6. **Depict all fences and gates, as they will be built, on the final elevations.**

Motion

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for New Construction, Part II, Design Details, for a new two and half story main building with an attached carriage house for the property located at 222 West Gwinnett Street with the following conditions for staff's final review and approval, because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. The front portico elements must be constructed of wood; provide clarification.
2. A foundation plan must be provided for evaluation and included in the final drawing packet for permitting.
3. Revise the front portico to feature foundation piers.
4. The window sash must be inset a minimum of three (3) inches from the façade of the building.
5. Provide the curb cut information on the drawings; the curb cut must not exceed 20 feet in width.
6. Depict all fences and gates, as they will be built, on the final elevations.

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	- Not Present
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

[16. Petition of Sanders Architecture, Scott Trowell | 22-002274-COA | 411 East Charlton Street | Addition](#)

🔗 [Staff Recommendation - 22-002274-COA - 411 E Charlton St.pdf](#)

🔗 [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Leah Michalak presented the petitioner's request of approval for a second-story addition to the rear one-story garage for the property located at 411 East Charlton Street (and Lane). The second story will allow the existing one-story garage to transition into a carriage house space. The existing one-story concrete block garage structure was constructed sometime after 1973. A rear structure is featured on the Sanborn Maps prior to this date (1916 and 1953), however there is no structure present by the 1973 map. Staff has determined that the rear garage structure is non-historic. 411 East Charlton Street (main building) was constructed in 1882 and is a contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District. The rear garage building is non-historic.

The additional story on the existing one-story garage structure will not alter the building coverage or setbacks. The finished two-story carriage house is permitted by the height map. The finished carriage house will be two-stories tall and 20'-7"; however, the height of the carriage house in comparison to the main building was not provided. It appears to staff that the finished height will be subordinate to the main historic building. However, **provide the height of the main building and/or a height comparison elevation in the final drawings for staff to stamp for final review and approval.** Two windows are proposed for the front façade of the carriage house, which are to be taller than they are wide and spaced 5'-0" from the side of the building; staff finds the relationship of solids to voids to be visually compatible.

The following materials are proposed to be utilized:

- Exterior Walls: Smooth finish stucco, color not provided
- Windows: 1/1 *Jeld-Wen* custom double hung window, in Bone White
- Gutter/Downspout: Metal
- Wood Trim and Window Trim: *Benjamin Moore* Black Forest Green

The stucco on the upper floor must be a true stucco, with the finish and color selection provided. Additionally, **clarify the window materiality**, as they are only labeled as 'custom'. Staff assumes this indicates wood, but this would need this to be clarified on the final drawings. The materials proposed are otherwise visually compatible. The roof of the second story/finished carriage house is to be flat, with a parapet. There are several other historic carriage house buildings along the lane which have a flat roof. Staff finds the roof shape to be visually compatible. While the drawings show stucco, no color was provided, and true stucco does not appear to be reflected. The plans would need to be revised to reflect the stucco applied onto masonry, per the definition: *Exterior plaster applied as a two- (2) or three- (3) part coating directly onto masonry.* **The stucco on the upper floor must be a true stucco, with the finish provided.** The garage door will not be altered, and all other entrance/man doors will not be visible from the public right-of-way. The windows will be inset 4 inches. It is unclear if the standard is met; **provide clarification regarding the materiality of the windows.** Staff finds the flat roof to be historically appropriate.

While staff finds the standard likely to be met; **Provide the height of the main building and/or a height comparison elevation in the final drawings for staff to stamp for final review and approval.** The existing garage door shall not be altered. The existing location of the one-story garage will not change with the added second floor, and the structure will not exceed 25 feet in height. The second story will not exceed the footprint, and therefore the established building coverage, that exists with the one-story CMU garage. Staff finds the building size and architectural style standards to be met. Parking will remain within the first story garage.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Scott Trowell, petitioner, made himself available for Board questions.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There were no public comments.

BOARD COMMENTS:

Ms. Memory asked about what is being proposed on the upper part. Staff replied it is stucco over masonry. **Mr. Trowell** stated that can be done.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the second-story addition to the rear one-story garage for the property located at 411 East Charlton Street (and Lane) with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval, because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. **Provide the height of the main building and/or a height comparison elevation in the final drawings.**
2. **The stucco on the upper floor must be a true stucco, applied onto masonry, with the finish and color selection provided.**
3. **Clarify the window materiality.**

Motion

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for of the second-story addition to the rear one-story garage for the property located at 411 East Charlton Street (and Lane) with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval, because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Provide the height of the main building and/or a height comparison elevation in the final drawings.
2. The stucco on the upper floor must be a true stucco, applied onto masonry, with the finish and color selection provided.
3. Clarify the window materiality.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Karen Guinn

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	- Not Present
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

[17. Petition of Matthew Hallett | 22-002302-COA | 418 East Jones Street | Addition](#)

🔗 [Staff Recommendation - 22-002302-COA - 418 E Jones St.pdf](#)

🔗 [Submittal Packet - History and Images.pdf](#)

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

🔗 [Updated Porch Columns.pdf](#)

🔗 [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

🔗 [Public Comment and Petitioner Response.pdf](#)

Ms. Leah Michalak presented the petitioner's request of approval for the demolition of an existing rear addition and the construction of a new rear addition and a new two-story carriage house, and the rehabilitation of the property located at 418 East Jones Street. The

applicant provided the following information regarding the property:

“The 1970 restoration stripped the exterior of all the original Victorian detailing and simpler ‘colonial style’ porch was added to the taste of the day (Federal seemed to be the preferred style). When you look at the 1968 photo from the HSF ward notebooks at the City archive you can see the original double arched front door, turned porch spindles, and six over six windows. The porch roof at this time appears original, but the columns are clearly replacement which is not surprising [as] they are the first to deteriorate. The rear of the property has a wooden addition, while it may follow the footprint of the original porch, no original fabric remains.”

Front Façade: Staff concurs with the applicant’s assessment that the porch columns present in the 1968 photo (provided within submittal packet) are not original, as it unlikely a building with turned spindles would have simple square columns. The applicant is proposing to rehabilitate the front façade from the information provided in the historic photo, with the exception of the porch columns, the style of which should be matched to the turned balusters and the building.

Existing Rear Addition: The current addition on the property is a wood-frame addition. The 1888 Sanborn Map indicates the presence of a two-story wood frame addition on the rear; by 1953, the rear features a three-story, partially bricked addition. While the current addition follows the general footprint of these original additions, it has been severely altered over time. This is evidenced by the return to an almost entirely wood frame structure and the presence of several different incongruous elements on the rear.

Carriage House: While this lot did not historically have the lot configuration that it has today (one single lot, extending to the lane), there is evidence of rear auto and accessory structures on this property throughout its history. There are additionally several remaining two-story carriage houses across the lane from this property.

418 East Jones Street was constructed in 1863 and is a contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District. The existing area of the lot is 2,100 square feet, of which the main building covers 780 square feet. However, the existing addition is proposed to be removed (returning the main house to 640 square feet) and replaced with an addition of 490 square feet. The new carriage house is proposed to be 445 square feet. The overall building coverage is proposed to be exactly 75%; the standard is met.

Staff finds the preservation standard to be met. The existing elements on the front façade that are proposed to be replaced are non-historic, and the overall configuration will not be altered. Additionally, staff has determined that the rear addition is non-historic. Therefore, the removal of these items will not remove historic materials or alter features/spaces that characterize the property. The elements on the front façade which are proposed to be replaced (windows, balusters, door, and columns) are generally based on a historic photo of the property. The turned balusters, double arched door, and 6/6 windows are all present and clearly original features in this photo. However, the original columns were not present and were therefore the original style was unable to be verified. The applicant has proposed a square wood column with chamfered corners with a cap and base molding, which staff finds to be in character with the historic building. Staff finds the preservation standards to be met and does not find the replacement porch elements to be conjectural.

Staff does not find that the rear addition has gained historic significance; it has been significantly altered and gutted over the years. Additionally, staff does not find the existing

simplistic front porch to have gained significance. The preservation standard is met. The rehabilitation of the front façade will return several distinctive features of the property.

The preservation standards are met. The addition is to be located on the rear and will be differentiated through materials (siding against brick exterior walls of the main building) and height (subordinate to the main building height). The addition will be reversible and shall not destroy or remove historic materials that characterize the property.

Following the construction of the carriage house, the only openings on the new rear addition that will be visible are on the third floor; all openings are to be taller than they are wide, and the third floor is to feature four paired windows and a single shuttered false window on the left side. Staff finds the proportion of openings within the new addition to be visually compatible. The carriage house is proposed to feature three windows on the second floor and an entrance door and garage door on the first floor. There is an adjacent carriage house which features an entrance door adjacent to a garage door. Staff finds the openings within the carriage house to be visually compatible.

The following materials are proposed to be utilized:

Front Façade:

- Porch Columns: Custom square wood with inset corners and cap and base, painted *Sherwin Williams 'Cyberspace'*
- Spindles/Balusters: Custom wood turned balusters, painted *Sherwin Williams 'Cyberspace'*, with a satin finish
- Windows: 6/6 wood windows, specification not provided, trim/window painted with *Benjamin Moore 'Linen White'* in a satin finish
- Porch Elements (Fascia, Soffit): Wood, painted with *Benjamin Moore 'Linen White'* in a satin finish
- Door: Double arched wood door (no lites), painted *Sherwin Williams 'Cyberspace'*
- Gutter/Downspout: Copper "C" shaped gutter with black metal decorative downspout, replaced in-kind to match existing

Though staff assumes the porch columns and windows will be custom wood, neither the exact specification nor indication of this in the drawings was provided. **Provide the specification and/or detail for the front façade windows.** The materials and colors proposed are otherwise visually compatible.

Rear Addition:

- Exterior Walls: *James Hardi* smooth lap (fiber cement) siding, 4" exposure, painted *Sherwin Williams 'Bunglehouse Gray'*
- Windows: *Sierra Pacific 'Westchester'* aluminum clad wood, 2/2 double hung, painted *Benjamin Moore 'Linen White'* in a satin finish
- Shutter: Custom wood louvered shutter, painted *'Cyberspace'* (see above)
- Soffit/Fascia: Wood, painted *Benjamin Moore 'Linen White'* in a satin finish

Staff did not include the materials proposed for the rear addition that will not be visible from the public right-of-way, due to the construction of the new two-story carriage house. This includes all elements below the third floor, including railing, windows, decking, and a door. Staff finds the materials and colors proposed to be visually compatible.

Carriage House:

- Exterior Walls: Three-coat scored stucco on CMU block, to match carriage house at 420 East Jones Street
- Windows: *Sierra Pacific 'Westchester'* aluminum clad wood, 6/6 double hung, painted *Benjamin Moore 'Linen White'* in a satin finish

- Entrance Door: *Lucker Door* 4-panel wood door, painted 'Cyberspace'
- Garage Door: *C.H.I. Overhead Doors* 'Contemporary Collection' Plank paneled steel overhead garage door with a wood grain finish, custom painted 'Cyberspace' with arched brick overhead detail to match adjacent carriage house
- Lighting: Small canopy metal light in black over entrance door and large metal canopy & arm over the garage door

Provide clarification regarding the color finish of the stucco. The applicant has indicated that the garage door will be custom painted; however, this model has wood grain finish options; **the steel garage door must not have a simulated wood grain.** Staff otherwise finds the materials and colors proposed to be visually compatible. The rear addition and carriage house are both to feature a flat roof. Staff finds this roof shape to be historically appropriate and visually compatible. The carriage house is to be two-stories tall, line up with the scale/massing of the adjacent carriage houses and be clearly subordinate to the main structure. The rear addition is to be three-stories tall and will also be clearly subordinate in height to the main historic structure. The rear addition is to be covered in fiber cement smooth lap siding and the carriage house will feature stucco over CMU block. **Provide clarification regarding the color finish of the carriage house.** The standard is otherwise met. The applicant provided evidence of the original door configuration, which it is proposed to match. The standard is met. This information was not provided for the carriage house. **The door frame within the carriage house must be inset not less than three (3) inches. The garage door must not feature a wood grain simulation.** The standard is otherwise met. The windows are proposed to be custom wood 6/6 windows based on a photograph which features the original window configuration, meeting the standard.

The *New construction, alterations to non-contributing resources and additions* standards are met. The framing members standards are met. The standard is met for the stucco/CMU carriage house. Staff finds the window sashes standard to be met. The grouped windows standard is met. The materials standards are met. The shutter standards are met.

The replacement features of the porch are predicated upon a historic photo of the property from 1968, with the exception of the columns, the originals of which were removed prior to this photo. The applicant is proposing what appears to be square wood columns with inset corners and a simple cap and base molding, which staff finds to be based on historic context. Staff finds the standards to be met. The roof of the addition and carriage house will be flat, which staff finds to be historically appropriate. The parapet standard is met. The roofing material will not be visible from the public right-of-way. The accessory structures and configurations standards are met. The doors and openings standard is met. The parapet will screen the roof mounted equipment. The lighting standards are met. The parking standards are met.

The rear addition was added 1986. The openings have changed considerably, but the siding has not.

Mr. Higgins stated there are no specs for ballusters.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Matthew Hallett, petitioner, stated column details will be added, along with any other requests.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Ian Clayton, east neighbor, 420 E Jones. the garden wall to be built was not approved.

Want to be sure that none of the wall will be on his property wall. Wants to keep the historic brick wall. Does not want the rear deck to be impacted.

Mr. Hallett stated he spoke with the neighbor. Will shift garden wall over to be certain it is on his property only.

BOARD COMMENTS:

The recommendation should include wall be built entirely on petitioner's property as the plans show it split.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the demolition of an existing rear addition and the construction of a new rear addition and a new two-story carriage house, and the rehabilitation of the property located at 418 East Jones Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1. Provide the specification and/or detail for the front façade windows**
- 2. Provide clarification regarding the color finish of the stucco.**
- 3. The garage door must not feature a simulated wood grain.**
- 4. The entrance door frame within the carriage house must be inset not less than three (3) inches.**

Motion

The Savannah Downtown Board of Review does hereby approve of the demolition of an existing rear addition and the construction of a new rear addition and a new two-story carriage house, and the rehabilitation of the property located at 418 East Jones Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Provide the specification and/or detail for the front facade windows
2. Provide clarification regarding the color finish of the stucco.
3. The garage door must not feature a simulated wood grain.
4. The entrance door frame within the carriage house must be inset not less than three (3) inches.
5. The common wall is entirely on applicant's property.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Thomas L. Thomson

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	- Not Present
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

[18. Petition of Hansen Architects, Patrick Phelps | 22-002279-COA | 220 East Bryan Street | New Construction Hotel, Part I: Height and Mass with Special Exception Requests](#)

- ☞ [Staff Recommendation 22-002279-COA 220 E Bryan St.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- ☞ [220 E Bryan St_22-002394-ZCL.pdf](#)
- ☞ [1954 and 1973 Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Previous Demolition Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- ☞ [MPC Policy- Documenting Prior to Demolition.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Thin Brick Mock-Up.pdf](#)

Ms. Leah Michalak presented the petitioner's request for 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).

The applicant is requesting Special Exception from the additional story criteria standard that states:

“... exterior building walls [shall] incorporate 100% modular masonry materials on all sides ...”

To allow thin brick on walls setback from the exterior face of the building (mechanical penthouse and sky deck).

The applicant is requesting Special Exception from the Large-Scale Development standard that states:

“Façades fronting streets shall incorporate windows and doors over the following minimum percentage of surface area: Ground level commercial uses: 55%”

To allow windows and doors over 50% of the ground floor surface area on Bryan Street, which is the street fronting façade.

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.

The requested Special Exceptions fall under the Design Standards.

Thin Brick Special Exception: The applicant provided a mock-up for the proposed thin brick on walls setback from the exterior face of the building (mechanical penthouse and sky deck) – see attached images. Because the locations proposed for the thin brick are minimally visible and its use in such a scenario is in conformance with the goals of the bonus story portion of the ordinance, to provide an additional public benefit in exchange for additional height, staff recommends approval for the use of the thin brick at the vertical inset walls of the sky deck and penthouse vertical walls only.

Fenestration Percentage Special Exception: The applicant provided two front elevations: one that illustrates the ground floor design with the 55% required glazing and one with the proposed 50% ground floor design. The applicant contests that, although they can meet the minimum glazing requirements, the design as proposed with 50% glazing provides a design that is more compatible with the ground floor openings on the adjacent church building to the west.

However, because staff is recommending to continue the project, staff also recommends that the Special Exception requests be continued until the project is redesigned. Because staff is recommending to continue the project, no additional conditions, restrictions, or

safeguards are recommended at this time. Staff also recommends that the Special Exception requests be continued until the project is redesigned.

The building is within a 6-story height zone per the Height Map; however, an additional story is requested. The height of the building is not visually compatible. The height of the building far exceeds the height of contributing buildings which are visually related to this site. Additionally, it is not typical for buildings of this scale to be internal to a tithing block; its scale and grandeur are more typical of a corner lot, a lot facing a north-south street, or a Trust Lot. Staff recommends that the height of the building be reduced: 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.

Staff also recommends that a bonus story not be granted as an additional story above the Height Map further exacerbates the incompatibility of the building's height. Furthermore, staff recommends that the building step back from the 3-story contributing building to the east; as currently designed, with a shear wall adjacent to the contributing building, the new building engulfs and destroys the historic context of the contributing building. The opening proportions are visually compatible.

The rhythm of the solids to voids on the front and rear facades is visually compatible; however, the lack of voids and architectural interest on the west and east façades is not compatible. Staff recommends that architectural interest be added to both side facades and that the building be redesigned to step back from the east to, not only show deference to the contributing building but to, allow for additional fenestration.

Although no setbacks and 100% lot coverage is permitted in this zoning district, it is not appropriate or visually compatible for the new building to abut the historic buildings on either side. This will obscure and cause damage to the historic building facades. 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 recommends that the new building be setback a minimum of 5 feet from either side property line.

The center main entrance is visually compatible. However, the reduced depth of the walkway in front of the building, most of which is tapered to allow for ADA access, is not compatible. Sidewalks are wide on Bryan Street and, with the addition of valet parking and luggage unloading, the sidewalk will be unusable for anyone other than hotel guests. Staff recommends that the proposed drop off lane be removed from the project. The proposed parapeted roof shape is not visually compatible. Visually related contributing buildings have hipped and low-sloped roofs with deep eaves and brackets. Revise the roof shape to be more compatible. The proposed building creates a wall of continuity. The overall scale and directional expression of the building is not visually compatible. See comments under other Visual Compatibility Criteria.

This project is Large-Scale Development. The standard is met. Parapets are proposed to be 2 feet and the mechanical access structures are not a story. The ground floor is proposed to be 18 feet. Staff recommends reducing the floor-to-floor height to a maximum of 14'-6" to decrease the overall height of the building and so that the first floor height is compatible with the first floor height of the contributing building to the west. Although technically not as tall as the first story, the exterior visual expression of the 7th story is taller than the first story. Reduce the height of the 7th story above the string course.

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 does not match this building form. The contributing buildings on immediately adjacent titling and trust blocks are either non-contributing or do not match the proposed building form. The standard is not 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. The standard is met. A hotel is considered a commercial building and the ground floor is designed as a storefront. The standard is met.

The base is proposed to be 24” high; the materials and/or design will be reviewed with Part II: Design Details. A roof deck is proposed at the top level at the northeast corner of the building and is screened to meet the standard. The deck itself will not be visible and, therefore, the color is not reviewed. 9’-4” clear above the sidewalk is proposed. The roof deck is not on the street façade. The standard is met. Electrical meters are proposed on the rear façade; the drawings indicate (internal). The standard is met. Equipment on the roof is proposed to be screened.

No on-site parking is proposed; therefore, the standards do not apply. This property is in a parking exempt zone. A drop off lane is proposed to be added to the city street/sidewalk in front of the building on Bryan Street; it is not within the footprint of the building.

The building footprint is proposed to be 13,434sf. The roofline variation proposed on the front façade constitutes the same result as a change in parapet height only, which does not qualify as “Roofline Variation” per the definition in the ordinance; the roof is simply built-up on the west and east masses. Although the applicant describes this roofline variation as being achieved through volumetric forms, the window height, pattern, etc. remains the same on all three forms, therefore, not achieving the intent of the ordinance as can be seen in Figure 7.8-8 below. Redesign the “Roofline Variation” to meet the massing standard per the diagrams below.

Alternately, staff recommends that the building be redesigned so that the “sky deck” extends to or is on the front of the building as this does constitute a one-half story roofline variation as currently designed on the rear and east facades. This project qualifies as Large-scale development; it is in a 6-story height map area within a D-CBD zoning district. The standard is not met (the front façade is 154 feet wide). See comments under the Large-scale development massing standards. 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 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 (46’-2”) 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.)

The applicant has requested a Special Exception to allow thin brick at the sky deck and penthouse (instead of modular masonry). The diagrams on HDBR 0.5 indicate that, otherwise, modular masonry is proposed on the remainder of the building with 30% natural quarried stone on the Bryan (street) façade.

From west to east, the sections measure 52'-4", 48'-0" and 52'-4". The standard is met. 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". The standard is met. The window sashes and door frames standard is not met. 3.5" insets are proposed. Revise to meet the standard. The refuse storage standard is met.

Mr. Higgins asked about the building being set back 5 feet. **Ms. Michalak** stated 5 feet allows for fenestration of some kind.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Phelps, petitioner, height of building; variety of historic buildings and typologies in the area. Highlighted various historic buildings to indicate the variety in the area. May be highest concentration of high-rise buildings. A few two/three story buildings. Larger buildings are visually compatible in this ward. Eligible for bonus story. They tried to keep the continuity. Using 30% natural stone (limestone). The bonus story will open the area; cafe on the first floor. Will reduce 7th floor height, and limit height of access structure to be obscured and screen mechanical. No encroachments; build on same property line.

Lightwells provide fenestration for light and fire code; will increase fenestration. Ordinance does not require setbacks. Will extend limestone to 7th floor. Parapeted roof for building of this scale is overkill. Will adjust window. Depth of lane is not included in the ordinance. Window depth will be adjusted. Would like Special Exception to be heard for thinbrick, and storefront glazing.

Ms. Taylor asked how will they address minimizing of mass or damage of buildings. Constructing a basement: foundation work not relative to adjacent buildings. Please take care, track movement during construction. Keeping street-fronting facades to keep historic continuity.

Ms. Isaacs asked about structural evaluation done? Impact of concrete foundation. Have structural engineer on board; soil and structural testing of impact to 226 East Bryan.

Mr. Higgins asked will there be a pitched roof? **Ms. Michalak** stated a highlighted pattern, not a suggestion.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Ellen Harris, DNA: supports staff recommendation. Numerous design concerns and incompatibilities. Height not visually compatible, lack of fenestration on east/west. Concerns with thinbrick and how it will wrap. Concerns of precedent it will set. The structure should be designed to meet the standard.

Ms. Sue Adler, HSF, stated the structure is too large. Requests the Board deny Special Exception; standards need to be met.

Mr. Harold Yellin stated he works across the street and supports the project

BOARD COMMENTS:

Ms. Memory stated it is not visually compatible. **Mr. Thomson** and **Ms. Guinn** have concerns with the design. Need to work with staff for visually compatibility, particularly on a titling block. **Ms. Taylor** stated the project may continue to weaken landmark district status because of high buildings. Height and mass needs to be looked at.

Mr. Altschiller stated massive buildings change the nature of Savannah. False equivalency between bonus story and quality materials. It should be built with good materials regardless of bonus story. There are too many issues. **Mr. Higgins** stated this is between two historic structures and is a disservice. **Mr. Thomson** asked how many hotel rooms are planned. **Mr. Phelps** responded 154. **Ms. Memory** stated we need to consider the Secretary of Interior Standards. Otherwise, there will be a continuance of deterioration of historic buildings **Ms. Isaacs** stated the design changes provided today were improvements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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 of 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.**

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

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 facade where is 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 facades.
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.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Nan Taylor

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	- Not Present
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

19. Acknowledge and approve of Staff-approved decisions as presented.

Motion

Acknowledge and approve of Staff-approved decisions as presented.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion:

Second:

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	- Not Present
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

[20. Petition of CORE DESIGN, Tim Kinsey | 22-002119-COA | 32 EAST BROUGHTON STREET | Exterior column trim and paint](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-002119-COA- 32 E Broughton St.pdf](#)

[21. Petition of GM SHAY ARCHITECTS, Meredith Stone | 22-002180-COA | 618 MONTGOMERY STREET | AMEND: New Construction ground-level recess/windows](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision 22-002180-COA 618 Montgomery St.pdf](#)

[22. Petition of THOMAS & KELLY McATEE | 22-002241-COA | 206 EAST GASTON STREET | Color change](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 22-002241-COA 206 E Gaston St.pdf](#)

[23. Petition of ROOFCRAFTERS, Kyle Conaway | 22-002244-COA | 414 EAST CHARLTON STREET | Roof Replacement](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec 22-002244-COA 414 E Charlton St.pdf](#)

[24. Petition of MERRIMAN MILLWORKS, Stephen Merriman, Jr. | 22-002344-COA | 202 WEST BROUGHTON STREET | Window replacements \(10\)](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 22-002344-COA 202 W Broughton #302.pdf](#)

[25. Petition of SARAH SEGER | 22-002377-COA | 513 EAST JONES STREET | Wood repair/replace](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 22-002377-COA 513 E Jones St.pdf](#)

[26. Petition of ROOF HUNTERS, Rusty Hunter | 22-002421-COA | 20 WEST GASTON STREET | In-kind roof replacement](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 22-002421-COA 20 W Gaston St.pdf](#)

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

[27. Report on Work Inconsistent With Issued COA for the June 8, 2022, HDBR Meeting](#)

[☞ Work Inconsistent with Issued COA_June Report.pdf](#)

[28. Report on Work That Exceeds Scope of Issued COA for the June 8, 2022, HDBR Meeting](#)

[☞ Work That Exceeds Scope of Issued COA_June Report.pdf](#)

[29. Report on Work Performed Without a COA for the June 8, 2022, HDBR Meeting](#)

[☞ Work Performed Without a COA_June Report.pdf](#)

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

[30. Stamped Drawings - June Report](#)

📎 [June 2022 REPORT.pdf](#)

[31. Items Deferred to Staff - June Report](#)

📎 [Items Deferred to Staff - June 2022 Report.pdf](#)

[32. COA Inspections - June Report](#)

📎 [June 2022 - REPORT.pdf](#)

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

[33. Nominating Committee: Announce Nomination for Vice-Chair](#)

Continue to July 13, 2022 HDBR meeting

XV. ADJOURNMENT

[34. Next HDBR Pre-Meeting - Wednesday July 13, 2022 at 12pm - 112 East State Street, Mendonsa Hearing Room](#)

[35. Next HDBR Regular Meeting - Wednesday July 13, 2022 at 1pm - 112 East State Street, Mendonsa Hearing Room](#)

[36. Adjourn](#)

4:52 p.m.

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.