



## Savannah Historic District Board of Review

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room - 112 East State Street  
September 14, 2022 1:00 PM  
MINUTES

### September 14, 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  
Karen Guinn  
Michael Higgins  
Melissa Memory  
Melissa Rowan  
Dwayne Stephens  
Thomas Thomson

**Members Absent:** David Altschiller  
Nan Taylor

**MPC Staff Present:** Melanie Wilson, Executive Director  
Pamela Everett, Assistant Executive Director  
Leah Michalak, Director of Historic Preservation  
Caitlin Chamberlain, Senior 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 Greenline Architecture | 22-002882-COA | 129-131 East Broughton Street | Alterations and Additions](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation - 22-002282-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Research.pdf](#)

#### **Motion**

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:

Provide brick, mortar, and awning fabric samples.

If the rooftop HVAC units are visible after installation; apply for mechanical screening.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Karen Guinn

Second: Michael Higgins

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

[2. Petition of Signs by James LLC, James Burnsed | 22-003489-COA | 27 Montgomery Street | Signs](#)

[📎 Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[📎 Petitioner's Presentation.pdf](#)

**Motion**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval for the installation of illuminated and non-illuminated signage at 27 Montgomery Street with the following condition to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

Address the standard which prohibits projecting signs from projecting over the curb line and ensure there is no traffic safety hazard with a projecting sign at this location.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Karen Guinn

Second: Michael Higgins

Dwayne Stephens	- Not Present
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Not Present

Nan Taylor	- Not Present
Ellie Isaacs	- Not Present
Karen Guinn	- Aye
Michael Higgins	- Aye
Melissa H. Rowan	- Aye
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

[3. Petition of Ryan Whyte-Buck | 22-003493-COA | 36 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard | Sign](#)

[☞ Staff Recommendation - 22-003493-COA 34 MLK.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approval to mount one projecting illuminated sign at new restaurant, Folklore, located at 36 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard with the following condition:

Mount sign into the mortar joints instead of the brick faces to avoid altering or damaging the historic brick and to ensure if the sign is removed in the future that it will not compromise the history integrity of the building.

because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards.

**Vote Results ( Voting )**

Motion: Karen Guinn

Second: Michael Higgins

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

[4. Petition of Ward Architecture + Preservation | 22-003896-COA | 439 Abercorn Street | Addition](#)

[☞ Staff Recommendation - 22-003896-COA- 439 Abercorn St.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[☞ Window Section.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approval for an addition to enclose the front patio of the property located at 439 Abercorn Street as requested

because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Karen Guinn

Second: Michael Higgins

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

[5. Petition of Array Design, Shauna Kucera | 22-003897-COA | 625 Tattnall Street | Alterations \(Fence and Driveway\)](#)

[Staff Rec - 22-003897-COA 625 Tattnall .pdf](#)

[Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approval of the alterations to the property located at 625 Tattnall Street with the following condition:

Contact the City for relocating the parking sign in the area for the curb cut

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

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Karen Guinn

Second: Michael Higgins

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

Thomas L. Thomson - Aye

#### IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

##### 6. Adoption the September 14, 2022 Agenda

###### **Motion**

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to approve the September 14, 2022 agenda as presented.

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

Motion: Thomas L. Thomson

Second: Melissa H. Rowan

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

#### V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

##### 7. Approval of August 10, 2022 HDBR Meeting Minutes

[📎 08.10.22 MEETING MINUTES.pdf](#)

###### **Motion**

The Historic Preservation Commission motioned to approve the August 10, 2022 HPC minutes as presented.

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

Motion: Karen Guinn

Second: Thomas L. Thomson

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

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

[8. Petition of Sign D'Sign | 22-003905-COA | 22 East Broughton Street | Sign](#)

## VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

[9. Petition of 190 Octane Retail, LLC. | 22-003872-COA | 19 East Bay Street | Sign](#)

### Motion

Continue.

### Vote Results ( Not Started )

Motion: Thomas L. Thomson

Second: Karen Guinn

## VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

## IX. REGULAR AGENDA

[10. Petition of Thomas Weihs Haus, Gerald Chambers and Michael Gronebaum | 22-003877-COA | 222 East Gwinnett Street | New Construction \(Small\), Part I and II](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation - 22-003877-COA 222 E Gwinnett St.pdf](#)

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

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

📎 [Zoning Determination Letter.pdf](#)

📎 [Petitioner's Presentation.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Research.pdf](#)

**Mr. James Zerillo** presented the applicant's request of approval for New Construction (Small), Parts I & II for a Caretaker's Dwelling Unit at the rear of the property located at 222 East Gwinnett Street. The new building is proposed to be attached to the full width of the west façade of the historic lane building and is, therefore, reviewed using both new construction and addition standards.

On August 2, 2022, the Zoning Administration made a determination regarding the 8.7.5 Caretaker Residential Unit (not including Accessory Dwelling Units) article of the Zoning Code stating the following:

*"The intent of the ordinance is to only permit one accessory structure for residential dwelling on a parcel. The accessory dwelling unit serves as an additional residential unit on a lot with a principal residential dwelling unit. The caretaker's residential unit is a residential unit that serves as a property manager of a commercial operation. Therefore, only one of these types of structures—either an accessory dwelling unit or caretaker's residential unit—may be constructed on a parcel."*

In line with the zoning interpretation, staff understands the new construction building to be prohibited under 8.7.5 of the Zoning Code. The full zoning determination letter is included in the file. The historic main building and lane building were constructed in 1884 and are contributing buildings within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Downtown Historic District. According to the 1996-1998 survey card alterations were made in 1981 and a small verandah addition was added to the west side of the main building. Staff conducted a site visit to examine the materials of the exterior wall on the western façade. Staff determined that the exterior siding was a mixture of historic wood,

replacement wood and Hardie board based on physical evidence. Photos taken at the site visit can be found attached to the Staff Research packet.

Referenced above, in accordance with the Zoning Administrator's determination on August 2, 2022, the proposed new construction does not conform to the base zoning standards in Section 8.7 of the zoning code. The use is not permitted according to base zoning because there already exists an accessory dwelling unit within the historic lane building. The standards are not met.

The lot width is a pre-existing condition. The total building coverage on the lot is 61% with the proposed new construction. No setbacks are required per these standards. The new building is two stories tall.

The proposed scope of work does not preserve the historic character of the historic lane building. Materials, features, and forms would be lost as the proposed scope of work includes the alterations of openings, the removal of eaves to incorporate the addition, and the obscuration of an entire façade of the structure. The scope of work is not compatible as it emulates the design language of the principal use structure and not the historic lane building. The massing and scale of the proposed scope of work also overshadows the historic lane building, lending to a false sense of historical development. The proposed scope of work is differentiated from the historic lane building, however these differences are not compatible due to the level of detail and scale of the structure.

The proposed scope of work details the modification of openings between the historic lane building and the new construction. The petitioner is proposing the conversion of the exterior windows to interior doorways. Connecting the two structures will also require modification to the existing eaves and roof structure of the historic lane building. The exterior wall is a mixture of non-historic and historic materials added over the building's lifetime. The guideline is not met. The caretaker's dwelling unit is attached to the historic lane building along the entire west façade; this will result in a high degree of loss of form. The eaves and roof structure will have to be modified to accommodate the proposed scope of work. The historic openings are proposed to be altered as well. The exterior wall will also have to be altered. The design of the new construction mimics the design of the principal building. This creates a sense of false historical development through the use of conjectural features that wouldn't have historically been utilized on a lane building which were typically simpler in design and detailing. The new addition overpowers the historic lane building and does not retain the essential form and integrity of the historic property.

*Rather than differentiating between old and new, it might seem more in keeping with the historic character simply to repeat the historic form, material, features and detailing in a new addition. However, when the new work is highly replicative and indistinguishable from the old in appearance, it may no longer be possible to identify the "real" historic building. Conversely, the treatment of the addition should not be so different that it becomes the primary focus. The difference may be subtle, but it must be clear. A new addition to a historic building should protect those visual qualities that make the building eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.*

The level of detail and scale of the proposed new construction causes it to become the primary focus over the historic lane building. The guidelines are not met. The proposed new construction is not subordinate to the historic lane building and takes design cues from the primary structure to which it is not attached. It does not share similar design language to the historic lane building. The guidelines are not met.

Historic materials will be removed and negatively impacted through the proposed new construction. The proposed new caretaker's dwelling would structurally impact the historic

lane building as it abuts the entire western façade. This new construction would also require the eaves of the historic lane building to be removed. The window openings are proposed to be altered into interior doorways. The emulation of features from the principal structure creates a false sense of historical development. It causes the new construction to be understood as a contemporary development of the principal structure which it is not. The standards are not met.

The proposed new construction will cause the eaves of the historic lane building to be removed and the western façade windows to be completely obscured. The historic elements of the western façade's exterior wall will also be removed. The standard is not met. Architecturally integrating the proposed caretaker unit to the historic lane building damages the historic integrity of the historic lane building. Historic materials and the form of the structure will be lost. The proposed work is not compatible in size, scale, or architectural features to the existing carriage home, not meeting the standard. New construction of this scale, which is architecturally integrated (by way of a shared wall with the existing carriage home), is not reversible. The standard is not met.

Since the proposed new construction is an accessory unit, the structure is considered visually related to the historic lane building on the parcel. This proposed caretaker unit is larger than the historic lane building and is not visually compatible in terms of height as the new building exceeds the height of the historic building. The width and height of the front façade is not visually compatible with the historic lane building and the width and height exceeds that of the historic building. The folding glass wall door is not visually compatible. The rhythm of solids to voids is visually compatible with the surrounding context. The rhythm of structures on streets will be significantly altered due to the mass and height of the addition of the caretaker unit on this parcel. It is not visually compatible with the surrounding context. The rhythm of entryway, porches, and walkways is not visually compatible with the surrounding context. While the porch detail and balusters are visually compatible with the main structure, the configuration and second story stair are not visually compatible with surrounding accessory structures.

The proposed materials, textures, and colors are visually compatible with the exception of the proposed window material (fiberglass) which are not visually compatible. The roof shape is not visually compatible with the surrounding visually related context; it is proposed to have a hip which is not permitted by the ordinance and doesn't exist on visually related contributing buildings. The scale of the new construction is not visually compatible with the existing carriage home on the property.

The new construction is considered an accessory building and does not exceed the two-story height limit. A specific front or side and rear yard setback is not required under the design standards. The brick foundation projects forward of the building plane and is not recessed, not meeting the standard. Hardie board siding is proposed which is appropriate in this area as it can be found on surrounding contributing structures. No prohibited materials are proposed. The proposed color is to match the existing carriage house and principal use structure.

No door frame inset measurement was provided. The proposed door system on the first floor is a sliding/folding glass door system. This type of door has been reviewed and approved in the past, however, when it was only visible from a lane (not a street). Since this door will be visible from Gwinnett Street, it does not meet the standard.

Double hung windows are proposed facing Gwinnett Street, meeting the standard. The proposed windows are Marvin Essential double-hung windows, which is not included on the



MPC's window brochure of windows previously approved by the Board. A previously approved window brand should be provided or a full-size sample of the proposed window for the Board to review. Fiberglass windows are not permitted. The standard is not met.

No railing detail was provided. The porch is proposed to be constructed of wood. A hip roof without a parapet wall is not permitted for an accessory building. A dimension was not provided and there is not a fascia. The standards are not met. Architectural shingles are proposed for the roofing material. The addition (caretaker dwelling) is not located on the rear of the historic lane building which is the most inconspicuous façade, not meeting the standard.

The addition is not subordinate in mass and height to the resource to which it is being added to (the historic lane building), not meeting the standard. The addition obscures and damages the historic lane building, not meeting the standard. The addition is distinguishable from the contributing building. The addition would not be reversible and it would damage the historic lane building because it is architecturally integrated with it, not meeting the standard. The proposed hip roof without a parapet is not permitted.

The location of refuse storage and mechanical equipment is existing and currently located in the lane. No change is proposed to be made to the location per this proposal. No lighting is proposed.

#### **PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Michael Gronebaum**, petitioner, stated he and co-owner Gerald Chambers filed a complaint because of belief of bias; not treated equally to previous submissions. One application was to increase the size of the current carriage house to include a two-story, three car garage. The application was not for a caretaker's dwelling, but for an addition to a current accessory dwelling structure. The intent was to expand the current carriage house. They believe the review should be based on the size, rhythm, scale, and mass of the principle main building, not the carriage house. Mr. Gronebaum cited other previous petitions to support his stand that the size is to be related to the primary main structure. He stated the current carriage house has some historic history, the majority of which has been removed. He argued that Staff did not accept their documentation that minimal historical materials remain. He stated their project should have the same decision as others have, that they believe they are the same as his submission. The petitioner highlighted their perceived inconsistencies between his submission and the Staff recommendations of other similar/exact petitions.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Ryan Jarles**, HSF, supports Staff's recommendation.

**Ms. Susan Atkinson**, supports consistency in decision-making, but not continuing with mistakes made in the past, as it adversely affects Savannah.

**Mr. Gerald Chambers**, responding petitioner, stated he understands preservation. Their reason for moving into neighborhood was to preserve this type of design; and they were certain to abide by the rules. He states what Staff is presenting is not true; it is not a caretakers dwelling, nor are the pictures accurate. The current carriage house has lost its historical significance, which he still wants to preserve. They are not looking to tear down, but a 3-car garage will not fit in the carriage house. Previous decisions and their submissions were based on DOI guidelines. They are asking to do what was already done. Precedence has to be followed. To them, it appears they are being treated differently.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Memory** stated this underscores the importance of carefully considering every project; not basing on what's happened before. They should be reviewed on an individual and equal basis.

**Mr. Thomson** stated alternatives need to be found.

**Mr. Higgins** stated he supports Staff recommendation.

**Mr. Stephens** asked is it a contributing structure? When was it last assessed? **Mr. Zerillo** stated it is contributing, last assessed in 2016. **IF** an error was made previously, we should not be chained to it; correct and go in right direction.

**Ms. Guinn** asked about clarification on zoning determination letter. **Ms. Wilson** clarified that the MPC is not the Zoning Administrator. The Planner of Zoning of Urban Design with the City made the determination. Previous decision was made on the previous ordinance; many things were corrected with the new. Requested the Board view from a contextual standpoint, as Staff did. MPC tries to find a win; the applicants should try to adhere to the guidelines. Several applications were received from the applicant. Recommended the applicant try to request something in harmony with the current Ordinance.

**Mr. Rowan** stated it does help when the petitioner and Staff come to resolution.

**Mr. Thomson** stated he supports Staff's recommendation. There should be more dialogue.

**Mr. Stephens** stated NewZo was established 2019/20, some of petitioner's examples are not valid, as they were determined under the previous Ordinance.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Denial for New Construction (Small), Parts I & II for a Caretaker's Dwelling Unit at the rear of the property located at 222 East Gwinnett Street because the work is not visually compatible, does not meet the preservation standards, and does not meet the design standards.**

**Motion**

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the petition for New Construction (Small), Parts I & II for a Caretaker's Dwelling Unit at the rear of the property located at 222 East Gwinnett Street because the work is not visually compatible, does not meet the preservation standards, and does not meet the design standards.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Michael Higgins

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Not Present
Nan Taylor	- Not Present
Ellie Isaacs	- Abstain
Karen Guinn	- Aye

Michael Higgins	- Aye
Melissa H. Rowan	- Aye
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

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

- 🔗 [Submittal Packet 1.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet 2.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Public\\_Comment\\_August.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Zoning Determination.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Public\\_Comment\\_September.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Public\\_Comment\\_September\\_2.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Petitioner's Presentation.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Public\\_Comment\\_September\\_3.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Petition of Support.pdf](#)

**Mr. James Zerillo** presented the petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction (Part II: Design Details) for a single-family residence at 336 Barnard Street. The building is a three-story residence with a two-car integrated garage. Additionally, since the last HDBR meeting, the height of the building has been reduced from four to three-stories; therefore, Part I standards for height have been re-reviewed.

Per the applicant response from the August meeting recommendation and conditions:

*“1. Provide a full-size sample of the proposed window or choose one which has been previously approved by the board / listed on the MPC’s window brochure.*

- Yes, the design team has chosen an alternate window from the approved window list supplied by the MPC. The window will be from the Kolbe Heritage/Sterling Series.
- Please see **Page 45** of the PDF, “Window & Door Specifications” showing this new window specification.

*2. Utilize a white-light source for all exterior lighting fixtures.*

- Yes, the design team will utilize a white light for all exterior light sources.
- Please see **Page 44** of the PDF, “Materials & Specifications” noting this design detail.

*3. Provide the height for the front-yard iron fence.*

- Yes, we have provided the height for front-yard iron fence in the updated design drawings.
- Please see **Page 25** of the PDF, or Sheet A201 “Barnard Street Elevations” showing this detail.

*4. Provide a dimensioned detail drawing for the porch and balcony railings, ensure they meet the standards for porch and balcony railings, and ensure that the balconies are not more than 3 feet deep.*

- Yes, we have provided dimensions in the plans and a detailed drawing for the porch and balcony railings.
- Please see **Page 23** of the PDF, or Sheet A102 "Floor Plans," and **Page 37** of the PDF, or Sheet A402 “Architectural Details” for the requested information.

5. *Provide dimensions for the standing seam metal roof detailing seam height and panel width.*

- Yes, we have provided the dimensions for the standing seam metal roof detailing the seam height and panel width.
- Please see **Page 26-28** of the PDF, or Sheets A202-204 "Elevations," and **Page 36** of the PDF, or Sheet A401 "Architectural Details" for the requested information."

The Part I (height & mass) of this project was proposed and approved on December 9th, 2020 with the condition that the proposed baluster height be approved. In addition to new construction, demolition of the existing non-contributing structure was proposed and approved under this COA. *Per the Part I board review context:* "Recently subdivided from the main historic building at 123 West Charlton Street, the existing building at 336 Barnard Street is listed as a non-contributing building on the Historic Building Map. Currently used as rental apartments, the building was originally two or more buildings that have evolved over time.

During the August 2022 HDBR meeting staff recommended approval with the following five conditions:

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

The applicant addressed each condition and found no issue with staff's recommendations. During the meeting it was brought to the board and staff's attention that because of the structure's height (4 stories) and because it's located in a D-R zoning district, it should have been reviewed under the Large Scale Development standards during the Part I Height & Mass review. Due to this procedural error the project was continued by the board. The board agreed with all of staff's conditions and added a 6th condition that the project be continued to allow for the petitioner to apply for special exceptions. Per the board decision from the August 2022 meeting:

*"The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition for New Construction, Part II (Design Details) at 336 Barnard Street to the September 14th Historic District Board of Review meeting with the following conditions because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:*

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

6. Apply for Special exceptions to be heard with Part II (Design Details).”

The HDBR continued the petition to the September 14th meeting with the following conditions based on additional information above that was provided at the meeting **(responses to the conditions are bolded and italicized)**:

1. Provide a full-size sample of the proposed window or choose one which has been previously approved by the board / listed on the MPC’s window brochure.

***Kolbe Heritage/Sterling Series was selected from the window brochure. The condition is met.***

2. Utilize a white-light source for all exterior lighting fixtures.

***Exterior lighting was detailed as having a white-light source. The condition is met.***

3. Provide the height for the front-yard iron fence.

***A height of 3’ 6” was provided for the front yard fence. This meets the standard. The condition is met.***

4. Provide a dimensioned detail drawing for the porch and balcony railings, ensure they meet the standards for porch and balcony railings, and ensure that the balconies are not more than 3 feet deep.

***The provided dimensioned drawings show that the proposed balconies do not exceed a 3 foot depth. The proposed railings meet the railing standards, not exceeding a height of 36 inches and having a 4” minimum spacing between balusters. The condition is met.***

5. Provide dimensions for the standing seam metal roof detailing seam height and panel width.

***Dimensions were provided for the standing seam roof height and panel width. The condition is met.***

6. Apply for Special Exceptions to be heard with Part II (Design Details).

***Special Exceptions are no longer required as the height has been reduced to 3-stories, thereby eliminating the Large-Scale Development standards, and the Zoning Administrator has made a determination that the “standard is met” for the primary entrance to face the north-south street (see attached for determination). The condition is met. Per the Zoning Administration’s decision:***

*“Sec. 7.8.10(g)(ii)(1)(g) states, “If none of the above conditions apply, the building entrance shall be consistent with contributing buildings within the context.” The request for determination asserts that Sec. 7.8.10(g)(ii)(1)(g) conditions a building’s primary entrance and allows new construction to locate the primary entrance on a north-south street when constructed within a tithing block containing contributing buildings within context.*

*Sec. 7.8.10(g)(ii)(1) is written in a way that the regulatory language, e.g., “A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street,” is the condition. Therefore, Sec. 7.8.10(g)(ii)(1)(g) exempts those parcels that cannot locate the primary entrance on an east-west street from the requirement.*

*It is the determination of the zoning administrator that any proposed construction on a tithing block may locate the primary entrance on a north-south street when location on an east-west street is not possible provided it is consistent with contributing buildings*

*within the context.”*

Following the Zoning Administrator’s determination, a member of the public appealed the determination to the Zoning Board of Appeals; however, it was found by the city that the member of the public did not have standing to appeal the determination and the city withdrew the application.

Originally constructed c.1900, the buildings were first used as sheds and stables in 1916, garages in 1954, and dwellings in 1973. The first maps show the building constructed from wood and brick; later maps show concrete block and brick. It is likely that this building has been heavily altered over time, hence the reason for its non-contributing status.”

Per the Savannah Downtown Historic District Height Map the structure is allowed 4 stories in this area as it is a principal building as defined by the Zoning Code. The petitioner has reduced the height to three stories. The reduced height is visually compatible with the surrounding context, meeting the standard.

The primary materials of brick, stucco, and marble are visually compatible with the historic context of Pulaski Square. There are several neighboring structures constructed primarily of brick with masonry ornamentation. The proposed colors for elements such as doors, windows, and architectural ornamentation is appropriate within the historic context. However, in some locations, stucco is proposed over wood framing which does not meet the definition of ‘true stucco’ per the ordinance which is two-or-three-part coating over masonry. Revise the building construction to meet the definition of true stucco.

This project no longer qualifies as Large-Scale Development since the 4th floor (per the “stories ...” standards below) has been removed. The definition of Large-Scale Development per the ordinance is:

*“ ... large scale development is any development whose combined ground floor footprint is equal to or greater than 9,000 square feet within a single parcel; or **is four- (4) stories or greater** in D-C and **D-R zoning districts**; or, is five- (5) stories or greater in all other zoning districts within the Savannah Downtown Historic District. In the case of an addition to an existing building, the combined footprint and height of both the existing building and the addition located on the same parcel apply.”*

The structure is a principal building, not an accessory building. The interior spaces above the third floor consist only of mechanical areas and access structures. The building is three-stories high. The interior spaces above the third floor consist only of a stairway enclosure and mechanical areas. The building is three-stories high.

The primary exterior materials are proposed to be brick, stucco, and marble. Metal accents are proposed on ornamental exterior details. No prohibited materials are proposed. However, in some locations, stucco is proposed over wood framing which does not meet the definition of ‘true stucco’ per the ordinance which is two-or-three-part coating over masonry. Revise the building construction to meet the definition of true stucco.

The proposed finishes are visually compatible with the surrounding context on Pulaski Square.

The attached determination of the Zoning Administrator (cited above) states that the last article (known as Article g in the Zoning Code) “*None of the Above*” is applicable in this context. The structure is permitted to align its primary entrance with the contributing buildings in the surrounding context. A north-south street primary entrance is appropriate according to this ruling and the above standard. The standard is met.

No sliding glass doors are proposed. All proposed doors are wood with glass, rectangular insets. No vinyl or steel-pressed doors are proposed. All glass insets are individual rectangular lights, French door lights, or transom windows.

Kolbe Heritage / Sterling series windows are previously approved per the MPC's window brochure. No glass tinting or vinyl is proposed. A covered, second story porch is located on the façade facing Charlton Street. Balconies are located on the second story of the primary façade facing Barnard Street and the third story facing Charlton Street. The second story porch on the Charlton Street façade has four wood columns with proper cap and base molding. The provided railing dimensions detail that the balusters do not exceed a 4-inch distance between one another. The railing height does not exceed 36 inches. The proposed balconies do not exceed the 3-foot depth standard.

Painted wood is proposed for the porch columns. A 3 foot high wrought iron railing is proposed, with a decorative baluster. The proposed awning is a mixture of wood bracketing and metal roofing. A standing seam metal roof with a proper drip edge is proposed. Dimensions were provided detailing the panel width and the height of the seams that meet the standards. Two metal sconce types are proposed, one being placed in the courtyard and the other being placed above each garage door. The sconces are metal and scaled appropriately. The color of the light source is indicated to be white. The standards are met.

The front façade fencing does not extend beyond the façade. The height of the front yard fence was provided as 42 inches. An iron fence is proposed in the front yard. The rear yard wood fencing is proposed to be painted. A masonry base is proposed for the front yard iron fencing. No prohibited materials are proposed.

#### **PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Christian Sottile**, petitioner, stated the project is a 3-story primary building facing Barnard Street, with no requested variances. It is a single family home. There was a reduction of density. A true contribution to the diverse fabric of the city. Use of natural materials. Updated drawings revised compliance regarding rooftop access. Regarding the stucco and masonry concern, it affects the rooftop access. It will be clad in shiplap siding and traditional casing. They agree with Staff recommendation.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Andrew Jones** stated he is against the petition. The petitioner should have a 2-story structure with parking below, affordable housing units above, rather than a luxury residence. This should be decided after sub & tithing lots decision. Part 1 should be denied as well. The Part 2 should be denied as well, conflicts with Pulaski Ward Greek Revival & Italianate Dwelling. Initial approval was a grave error in his opinion. The Zoning conclusions did not include 336 Barnard. The National Park Service 2018 report should be adhered to.

**Ms. Anna Wright** concerned that staff approves violation of ordinance. The bay window is an example; there are two commercial grade windows, a definite violation. Nor do the windows align, which is a fundamental design principle. There are about 15 different windows on the structure; it cannot be justified.

**Ms. Ardis Wood** stated the reference the Oglethorpe Plan regarding tithing lots. She also referenced the height regulations. She stated it is not visually compatible with structures. If permitted, sets a precedence for loss of Oglethorpe plan and its design. Potential for more subdivided lots.

**Ms. Kathy Ledvina** stated she is concerned the decision can threaten the Landmark

status. She asked about some of the design details relating to the Ordinance.

**Ms. Susan Atkinson** asked how current structure looks. Requests this does not become a precedent; block to have this continue throughout the City. Rhythm is essential - high/low. The top floor looks like habitable space.

**Ms. Ellen Harris**, DNA, concerned about tithing lots east/west nature, interior tithing lots should not be subdivided to leave lane-only access to a building; not like this historically. She stated they support Staff's recommendation but would not like it to set a precedence.

**Ms. Sabrina Nagel** (virtual) stated they are directly affected as neighboring property owners. The height takes away light and creates dark lanes. Though they heard the fourth floor was eliminated; it is enclosed, therefore a floor. Their view is the solid shiplap, lost view of Pulaski square. Should have been limited to two stories. The mass is there; it is a four-story building. The lanes are for service; what happens to the service for the main house/condo; where will they put there trash. She will lose her space for her dumpsters. This is a bad precedent that will continue to happen.

**Mr. Ryan Jarles**, HSF, understands concerns regarding Oglethorpe plan and lane issues, and threatened of status of the Landmark District, used the modeling of the Oglethorpe Plan. Lanes need to be protected

**Mr. John Brown** stated he was concerned about subdivision of lots and precedence it sets. No objection of architectural features, but should be built somewhere else. The main structure will have no access to the lane.

**Mr. Harold Yellin** stated none of concerns are supported by NewZo. Nothing stated only carriage house on site. There are at least 78 buildings on tithing lots that face north/south streets in the city. Zoning Administrator stated this property and design is a properly subdivided lot. The Board unanimously approved the height and mass was in 2020.

**Mr. Christian Sottile** stated the design and details will be made by hand. All windows have been presented to the Board and Staff in presentation package. Have developed a side-yard in lane to accommodate the trash. The structure is a book-match of its neighboring structure facing Barnard. The rooftop structure is per the standards.

#### **BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Rowan** stated she supports staff recommendation.

**Ms. Guinn** stated she supports staff, appreciates the passion of neighbors for the historic district. Taking steps regarding tithing lots.

**Mr. Higgins** asked is it visually compatible; the extreme ornamentation is jarring. Does not think it is proper in context.

**Mr. Thomson** stated he supports Staff. There was a time when historic buildings were worth nothing; a living, breathing district has changed that. How we address investment into a community determines its length of life and value. Without investment into community, the Historic districts will not survive. The subdivision conversation needs to be had to preserve and protect them.

**Ms. Memory** stated she has no problem with building itself. Believes the Board didn't get all information needed in Part 1, regarding subdivision; had it not been subdivided, this would



not be an issue today. This should be viewed as preservation practice, and what is visually related. We have to develop Savannah, but this is what has gotten us in threatened status in the Landmark District. Many buildings built after period of significance are not contributing; must extend highest stewardship of preservation as we have designation of National Landmark District, not National Register District. This Board has to be champions to hold the line; not just continue to approve things like this. Things like this should not be approved.

**Mr. Higgins** stated he agrees and supports Ms. Memory's statement.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval for New Construction (Part II: Design Details) for a single-family residence at 336 Barnard Street with the following condition to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:**

- 1. Revise the building construction to meet the definition of true stucco.**

**Motion**

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for New Construction (Part II: Design Details) for a single-family residence at 336 Barnard Street with the following condition to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the building construction to meet the definition of true stucco.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Melissa H. Rowan

Second: Dwayne Stephens

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

[12. Petition of Sawyer Design | 22-003325-COA | 301 West York Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

🔗 [Staff Recommendation - 22-003325-COA 301 West York Street](#)

🔗 [Submittal Packet](#)

🔗 [Staff Research](#)

🔗 [Public Comments](#)

**Mr. Ethan Hageman** presented the applicant's request of approval for New Construction:

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

The project description per the applicant, is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Street. Staff finds the scale of building and directional expression of front elevation to be visually compatible. The proposed project fits the scale of contributing buildings and structures surrounding the property in the Downtown Historic District.

The Streets and Lanes and Height standards are met. The proposed parapet wall height will be 3'-7". The exterior expression of the proposed buildings first floor will be 11' 1" for the first-floor, floor to ceiling height. The floor to ceiling height will be 9' 1" on both the second and third floor of the proposed building. The floor truss will be approximately 16", making the exterior expression greater than 10 feet. West York Street is a connecting street. Per the ordinance, Building Form is defined as: "The physical shape of a building resulting from its mass, height, and envelope." Staff finds that the proposed project will utilize the form of the existing contributing buildings currently within West York Street. See the visual compatibility criteria comments above regarding height of the proposed building and surrounding contributing buildings. The building form of the proposed building will emulate 136 Jefferson which has multiple entrances and a flat roof.

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

According to the site plan submitted by the applicant, the meter boxes will be placed behind the townhouse units facing the courtyard and will be minimally visible from view. Roof mounted equipment and HVAC units are proposed on the roof and the parapet walls will screen them from view. The proposed refuse storage areas will be in the rear yard and screened from the public right-of-way. Alternative energy source devices are not proposed for this project.

Parking is not proposed for this project, the zoning district does not require a parking minimum. The rear of the property will be used as a common space for the units.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Jonathan Leonard**, petitioner, agrees with Staff recommendation.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Andrew Jones** stated this should be a two-story carriage proposal in the back. Three townhouses in the front and affordable housing above. The conditional approval was an error; the owner owns the entire lot; therefore the determination was not appropriate. The petitioner is being granted special exception for something that he refuses to comply with in the Ordinance. He stated he filed an appeal with the City. Though they have stated he does not have standing, he believes he does and will do the same for the area residents of 336 Barnard. If denied, there will be an issue of due process that will have to be addressed and 336 Barnard will have to return before the Board. The rules are to be more stringent, not to allow more degradation of historic areas The National Park Service Report of 2018 stated removing the voids was to be stopped, it is a threat to the Plan. He encouraged the Board to review the Oglethorpe Plan and remain loyal to its direction. Every building on tithing lots face the east/west streets; only the ones in trust lots face north/south. The plan should not be degraded.

**Ms. Kim Dougherty** (virtual) is there anything that will attach to 305 W York because of the third story; her home is a 200-year-old structure built by Isaiah Davenport. Would like petitioner to ensure that the design of the structure so that rainwater will be captured from Unit A and not run off on her property from the third story.

**Mr. Leonard** responded there is no intent of attaching to building; it will be freestanding next to hers. There will be a zero-lot line; can't flash to the other house. They divert rainwater containment system with gutter. He stated he cannot keep water from between houses as they cannot touch the neighboring house. Would love to flash to protect both houses if neighbors allow.

### **BOARD COMMENTS:**

There were no Board comments.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

#### **Motion**

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

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

Motion: Thomas L. Thomson

Second: Karen Guinn

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

### [13. Petition of J. Elder Studio | 22-001843-COA | 302 East Oglethorpe Avenue | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

- 🔗 [Staff Recommendation - 22-001843-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Narrative and Specifications.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Part I Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [MPC Policy for Documenting Buildings Prior to Demolition or Relocation.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Renderings and Drawings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [brick jamb detail.pdf](#)

**Ms. Leah Michalak** presented the applicant's request of approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details for a 4-story building for the property located at 302 East Oglethorpe Avenue. The west side of the building has the exterior visual expression of 5-stories; however, it contains a mezzanine within the mansard roof and not a 5th floor. Because this building is 4-stories (or greater) in a D-R zoning district, it qualifies as Large-Scale Development.

Per the applicant:

#### PART II SUMMARY: UPDATES TO MASSING

- The oriel windows along the east façade were reconfigured to better relate to the architectural details of the main building. Its projection remains the same as the previous design.
- The 4th Floor windows on the eastern portion of the southern façade were revised to be paired aluminum clad double hung windows.
- The canopies were revised and extended to project 5'-0" and is 10'-8" clear above the sidewalk

#### MATERIALS

The exterior of the building's façade is almost 100% modular masonry brick, excluding windows, doors, and metal cladding on the oriel windows, with horizontal brick and cast stone detailing to emphasize base middle and top. The material colors and textures are in keeping with and complementary to the neighboring buildings as well as other buildings within the area and along Oglethorpe Ave. The Amelia's southern façade field brick is comprised of two distinct textures of the same color, to the western portion (with mansard roof) will be smooth white brick and to the eastern portion (no mansard roof) will be wired white brick. Details of the locations and more specifics on the material are identified in our elevations and material sheet and within the material specifications document.

The field brick will host a stepped back opening which will host the punched openings, in a contemporary nod to brick façade and opening details on many contributing brick buildings in the historic downtown district of Savannah, GA. The windows all feature a smooth cast stone lug sill, complementary in color to the field brick and the fourth floor windows of the portion of the building with the mansard roof will have full cast stone surrounds of the same floor and finish.

This project was first heard at the July 13, 2022 HDBR Meeting and was continued. In addition to demolition and new construction, the applicant also requested two (2) Special Exceptions and a Variance Request Recommendation. In order to allow for the recesses to be 9'-4" wide and 2'-8" deep and for the building to be 5 and 4-stories within 18 feet of the lane because the Special Exception criteria are met. Recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals for an increase of 5% to the maximum permitted building coverage of 75% in the D-R zoning district to allow for 80% building coverage because the variance criteria are met with the following condition:

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

With the revised proposal, neither Special Exception nor the Variance Request Recommendation needed to be sought.

At the August 10, 2022, HDBR meeting, the Board approved demolition of the non-contributing building and New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass with the following

conditions:

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

The conditions are addressed in the following review (where necessary).

The proposed materials, textures, and colors are visually compatible. The use of white brick is modern; however, it complements the use of “white” and light-colored stuccos and siding used on contributing buildings throughout the district, several of which exist on the same north side of the street within several blocks of the site. The building is constructed from brick. Metal and cast stone detail elements are included. The standards are met. The proposed materials, textures, and colors meet the standard. The use of white brick is modern; however, it complements the use of “white” and light-colored stuccos and siding used on contributing buildings in the block face within the block; the historic duplex building directly adjacent (and attached to this building) is a white building with black and grey elements.

Doors are proposed to be commercial-grade-stained wood. Windows are proposed to be double-hung and casement. The windows are proposed to be Marvin Signature Casement Narrow Frame G2 and Ultimate Double Hung GS windows which meet the standards. Staff requests additional information regarding the proposed detailing around the windows. The elevations show differing brick coursing and/or cast stone surrounds that appear atypical in relation to appropriate/traditional molding. The oriel windows are not supported by brackets. Add brackets below the oriel windows to meet the standard. Windows are aluminum clad.

All elements are metal. A metal standing seam roof is proposed. Staff recommends using a maximum 16” wide panel wide and maximum 1” high seam to be visually compatible. Copper gas lantern light fixtures are proposed and meet the standards. The wall facing the street that screens the parking is proposed to be white brick to match the building. The equipment is indicated on the roof plan to be on top of the mansard roof which does not have a parapet to screen the equipment. Provide screening for the rooftop HVAC equipment or provide information indicating that the equipment is not visible from a right-of-way without additional screening. The entire building is proposed to be constructed from brick. Accent elements are metal and cast stone.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Jerome Elder**, petitioner, thanked Staff for their assistance with the project.

**Mr. Ryan Jarles**, HSF, suggested the additional elements to the Oglethorpe facade to help it read as a residential building: portico over the entrance or make the Juliette-esque balconies on the upper levels more projected to match the rear of the building.

**Ms. Sabrina Nagel** stated she supports the project. Good example of how the City can move forward with something appropriate.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

The Board commended the petitioner for the changes and working with the neighborhood.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval for New Construction: Part II, Height and Mass for a 4-story building for the property located at 302 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to staff with the permit drawings for final review and approval because the proposed project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:**

- 1. The existing building must be documented per the *MPC Policy for Documenting Buildings Prior to Demolition or Relocation* and that the building be deconstructed, and all materials salvaged for resale or for use in the new construction (rather than traditional demolition and materials landfilled).**
- 2. Provide details of the brick and cast stone window surrounds.**
- 3. Add brackets below the oriel windows.**
- 4. The metal standing seam roof must have panels widths not to exceed 16” and a seam height not to exceed 1”.**
- 5. Provide screening for the rooftop HVAC equipment or provide information indicating that the equipment is not visible from a right-of-way without additional screening.**

**Motion**

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for New Construction: Part II, Height and Mass for a 4-story building for the property located at 302 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to staff with the permit drawings for final review and approval because the proposed project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1.The existing building must be documented per the MPC Policy for Documenting Buildings Prior to Demolition or Relocation and that the building be deconstructed, and all materials salvaged for resale or for use in the new construction (rather than traditional demolition and materials landfilled).
- 2.The metal standing seam roof must have panels widths not to exceed 16” and a seam height not to exceed 1”.
- 3.Provide screening for the rooftop HVAC equipment or provide information indicating that the equipment is not visible from a right-of-way without additional screening.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Melissa H. Rowan

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

14. Petition of Hansen Architects | 22-002279-COA | 220 East Bryan Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass

- ☉ [Staff Recommendation - 22-002279-COA.pdf](#)
- ☉ [1 - September 14, 2022 - Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- ☉ [2 - September 14, 2022 - Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- ☉ [Submittal Packet - ADA Parking Concept Plan.pdf](#)
- ☉ [Submittal Packet - Structural Information.pdf](#)
- ☉ [June 8, 2022 - Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- ☉ [August 10, 2022 - Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- ☉ [220 E Bryan St\\_22-002394-ZCL.pdf](#)
- ☉ [1954 and 1973 Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- ☉ [Petitioner's Presentation.pdf](#)

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

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

This building was first approved by the Board for demolition on May 11, 2016 [File No. 16-002194-COA], with the following conditions:

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

On March 8, 2017, the Board approved a 12-month extension. The COA subsequently expired on May 11, 2018. The Board again approved this building for demolition on March 14, 2018 [File No. 18-000793-COA] with the same conditions as the previous approval. On April 10, 2019, the Board approved a 12-month extension. The COA subsequently expired on April 10, 2020.

On November 21, 2018, staff approved a COA [File No. 18-006312-COA] for the installation of temporary fencing to secure the property until demolition could occur. It is not clear if this fencing was ever installed since the demolition never occurred.



In 2019, the same applicant and owner submitted applications for three projects for this and adjacent parcels to the east. 19-005943-COA was for Contributing Building Relocation for 226 East Bryan Street. 19-005944-COA was for Contributing Building Relocation for 9 Lincoln Street. 19-005945-COA was for New Construction Hotel: Part I, Height and Mass and Special Exception Request for 220 East Bryan Street; this new hotel's footprint proposed to cover all three of these parcels with a footprint that exceeded the maximum permitted in this portion of the district. However, upon receipt of the staff recommendations associated with the Preliminary Agenda, the applicant requested a continuance and the applications expired 90 days later.

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

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

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

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

This COA is still valid.

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

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

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

AND

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

The applicant changed the design prior to the submission which no longer required the two Special Exceptions as previously requested.

At the August 10, 2022, HDBR meeting, the Board continued the petition so that the petitioner and staff can continue to work to reduce the height and mass of the overall project.

The building is within a 6-story height zone per the Height Map; an additional story is

requested. The overall height of the building, to the top of the penthouse, is 90 feet to the top of the mechanical penthouse (and amenity roof which must be removed to meet the ordinance) is 90 (which is a reduction from the June meeting of 96 feet). The 6th and 7th stories are setback on the front and west façades, and, on the front portion of the east façade, the 5th floor is setback to create a 4-story mass facing the adjacent historic 3-story building. Additionally, the height of the building above the second floor (and the location of the cornice which accentuates the top of the second floor) has been reduced to align with the eaves of the adjacent historic 3-story building. Staff finds that the height and proportions now show appropriate deference to the historic buildings and finds the proposed height visually compatible once the amenity roof use is removed. The amenity roof was shown in the August submittal packet but was overlooked during the review; the June drawings did not show this feature.

The opening proportions are visually compatible. The rhythm of the solids to voids is visually compatible. The site plan and floor plan has been corrected to show the proposed side yard setback conditions. The west setback is shown as 1'-4" (and the southwest side of the building) with 6'-2" between the historic and the new building at its narrowest point. The east setback is shown as 1'-2" and the historic building is on the property line. Staff concerns remain regarding distance between the east historic building and the proposed building; staff recommends that the applicant provide a full building section showing the cantilevered structure and inset basement walls as described by the applicant in previous HDBR meetings and that the applicant provide engineering reports regarding as-is condition reports, proposed proactive measures to ensure the integrity of the surrounding buildings with regard to soil testing and foundation systems, foundation and building stabilizations measures for adjacent contributing buildings, vibration monitoring and pile driving during demolition and foundation construction.

The center main entrance is visually compatible. The roof shape has been revised. The 7th floor roof has an overhanging eave with brackets which is compatible with the religious building to the west; from the August submission, the side parapets have been removed and the overhand and brackets have been extended to the side facades. However, staff recommends that the front-gable (between the overhang roof form) be changed to flat to be visually compatible. The proposed building creates a wall of continuity.

This project is Large-Scale Development. It is not clear whether any of these habitable spaces, which are not permitted above the bonus story, are proposed within the space labeled "amenity roof"; however, the amenity roof is not permitted regardless and must be removed in its entirety. The exterior expression, to the top of the second story, is 28 feet. 10 feet are proposed for stories 3 through 5, 11'-4" for story 6, and 10 feet for story 7. The standard is met.

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 low-pitched roof with parapet walls on the side facades and deep bracketed eaves; the proposed building matches this building form. The standard is 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.

A hotel is considered a commercial building and the ground floor is designed as a storefront. The base is proposed to be 24" high; the materials and/or design will be reviewed with Part II: Design Details. The inset is proposed to be 4". The amenity roof must be removed. 11'-4" clear above the sidewalk is proposed.

Electrical meters are proposed on the rear façade; the drawings indicate (internal). Equipment on the roof is proposed to be screened.

The drop off lane has been removed from the project. This property is in a parking exempt zone. The applicant provided (not part of the submission) a potential solution, on the adjacent vacant site to the east, to a drop off and ADA parking area (see attachment) where cars could temporary locate here and the hotel accessed from this site by the side door. No on-site parking is proposed or required.

The building footprint is proposed to be 13,262sf. The 6th and 7th floors are set back, and the roof form changes above the 7th story creating roofline variation along Bryan Street. Additionally, the roof line drops to above the 5th floor at the southeast corner of the building.

This project qualifies as Large-scale development; it is in a 6-story height map area within a D-CBD zoning district. The 6th and 7th floors are set back, and the roof form changes above the 7th story creating roofline variation along Bryan Street. Additionally, the roof line drops to above the 5th floor at the southeast corner of the building. An amenity roof is shown above the bonus story (on the roof plan) which is strictly prohibited. The roof plan does not show how the roof will be accessed; provide a roof plan which indicates that only one point of access (excluding hatch access) will be above the bonus story.

From west to east, the active use spaces proposed are: "Blue Stone Lane Café", Lobby, and Retail; each maintains an individual primary exterior entrance. The lobby occupies less than 30% of linear frontage, less than 60 linear feet (48 feet) and less than 60 feet of the building width. Staff received a determination from the Zoning Administrator that the active use spaces do not have to be accessed ONLY from the exterior; their PRIMARY ENTRANCE must only be accessed from the exterior. Therefore, the standard is met. Special Exception for think brick is no longer requested.

From west to east, the sections measure 53'-8", 48'-0" and 52'-4". 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.

All upper levels exceed the standard. Regarding windows, 4-inch insets are proposed. The refuse storage area is inside the building off the lane.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Patrick Phelps**, petitioner, stated there is an updated submittal packet and highlighted their changes. **Mr. Kevin Grass**, owner, requested approval of petition after the changes to support Board requests.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Ryan Jarles**, HSF, stated they are concerned with overall scale of buildings that could pose a threat to landmark status. Commended petitioner.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Memory** stated this is another example of being larger and more prominent of the adjacent buildings. Large buildings are detrimental to health of the historic district.

**Mr. Thomson** stated it has come a long way.

**Mr. Higgins** stated they have not gone far enough to work on mass based on surrounding buildings.

**Mr. Stephens** stated it is big; he acknowledged the work from original submittal.

**Ms. Guinn** stated she has the same concerns, while acknowledging the modifications.

**Ms. Rowan** commended petitioner.

**Ms. Isaacs** stated she has encroachment concerns.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approve the petition of New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass to construct a 7-story hotel on the property located at 220 East Bryan Street with the following conditions to be submitted to the HDBR for review with Part II, Design Details (within a maximum of 90 days) because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:**

- 1. Remove the “amenity roof” in its entirety as it is not permitted above the bonus story and provide a roof plan which indicates that only one point of access (excluding hatch access) will be above the bonus story.**
- 2. Revise the front-gable (between the overhang roof form) be changed to flat.**
- 3. Provide engineering reports regarding as-is condition reports, proposed proactive measures to ensure the integrity of the surrounding buildings with regard to soil testing and foundation systems, foundation and building stabilizations measures for adjacent contributing buildings, vibration monitoring and pile driving during demolition and foundation construction.**

**Motion**

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass to construct a 7-story hotel on the property located at 220 East Bryan Street with the following conditions to be submitted to the HDBR for review with Part II, Design Details (within a maximum of 90 days) because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1.Remove the “amenity roof” in its entirety as it is not permitted above the bonus story and provide a roof plan which indicates that only one point of access (excluding hatch access) will be above the bonus story.
- 2.Revise the front-gable (between the overhang roof form) be changed to flat.
- 3.Provide engineering reports regarding as-is condition reports, proposed proactive measures to ensure the integrity of the surrounding buildings with regard to soil testing and foundation systems, foundation and building stabilizations measures for adjacent contributing buildings, vibration monitoring and pile driving during demolition and foundation construction.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Thomas L. Thomson

Second: Melissa H. Rowan

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

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

- 📎 [Staff Recommendation - 22-002854-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Narrative.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Research, Photos, Drawings, and Renderings.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Staff Research.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Public Comment.pdf](#)
- 📎 [First Submittal Packet - Not Heard by HDBR \(for reference only\).pdf](#)
- 📎 [Petitioner's Presentation.pdf](#)

**Ms. Leah Michalak** presented the applicant's request of approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 4-story parking structure for the vacant parcel (surface parking lot) at 11 Jefferson Street. The building will contain a car elevator system that extends 18 feet underground (2 levels of cars); the portion of the building above ground is expressed in 4-stories but allows for 6 levels of cars. The building's footprint covers the entire tithing block; however, it is split into two buildings, per building code. The western portion has a footprint of 8,280sf and the eastern portion has a footprint of 13,500sf. The building(s) qualifies as Large-Scale Development; however, a bonus story is not sought. Historically, the site consisted of primarily brick 1,2, 3 and 4(3B)-story buildings that faced all three streets as well as the lane. Historic photographs show a variety of building forms with parapeted roofs, mansard roofs, curved walls at corner parcels, etc. They were both commercial and single-family residential as well multi-family. All but one building were gone by 1973.

The project is an entire tything block. Coverage is 100%. No setbacks are proposed. The block length is an existing condition. The Height Map permits 4-stories in this location and 4-stories are proposed. The overall height of the building steps down to the historic one-and-two-story City Market buildings and is less than the height of the non-historic hotel building to the north. Staff finds the height minimizes to the greatest extent possible and visually compatible. It is not uncommon, throughout the district, for single building masses to extend the full width and depth of the tything block. The height is varied along this mass through recesses and setbacks and staff find the proportions visually compatible.

All openings are taller than they are wide which staff finds visually compatible. The variety of

opening sizes and patterns creates variation throughout the building's facades. The variety of opening sizes and patterns creates variation throughout the building's facades. The building(s) extends the full width and depth of the tything block with a deeply recessed corner entrance that is visually compatible. Parapeted and flat roof are present on surrounding contributing buildings and is, therefore, visually compatible. The building(s) itself creates walls of continuity along all three streets which is visually compatible.

Because of the footprint of the building(s), it qualifies as Large-Scale Development. No variances are requested. The building is 4-stories and none of the unpermitted uses exist above the 4th floor.

**West Building:**

- Ground Floor: 18'-2"
- Second Floor: 13'-4"
- Third Floor: 12'-4"
- Fourth Floor: 12'-0"

**East Building:**

- Ground Floor: 17'-1"
- Second Floor: 12'-4"
- Third Floor: 10'-4"
- Fourth Floor: 10'-0"

This building(s) faces three streets: a north-south service street (Jefferson Street to the east), a north-south connecting street (Montgomery Street to the west), and an east-west connecting street (West Bryan Street to the south). There are no other buildings, contributing or otherwise, in the block front. The immediate adjacent trust block has one-and-two story contributing masonry buildings with hipped or parapeted roof forms and entrances facing all 4 streets. The immediate tything block, to the east, has non-contributing buildings. The immediate tything block to the west has two-and-three story contributing masonry buildings with parapeted roof forms and entrances facing south and west. The height of the proposed building is setback along portions of all three streets to create lowered roof lines of 3-stories with building forms that have parapeted roofs.

The building(s) is slab on grade. The building(s) is on an entire tything block and has primary entrances facing all three streets, including 4 specifically facing the east-west street. The first story is design as storefront throughout, storefront glazing percentages meets or exceeds the standard, and the building(s) have an 18" high base. "Flat" and parapeted roofs are proposed which are appropriate and they have stringcourse and coping. Vehicular access is from the lane. The proposal is divided into two buildings, per the Building Code, with footprints that meet the standard. Building 1 uses the Setback Standard and Roofline Variation Standard massing devices. Building 2 uses the Recess Standard and Roofline Variation Standard massing devices.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Mr. James Galluci**, petitioner, explained the reasoning behind their proposed concepts.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Ryan Jarles**, HSF, commended the petitioner, supports the petitioner's request. HSF will work with them for Part 2.

**Mr. Travis Coles**, manager of area business, stated late night hours parking can be troublesome. Would like to see entrance moved to Montgomery Street; one directional lane

from Jefferson to Montgomery; avoids cars off of Bay. It creates an island if traffic is backed up. Already a pedestrian and vehicular problem.

**Mr. Marco George (virtual)** stated there are concerns with structural impact on the historical church.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Memory** supported geo-technical studies due to depth of excavation. Make sure surrounding buildings are protected.

**Mr. Thomson** stated they need to be able to accommodate current lane activity (dumpster).

**Ms. Isaacs** stated materiality in relation to the massing is a concern. Appreciated they are not asking for the additional story they qualify for.

**Ms. Guinn** commended the applicant. Encourages geo-technical and archeological and traffic studies. Concerns with aesthetic of the first floor from the public right of way.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 4-story parking structure for the vacant parcel (surface parking lot) at 11 Jefferson Street with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board for review with Part II, Design Details because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:**

- 1. Window sashes, storefront glazing, and door frames must be inset not less than four (4) inches from all façade surfaces.**

**Motion**

The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 4-story parking structure for the vacant parcel (surface parking lot) at 11 Jefferson Street with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board for review with Part II, Design Details because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1.Window sashes, storefront glazing, and door frames must be inset not less than four (4) inches from all façade surfaces.
- 2.Provide engineering reports regarding as-is condition reports, proposed proactive measures to ensure the integrity of the surrounding buildings with regard to soil testing and foundation systems, foundation and building stabilizations measures for adjacent contributing buildings, vibration monitoring and pile driving during foundation construction.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Karen Guinn

Second: Melissa H. Rowan

Dwayne Stephens	- Not Present
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Not Present
Nan Taylor	- Not Present
Ellie Isaacs	- Abstain

Karen Guinn	- Aye
Michael Higgins	- Aye
Melissa H. Rowan	- Aye
Thomas L. Thomson	- Aye

**X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS**

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

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review acknowledged and approved of Staff decisions as presented.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion:

Second:

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

17. Petition of PRECISION ROOFING, Justin Rodriguez | 22-004010-COA | 147 PRICE STREET | Roof replacement

📎 [SIGNED Staff Dec - 22-004010-COA 147 Price.pdf](#)

18. Petition of KEVIN SHOTSBERGER | 22-003852-COA | 345 EAST BROAD STREET | Window replacements

📎 [SIGNED Staff Decision- 22-003852 345 East Broad St..pdf](#)

19. Petition of SOLID STATE CONSTRUCTION, Ajani Azizi | 22-004037-COA | 349 WEST BRYAN STREET | In-kind window replacement and repair

📎 [SIGNED Staff Dec - 22-004037-COA 349 W Bryan St.pdf](#)

20. Petition of SAVANNAH COLLEGE OF ART & DESIGN, Glen Hensley | 22-003988-COA | 516 DRAYTON STREET | Non-illuminated sign

📎 [SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-003988-COA 516 Drayton St..pdf](#)

21. Petition of FEEHLEY NYBERG CONSTRUCTION, Missy Nyberg | 22-0038989-COA | 19B EAST BAY STREET | Color change (front facade)

📎 [SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-003898-COA 19 B E Bay St.pdf](#)

22. Petition of COASTAL CANVAS, Austin Webb | 22-003874-COA | 225 WEST BROUGHTON STREET | Awning installation



[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 22-003874-COA 225 W Broughton.pdf](#)

[23. Petition of KEYSTONE ROOFING, Chris Purvis | 22-003879-COA | 47 EAST BROAD STREET | Roof replacement](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 22-003879-COA 47 E Broad.pdf](#)

[24. Petition of COASTAL CANVAS, Austin Webb | 22-003875-COA | 201 WEST RIVER STREET | Awning installation](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 22-003875-COA 201 E River 202 E Bay.pdf](#)

[25. Petition of MARK FITZPATRICK | 22-003985-COA | 300 BULL STREET #605 | Retractable awning installation](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-003985-COA 300 Bull St 605.pdf](#)

[26. Petition of SOTTILE & SOTTILE, Craig Clements | 22-003873-COA | 110 WEST GASTON STREET | Color change](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision- 22-003873-COA 110 W Gaston.pdf](#)

[27. Petition of PAUL ROBINSON | 22-004009-COA | 127 ABERCORN STREET | Shutter installation and in-kind repairs](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-004009-COA 127 Abercorn St.pdf](#)

[28. Petition of KEYSTONE ROOFING, Chris Purvis | 22-003592-COA | 218 WEST JONES STREET | Roof replacement/repair](#)

[☞ CORRECTED SIGNED Staff Dec - 22-003592-COA 218 W Jones St \(003\).pdf](#)

[29. Petition of LS3P ASSOCIATES ARCHITECTS, Scott Cook | 22-003843-COA | 700 DRAYTON/701 ABERCORN STREETS | New construction amendments](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-003843-COA - 700 Drayton Street.pdf](#)

[30. Petition of 190 OCTANE RETAIL, Lawrence Brown | 22-003871-COA | 423 EAST RIVER STREET | New awning](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-003871-COA 423 E River St\\_.pdf](#)

[31. Petition of 190 OCTANE RETAIL, Lawrence Brown | 22-002894-COA | 22 WEST BRYAN STREET | New awning](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-002894-COA 22 W Bryan St.pdf](#)

[32. Petition of SIGNS OF THE SOUTH | 22-003868-COA | 101 WEST BROUGHTON STREET | Illuminated sign facade face change](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-003868-COA 101 W Broughton.pdf](#)

[33. Petition of WATERS BUILDING & DESIGN, Josh Waters | 22-003847-COA | 301 EAST CHARLTON STREET | Color change and non-historic window header removal](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 22-003847-COA 301 E Charlton st.pdf](#)

[34. Petition of THE HOUSE DOCTOR, Charles Angell | 22-003613-COA | 556 EAST GORDON STREET | Roof repair, downspout replacement, and in-kind exterior painting](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 22-003613-COA 556 E Gordon St.pdf](#)

[35. Petition of UNION MISSION, Michael Traynor | 22-003728-COA | 125 FAHM STREET | Non-illuminated wall sign](#)

[☺ SIGNED Staff Decision - 22-003728-COA 125 Fahm St.pdf](#)

[36. Petition of GRAY'S REEF NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY, Stan Rogers | 22-003490-COA | 340 MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. BLVD | Non-illuminated sign](#)

[☺ SIGNED Staff Dec - 22-003490-COA 340 MLK.pdf](#)

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

[37. Report on Work Inconsistent With Issued Certificate of Appropriateness for the September 14, 2022 HDBR Meeting](#)

[☺ September 2022 - Inconsistent with Issued COA.pdf](#)

[38. Report on Work Performed Without a Certificate of Appropriateness for the September 14, 2022 HDBR Meeting](#)

[☺ September 2022 - Work Performed without a COA.pdf](#)

[39. Report on Work That Exceeds Scope of Issued COA for the September 14, 2022 HDBR Meeting](#)

[☺ September 2022 - Exceeds Scope of Issued COA Report.pdf](#)

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

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

[☺ September 2022 REPORT - Stamped Drawings.pdf](#)

[41. Items Deferred to Staff - September Report](#)

[☺ Items Deferred to Staff - September Report.pdf](#)

[42. Inspections Completed by Staff - September 2022 Report](#)

[☺ September 2022 - REPORT Inspections.pdf](#)

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

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

#### **XV. ADJOURNMENT**

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

[44. Next HDBR Regular Meeting - Wednesday October 12, 2022 at 1pm - 112 East State Street, Mendonsa Hearing Room](#)

[45. Adjourn](#)

There being no further business to present before the Board, the Savannah Historic District Board of Review motioned to adjourn the September 14, 2022 HDBR meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Leah G. Michalak  
Director of Historic Preservation

/bm

***The Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission provides meeting minutes which are adopted by the respective Board. Verbatim transcripts of minutes are the responsibility of the interested party.***