



Historic Preservation Commission

Virtual Meeting
August 26, 2020 - 3:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

AUGUST 26, 2020 HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Members Present: J. Haley Swindle, Pro-Tem Chairperson
Kendra Clark
Rebecca Fenwick
Chelsea Jackson-Greene
Darren Bagley-Heath
Vernon Jones
T. Jerry Lominack
Dr. Robin Williams

Member Absent: Virginia Mobley

Staff Present: Pamela Everett, Esq., Assistant Executive Director
Leah Michalak, Historic Preservation Director
Ryan Jarles, Cultural Resources Planner
Aislinn Droski, Assistant Planner
Olivia Arfuso, Assistant Planner
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant
Sally Helms, Administrative Assistant
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

[1. Call to Order and Welcome](#)

Ms. Swindle called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. She outlined the role of the Historic Preservation Commission. Ms. Swindle explained that staff will present each application with a recommendation and then the petitioner will then present his/her comments. The public will make comments. The petitioner will be given the opportunity to respond to the public comments. Then the HPC will make its decision.

[2. Nominating Committee: Announce Nominations for Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson](#)

Ms. Swindle reported that the Nominating Committee is recommending Ms. Virginia Mobley serve as Chairperson and Ms. Chelsea Jackson-Greene serve as Vice-Chairperson.

[3. Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson Vote](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve Virginia Mobley as Chairperson and

Chelsea Jackson-Green as Vice-Chairperson

Ms. Virginia Mobley was not present. Therefore, Ms. Chelsea Greene-Jackson, newly elected Vice-Chairperson chaired the meeting.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Darren Bagley-Heath

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Abstain

[4. Introduce New Staff Members](#)

Ms. Leah Michalak introduced the new Historic Preservation staff members. They are Aislinn Droski and Olivia Arfuso.

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

[5. Approve All Items on the Consent Agenda](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve All Items on the Consent Agenda

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: J. Haley Swindle

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[6. Petition of J. Eady Construction, LLC | 20-003658-COA | 504A and B East 34th Street | New Construction, Small \(Part I and II\) Two Single-Family Buildings](#)

- [☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation 20-003658-COA.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Photos and Specifications.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - 504A Drawings.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - 504B Drawings.pdf](#)
- [☞ Staff Research.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the petition for New Construction (Small): Parts I and II for two (2) identical, two-story single-family residences at 504A and 504B East 34th 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.Revised the site plan to show both new buildings.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: J. Haley Swindle

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[7. Petition of Architecture 101 Design | 20-003691-COA | 2425 Bull Street | Rehabilitation](#)

- [☞ Staff Recommendation 2425 Bull Street.pdf](#)
- [☞ 2425 Bull Street Project Description.pdf](#)
- [☞ 2425 Bull Street Drawing Set.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the proposed work at 2425 Bull Street with the following conditions to be provided to staff for review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1.Revised window selection for new windows in historic or new openings to be wood, single-paned, double-hung, TDL.
- 2.Storefront specification

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

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: J. Haley Swindle

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

[8. Adopt the August 26, 2020 Agenda](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby adopt the August 26, 2020 Agenda

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jerry Lominack

Second: Robin Williams

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

[9. Approve July 22, 2020 Meeting Minutes](#)

[📎 07-22-2020 Minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve July 22, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: J. Haley Swindle

Second: Vernon Jones

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

[10. Petition of City of Savannah Code Compliance | 20-002642-COA | 726 West Victory Drive | Contributing Building Demolition](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve to continue the petition as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kendra Clark

Second: Darren Bagley-Heath

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[11. Petition of Jal's Pena Construction | 20-002889-COA | 300 West Henry Street/1207 Jefferson Street | Rehabilitation and Alterations](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve to continue the petition as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kendra Clark
Second: Darren Bagley-Heath
Rebecca Fenwick - Aye
Jerry Lominack - Aye
Kendra Clark - Aye
Vernon Jones - Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene - Abstain
Robin Williams - Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath - Aye
J. Haley Swindle - Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

IX. REGULAR AGENDA

VICTORIAN DISTRICT

[12. Petition of Barnard Architects | 20-003677-COA | 211 East Gwinnett Street | Additions](#)

- [📎 Victorian Staff Recommendation 20-003677-COA.pdf](#)
- [📎 Submittal Packet - Narrative and Specifications.pdf](#)
- [📎 Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- [📎 Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- [📎 8-6-2020 Letter of Support.pdf](#)

Mr. John Clegg was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for an addition and window restoration for the property located at 211 East Gwinnett Street. The rear 3-story addition includes a partially submerged ground floor, a sunroom on the second floor, and Juliette balcony and trellis on the third floor (along with a small enclosed space). A non-historic uncovered wood deck will be removed from the rear to construct the addition. The existing windows on the west, north, and south facades (including the stained-glass windows) are proposed to be repaired in-kind “using the same materials, details, and appearance”.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends to continue the request for an addition and window restoration for the property located at 211 East Gwinnett Street in order for the petitioner to consider the following:

1. Remove the polycarbonate roof that is over a portion of the trellis.
2. Revise the aluminum windows and doors to be materials that are permitted by the ordinance. If the revised product is not one that has previously been approved by the Board, provide a full-sized sample. Ensure that the muntins and rails meet the design standards.
3. Remove all “transom windows” that are not located over a door or a window OR redesign them to be windows that are taller than they are wide.
4. Add headers, surrounds, and pronounced sills to all windows.
5. Remove the Juliette balcony or redesign it to be a traditional balcony.
6. Ensure that the railing height is noted as a maximum of 36 inches high and revise the baluster spacing to 4 inches on center.
7. Extend the eaves to a minimum of 12 inches deep and redesign the soffit to be perpendicular to

the building wall.

8. If more HVAC units are to be added due to the addition, ensure they are screened from view of Gwinnett Street.

Ms. Michalak entertained questions from the Commission.

Ms. Clark asked if the windows on the front would be replaced so that they would be similar to the windows on the back.

Ms. Michalak answered no. The front is stained glass. It is her understanding the applicant found someone who will be able to repair the windows in-kind.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Clegg thanked the Commission for hearing their petition. He said he would respond to the eight items that the staff has recommended.

1. Removing the polycarbonate roof that is over a portion of the trellis.

This is a new material. They used it on the Wesley Monumental Church canopies. The area they are wanting to cover with the polycarbonate roofing is not very visible; it is only 18 inches. But, they do not want this to be a stumbling block. Therefore, their goal is to obtain approval even if it is a conditional approval.

2. Revise the aluminum windows and doors to be materials that are permitted by the ordinance. If the revised product is not one that has previously been approved by the Board, provide a full-sized sample. Ensure that the muntins and rails meet the design standards.

Mr. Clegg pointed out that the Zoning Ordinance, Section 7.9.10 mentions metal products. Therefore, they believed that aluminum would be acceptable; especially since it is on the rear of the house, new construction. However, they are willing to concede and specify one of the pre-approved window products that has been approved in the past.

3. Remove all "transom windows" that are not located over a door or a window OR redesign them to be windows that are taller than they are wide.

The aesthetic was to create a continuous band around the addition to allow the natural lighting into that area. However, they are willing to concede and keep the transoms only where they exist or proposed to be over the doors and the larger windows.

4. Add headers, surrounds, and pronounced sills to all windows.

They agree with the staff's recommendations.

5. Remove the Juliette balcony or redesign it to be a traditional balcony.

This will be new construction on the rear and is minimally visible. They found other examples of this type in the area. The one on their street is a very traditional house. However, they are willing to concede that, but they do want the double doors to remain as designed and the doors that swing in instead of a balcony. A simple guardrail will be between the door jams for safety reasons.

6. Ensure that the railing height is noted as a maximum of 36 inches high and revise the baluster spacing to 4 inches on center.

They agree with staff's recommendation.

7. Extend the eaves to a minimum of 12 inches deep and redesign the soffit to be perpendicular to the building wall.

They will comply with the staff's recommendation. They will meet with staff to ensure exactly

what they need to do.

8. If more HVAC units are to be added due to the addition, ensure they are screened from view of Gwinnett Street.

They understand that if they will have more units due to the addition, that they be screened from view of Gwinnett Street.

Mr. Clegg stated that he believed Mr. & Mrs. Peter Belau [the homeowners] were online to make comments to the Commission should they need them to do so.

Mr. Peter Belau stated that they did not have any additional comments to make regarding their petition.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] stated that their Architectural Review Committee reviewed this petition. They agree with staff regarding this project; specifically as it pertains to the so called "transoms windows." Because these windows are clearly visible from the public right-of-way and because they are somewhat an incongruent feature, they, too, found them incompatible. They feel the same way about the Juliette balcony. They understood the property owners' desire for wanting to open up an area and allow air to come in to the upper floors, but they believe losing the balcony and just leaving the doors would be just as incongruent. Mr. Arvay said they are in agreement with staff regarding the trellis. He pointed out that the little overhang over the back door that the two eaves appear to be slightly odd features. The HSF was wondering if these features could be uniform.

Mr. Arvay said they are encouraged by the architect and owners willingness to concede to some of these issues. If the project is approved with those caveats, that the motion will be carefully crafted to ensure that all the things are covered.

Mr. Clegg, in response to public comments, stated that he appreciated Mr. Arvay's comments. He said regarding Mr. Arvay's comment about the eaves, they can make them consistently 12 inches all the way across.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission discussed the design of the front and back, especially pertaining to the windows. Several Commission members agreed with the HSF regarding the roof over the doors could be continued all the way across to add protection for the doors. They felt that the opportunity to design a balcony would have been a strong design decision. Although the Juliette balcony was not compatible, but a traditional balcony would be compatible. The Commission was in agreement with the staff recommendations. The motion (amended) stated that in addition to the recommendations from staff, that the petitioner also "weigh all comments that were made today [by the Commission] in addition to those made by staff." (Comments from the Commission have been added to the items listed in the decision).

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the request for an addition and window restoration for the property located at 211 East Gwinnett Street in order for the petitioner to consider the following:

- 1.Remove the polycarbonate roof that is over a portion of the trellis.
- 2.Revise the aluminum windows and doors to be materials that are permitted by the ordinance. If the revised product is not one that has previously been approved by the Board, provide a full-sized sample. Ensure that the muntins and rails meet the design standards.
- 3.Remove all "transom windows" that are not located over a door or a window, redesign them to be windows that are taller than they are wide OR redesign the them to be a contemporary interpretation of the Italianate corbels and banding found under the eave on the historic main building.

4. Add headers, surrounds, and pronounced sills to all windows.
5. Remove the Juliette balcony and doors (and replace with windows), or redesign to be a traditional balcony with French doors.
6. Ensure that the railing height is noted as a maximum of 36 inches high and revise the baluster spacing to 4 inches on center.
7. Extend the eaves to a minimum of 12 inches deep (consistent eave depth over the full width of the 2nd floor) and redesign the soffit to be perpendicular to the building wall.
8. If more HVAC units are to be added due to the addition; ensure they are screened from view of Gwinnett Street.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jerry Lominack

Second: Robin Williams

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[13. Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 20-003693-COA | 1313 Habersham Street | Rehabilitation/Alteration](#)

- [📎 Victorian Staff Recommendation 20-003693-COA.pdf](#)
- [📎 Submittal Packet - Narrative and Specifications.pdf](#)
- [📎 Submittal Packet - Photos and Drawings.pdf](#)
- [📎 Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- [📎 Petitioner Presentation.pdf](#)

Mr. Justin Bienvenu of Lynch Associates Architects was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for rehabilitation and alterations to the property located at 1313 Habersham Street. Per the applicant:

“The work proposed in this application includes the renovation of all exterior facades of the building. The proposed scheme will break down the building façade along Habersham into two smaller tenant entries that will be more contextual with the surrounding buildings and add a contemporary aesthetic to the façade. The parapets at the north and south tenant spaces will be raised 4'- 0” to better articulate the two separate entries and help vary the roofline of the existing building. The wall section between the north and south entries will be removed and a glass storefront will be installed to further visually reinforce the separation of the two tenant spaces. The building materials will be changed at the Habersham (south) corner to horizontal wood shiplap siding and the remainder of the building will be re-stuccoed with a smooth sand finish. Additional wood accents will also be used at the window openings to break down the façade mass.

The work will also include the partial demolition of the existing pitched roof canopy while maintaining a portion of the existing canopy on the Habersham and Anderson facades. Finally, the renovation work will

also include the replacement and modification of all existing windows on the south portion of the building with direct set Marvin aluminum clad windows and the addition of new openings (decorative open metal fence to look like steel windows) on the north sides of the façade fronting Habersham Street and the lane. Signage for the building will be submitted in a separate submission by the owner.”

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for rehabilitation and alterations to the property located at 1313 Habersham Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Remove the “walk-up” window in its entirety.
2. Remove the curved portion of the parapet in its entirety.
3. Redesign the custom 1” welded powder coated frame material within the northern window and doors openings to more closely resemble steel windows or another traditional window type found on similar buildings in the district.
4. Make a final selection between the “Marvin Ultimate Clad, fixed direct set” or “YKK TU-45, storefront non-impact windows” for the storefront (both are proposed).
5. Paint the shiplap siding.
6. Ensure that the windows are inset a minimum of three (3) inches from the façade of a building and that the storefront glazing is inset a minimum of four inches from the face of the building.
7. Redesign the storefronts to have a base that is 18-24 inches tall and of a contrasting material or design.
8. Screen the roof mounted equipment from view of the streets.
9. Ensure that the refuse storage area is located within the building or to the side or rear of the building and screened from the public right-of-way.
10. If new light fixtures are proposed, ensure that they meet the lighting standards.
11. Install a 36 inch high wall and shrubs across the parking lot portion (not across the driveway) at the Anderson Street property line – aligned with the front façade of the building.

Ms. Michalak entertained questions from the Commission.

Mr. Lominack asked what was the reason for removing the walk-up window?

Ms. Michalak answered that in the Development Standards for TN-2 zoning, drive-through service windows are not permitted.

Mr. Lominack stated that due to COVID-19, he believes this should be approved.

Ms. Michalak stated that the ordinance does not make this distinction.

Mr. Bagley-Heath asked if the parking was adjusted to the side where the walk-up window was, therefore, eliminating the possibility of a drive-through, would it be permitted at this point?

Ms. Michalak said the standard is very specific. It says that they are not permitted. This is not something that the Commission is allowed to say is okay.

Mr. Bagley-Heath explained that it would not be a drive-up if parking spaces were in front of it. No one would be able to drive up to it.

Ms. Michalak asked Mr. Bagley-Heath if he was saying put the parking spaces against the wall.

Mr. Bagley-Heath replied yes, on the far side.

Ms. Michalak said this could possibly be done if the petitioner is amenable to this.

Mr. Bagley-Heath stated that this is a heavily pedestrian area. The walk-up window would be good for the neighborhood.

Ms. Michalak said if it could be possible if the parking lot is layout in a different direction than what is shown now. However, she does not know what the parking requirements are as they are done by another department. But, she believes that Mr. Bagley-Heath's suggestion is good.

Ms. Greene-Jackson stated if the walk-up window is removed, would this be just a stucco wall? Are there any suggestions for some type of window to be here as she could not imagine that a 49 foot slab of stucco wall would be more compatible with the neighborhood rather than a window.

Ms. Michalak explained that the design standards for windows state that the window has to be a certain type. If this was going to be a drive-through window it is not meeting one of the window types that is permitted.

Mr. Lominack asked if the drawings before the Commission is for Part I and Part II. Or is this just a single submittal?

Ms. Michalak answered that there is not a Part I and Part II for renovations.

Mr. Lominack stated that he did not believe that the drawings are adequate enough for the Commission to make a good decision as to whether or not they meet the criteria.

Ms. Michalak explained that the drawings met everything on the checklist. If the Commission feels that something else is needed, they have the purview to continue the petition.

Mr. Lominack said an existing metal roof is here and it appears that the petitioner wants to keep it. He is not sure where the metal roof is located.

Ms. Michalak pointed out this section again. She explained that the blue color is to be removed. But underneath is the ceiling which the petitioner is proposing to keep.

Mr. Lominack stated that something is projecting outward.

Ms. Michalak explained that this is the new awning that is being proposed over the second tenant space. What is seen in the background is the brand new awning.

Dr. Williams said two tie-rods are shown on the left [south facade] and two tie-rods are mounted in the IPE. He stated that it appears that where Ms. Michalak had the curser placed all the way to the wall that the metal awning would be preserved here as well. Is this correct?

Ms. Michalak answered yes, but the Commission could ask the petitioner this question when he makes his presentation. However, she believes it was placed there to accentuate the corner.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Bienvenu thanked Ms. Michalak for the presentation. He explained that they agree with the following recommendations.:

#2. Remove the curved portion of the parapet in its entirety along Habersham Street; They agree to change the parapet profile;

#4 Make a final selection between the "Marvin Ultimate Clad, fixed direct set" or "YKK TU-45, storefront non-impact windows" for the storefront (both are proposed). Mr. Bienvenu said they have selected the YKK storefront;

#6. Ensure that the windows are inset a minimum of three (3) inches from the façade of a building and that the storefront glazing is inset a minimum of four inches from the face of the building. They agree with the standard that the staff has recommended;

#9. Ensure that the refuse storage area is located within the building or to the side or rear of the building and screened from the public right-of-way. He said they presently have a room in the back at the dish washing station and can put the refuse storage here. Also, the owner is planning to put in the rear of the parking lot a dumpster enclosure.

#10. They will ensure that the light fixtures meet the standards.

Mr. Bienvenu stated they disagree with the following recommendations:

#3. Redesign the custom 1" welded powder coated frame material within the northern window and doors openings to more closely resemble steel windows or another traditional window type found on similar buildings in the district. He said probably graphically it may not be showing how they want it, but they were thinking that they would have a window similar to the one on Bull Street at 'The Vault.' They want more light and transparency, therefore, they wanted this type of window.

#5 Paint the shiplap siding. He said their original intent was that the facade be broken up visually through scale, material, and transparencies. He wants to reflect on the two buildings that occupy the site. Mr. Bienvenu explained that they are trying to create more visual variety. They wanted the IPE because of its materiality. But, staff has recommended that this be changed. Therefore, they are asking that they keep an IPE with paneling at the sills of the windows.

#7. Redesign the storefronts to have a base that is 18-24 inches tall and of a contrasting material or design. He said they agree with staff's recommendation. But, their intent was to break up the two portions of the facade. They want to keep the storefront between the signage and the curve at the facade. This helps the facade as it serves as a visual break in the two facades.

#8. Screen the roof mounted equipment from view of the streets. He said this is existing equipment. From the street level, they believe that the equipment is far enough away from the facade so that they will not need to enclose it; but, if they find out that this is not the case, they will add mechanical screening.

#11 Install a 36 inch high wall and shrubs across the parking lot portion (not across the driveway) at the Anderson Street property line – aligned with the front façade of the building. Mr. Bienvenu clarified that the drawings indicated the parking lot striping incorrectly and that there is no intention to modify the parking lot at all. If the wall recommendation was based on the idea that they were doing improvements to the parking, they disagree with staff. They do not need the wall.

#1 Remove the "walk-up" window in its entirety. Mr. Bienvenu stated that as he has aforesaid, the parking and flow of traffic will not change. Therefore, this refutes the notion that this will become a "drive-through" window. It was never their intention for this to be a drive-through window; it will be a "walk-up" window. The owners are adamant about keeping the walk-up window in light of this year's situation with COVID-19. The window is not facing the street and is on a noncontributing building. Therefore, they believed that the window could be there. He explained that if the window type is in dispute, they are willing to change it from a sliding window to a double hung window.

Mr. Bienvenu entertained questions from the Commission.

Dr. Williams said the petitioner mentioned that their desire is to break up the facade and also recognize that the evolution of the site as separate buildings. He believes this is a worthy underlining motive. However, he is curious why the elements on the east facade with IPE rises slightly higher and then there is another material for a parapet above the canopy. What is the need to breakup the building as two components as if this is two separate buildings?

Mr. Bienvenu answered that this was done to emphasize the corner.

Dr. Williams asked if tie-rods will be used to holdup the canopy section on the north?

Mr. Bienvenu answered that presently, they do not know if tie-rods will be added here. If needed, they can explore this. But, presently they are just showing them on the corner.

Ms. Clark said the drive-up is on the side where the cars will be coming in. Is there a possibility to move it to the side of the building where there is a sidewalk?

Mr. Bienvenu explained that the walk-up window is located where it is because they wanted to place it on a non-street facing facade. Also, this is where the kitchen is located. Therefore, it works better in this location.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said that their Architectural Review

Committee looked at this project. They appreciate what the petitioner is trying to do with this building. He said that the HSF comments have no bearing on the building, itself, as a noncontributing building, but more on the design and what is being proposed.

Mr. Arvay said he was glad to hear that the petitioner is willing to make certain concessions and follow staff's recommendations. The overall design is very suburban. They appreciate the attempt to breakup the long facade and certainly the curved parapet on the northernmost portion what lends itself to the suburban feel and not to be disparaging, but almost a shopping center type feel. The HSF feels that by correcting this and removing the curve portion will help. Mr. Arvay said they are also concerned with the materiality. The stucco with the siding for the corner property may still lend to that suburban feel. He does not know if the petitioner would possibly consider a more traditional material to cover the building. Mr. Arvay said they appreciate the fact of trying to make one building appear as many, but in doing so, it is missing some of the key characteristics that would exist in multiple facades. Namely, property entrances. The HSF likes that the corner entrances are being kept, but as far as the rest of the Habersham facade it really is only one other door on a very long building.

Mr. Arvay said it appears that the petitioner is willing to make certain concessions to the walk-up window. This neighborhood is pedestrian friendly and perhaps its present location is better than putting it on the actual sidewalk. He said, therefore, because of the location of this project and its historic context, some tweaks might need to be made to possibly make it appear less suburban.

Mr. Bienvenu, in response to public comments, stated that they will work with staff to balance out their design and what the neighborhood wants while also maintaining the modern aesthetic that they are looking to achieve. He thanked the HSF for their comments regarding the walk-up window. They, too, believe the location gives a nod to the neighborhood

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission discussed that a walk-up window, but not a drive-thru window, is appropriate in this era of COVID-19 and will encourage more pedestrian activity. However, the walk-up sliding window type needs to be revised to be an operable window type that is permitted by the ordinance. They felt that the IPE should remain unpainted and that more detailed information is needed regarding the "tie-rods" or supports for the canopies. Additionally, several Board members expressed concerns regarding the faux facades to try to make the building look like multiple buildings and stated that this design aesthetic needs to be redesigned to address a more continuous façade design. Because no parking lot work is occurring, the Board did not feel it was necessary to require the parking lot wall.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the petition for rehabilitation and alterations to the property located at 1313 Habersham Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Remove the curved portion of the parapet in its entirety.
2. Redesign the custom 1" welded powder coated frame material within the northern window and doors openings to more closely resemble steel windows or another traditional window type found on similar buildings in the district.
3. Make a final selection between the "Marvin Ultimate Clad, fixed direct set" or "YKK TU-45, storefront non-impact windows" for the storefront (both are proposed).
4. Ensure that the windows are inset a minimum of three (3) inches from the façade of a building and that the storefront glazing is inset a minimum of four inches from the face of the building.
5. Redesign the storefronts to have a base that is 18-24 inches tall and of a contrasting material or design.
6. Screen the roof mounted equipment from view of the streets.
7. Ensure that the refuse storage area is located within the building or to the side or rear of the building and

screened from the public right-of-way.

8.If new light fixtures are proposed, ensure that they meet the lighting standards.

9.Redesign the canopy supports.

10.Redesign the multiple faux facades to create façade continuity.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jerry Lominack

Second: Robin Williams

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[14. Petition of Array Design | 20-003674-COA | 524-526 East Anderson Street | Addition, New Construction Small, Parts I and II, and Special Exception Request](#)

[☞ Staff Recommendation 524 East Anderson Street.pdf](#)

[☞ drawings, 524 E Anderson st, 20-003674-COA.pdf](#)

[☞ Coa application and checklists-524 e anderson-080520.pdf](#)

[☞ Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

Ms. Shauna Kucera was present on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Ryan Jarles gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction Small, Parts I & II, and an addition to the rear of 524 and 526 East Anderson Street. The applicant is also requesting a Special Exception from the Article 5 Base Zoning standard that reads:

TN-1.

Building Setbacks (ft).

For blocks with contributing structures.

Side Yard (interior): 3 (min)

To allow for a 2'-0" west side yard setback.

Mr. Jarles explained that the addition to the rear of 524 and 526 is to be constructed onto the existing non-historic rear addition, and the non-historic rear addition is proposed to be delineated from the historic building by including a vertical trim where the historic building meets the non-historic addition. The addition will project from the existing non-historic addition an additional 14'-0" and will be full width across the rear of the building. The east side of the addition is proposed to have a 3'-11 1/2" setback while the west side is proposed to have a 2'-0" setback. Due to the existing structure having a 2'-0" west side yard setback, the applicant is requesting approval for a Special Exception to the development standard requiring a 3'-0" side yard setback within the TN-1 zoning district, to allow for a 2'-0" side yard setback on the proposed addition.

Mr. Jarles reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction Small, Parts I & II, and an addition to the rear of 524 and 526 East Anderson Street with the following conditions to be provided to staff for review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Omit the clerestory window on the New Construction accessory dwelling.
2. Provide material specifications for all door and windows, the brick and mortar, and the roofing for the addition.
3. Ensure that the space between the foundation piers of the addition is filled with heavy gauge wood lattice with at least one-half (0.5) inch thick lattice boards, horizontal boards, brick or stucco over concrete block and that the infill material is recessed a minimum of three inches behind the front edge of the pier.
4. Revise the soffits to be perpendicular to the building wall.
5. Revise the fence location to only be forward of the rear façade and ensure that the fence be painted or stained.

AND

Approval for a Special Exception from the Article 5 Base Zoning standard that reads:

TN-1.

Building Setbacks (ft).

For blocks with contributing structures.

Side yard (interior): 3 (min)

To allow for a 2'-0" west side yard setback because the Special Exception criteria are met.

Mr. Jarles entertained questions from the Commission.

Mr. Lominack asked Mr. Jarles if he stated that the roofing material would be asphalt shingles?

Mr. Jarles answered no, the roofing shown on the drawings will be a metal roofing, but the petitioner did not provide the roofing specification, Therefore, staff is asking that the material specification be provided.

Mr. Lominack asked Mr. Jarles to restate the fence requirements.

Mr. Jarles explained that the standard for fences require that the fence not be within five feet if running parallel to a building wall. He showed the Commission where the edge of the building is located. The fence is running parallel two feet from the wall on the west side and on the east side three feet and eleven inches. Therefore, the staff is requiring that the fence not run parallel to the addition.

Ms. Michalak explained that this is a new standard that fences not run between house that are that close together for safety reasons. From the accessibility standpoint, fire safety standpoint, there has been a lot of dispute between neighbors every time this happens.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Kucera thanked Mr. Jarles for the thorough explanation. She explained that the Special Exception is to have the new addition on the back of the structure be the same width as the existing structure. They are asking for everything to be aligned. They are willing to comply with all of the conditions in the staff recommendation with the exception of the fences.

Ms. Kucera stated that if the Commission looks at the elevation of the principal structure with the addition on the rear, they will see that they have each entry door facing the rear courtyard. The proposed elevation shows the corner is a small entry porch that is five feet long and approximately three feet wide. They are proposing that the new fence that encapsulates the back courtyard comes to the edge of the fence where the entry porch ends. If they move this to where the staff is saying, she believes this would be strange as you would be walking up the stairs through the fence and then you

would be beyond the landing without a fenced in yard. Therefore, Ms. Kucera asked the Commission to reconsider this and allow them to take the fences five feet six inches back to the corner of the physical building.

Mr. Jarles responded that with what Ms. Kucera has suggested, it would meet the intent of the standard having it where it is located as proposed. He said, therefore, staff is recommending that #5 be changed to read "Ensure that the fence be painted or stained."

Ms. Kucera entertained questions from the Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] commended the petitioner on trying to design the new addition to be sympathetic to the original design with the two back doors. This was a noble effort. Mr. Arvay asked Mr. Jarles to show on the screen the side-by-side floor plan verses the proposed plan. He was not sure whether this falls under this Commission's purview, but he asked Mr. Jarles to trace on the plan the "as-built" on the left side and trace the original portion as he pointed out in his presentation. Mr. Arvay then asked Mr. Jarles to trace the same area on the proposed request. He asked that since this building is already enclosed and obviously they are making some dramatic alterations [even though alterations have already been made to this house], if the additional alterations are approved, the building will never be returned to its historic appearance. Obviously, alterations are begin made to the floor plan and the most egregious would be the removal of the mantle. However, he his aware that this is not part of the Historic Preservation Commission purview.

Mr. Arvay said pertaining to the lane dwellings, the form they thought is unusual as it relates to the original house. The L-shaped form is the dramatically different in the roof height and the fact that traditionally lane dwellings relate to the lane and the front facade. This primary entrance is on the side of the building. They saw this as being visually incompatible given the history precedent. The width of the house seems slightly off. They agree with staff regarding the clerestory window. The entrance on the side, versus on the lane, and the overall shape of the building seem to be incompatible. If special exceptions are being made and he does not know if a variance is required for the lot coverage, but something that did not have the L-shape would look much better. This will be a very narrow building with an appendage on the rear. This is a concern as to the visual compatibility from the lane.

Mr. Arvay said he would love to have this conservation offline with the petitioner, but if the intention is to replace the metal standing seam roof, the HSF might be able to connect the petitioner with someone who might be able to help them save this.

Mr. Jarles informed Mr. Arvay that the interior at this time is not visible from the public right-of-way. The Historic Preservation Commission purview is over what is visible from the public right-of-way and this is not.

Mr. Jarles informed the Commission that another person wanted to speak. However, this individual did not come forward.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission discussed if this was a double house with two different addresses. Staff explained that this is one parcel, but has two separate addresses. They discussed that the rear building does not respect the foundation situation that exists in historical structures. This is a slab on grade structure. The Commission was in agreement with the HSF concerning the roof line variation. They were in agreement to approve the addition to the main building as recommended by staff and the special exception, but continue the accessory dwelling unit to the regular meeting of October 28, 2020.

NOTE: **Ms. Kucera** gave the following background data on how the carriage house came to be in the shape it is in. Originally, they proposed two garages with a standard carriage house above. One of the parameters that prevented them from doing this was the height of the existing building. The

existing building is surrounded by larger buildings, especially on the north side of the lane, especially on Henry Street and then a large two-story building is on the side of it. Their building is only 18 feet tall. The accessory structure is not allowed to be taller than the principal structure. This is why they are looking at a slab on grade condition with limiting the footprint of it per NewZO to be 40% of the principal footprint. This also gives them limited amount of space with only 480 square feet of footprint. Ms. Kucera said there are a lot of regulations at play with NewZO. She said she hears what the Commission is saying and there will be a gutter at the front door roof, providing the parking space and making it work with the limited lot with its height was a challenge.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve for an addition to the rear of 524 and 526 East Anderson Street with the following conditions to be provided to staff for review and approval prior to submitting drawings to be stamped for permitting because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Provide material specifications for all doors and windows, the brick and mortar, and the roofing for the addition.
2. Ensure that the space between the foundation piers of the addition is filled with heavy gauge wood lattice with at least one-half (0.5) inch thick lattice boards, horizontal boards, brick or stucco over concrete block and that the infill material is recessed a minimum of three inches behind the front edge of the pier.
3. Ensure that the fence be painted or stained.

AND

Approval for the request of a Special Exception from the Article 5 Base Zoning standard that reads:
TN-1.

Building Setbacks (ft).

For blocks with contributing structures.

Side yard (interior): 3 (min)

To allow for a 2'-0" west side yard setback because the Special Exception criteria are met.

AND

Continue the petition for New Construction Small, Parts I & II at the rear of 524 and 526 East Anderson Street to the October 28, 2020 HPC regular meeting date, to allow for the petitioner to revise the drawings to be more compatible with the accessory dwellings on East Henry Lane, and include the following conditions:

1. Omit the clerestory windows on the New Construction accessory dwelling.
2. Provide material specifications for all door and windows
3. Revise the soffits to be perpendicular to the building wall.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Jerry Lominack

Rebecca Fenwick - Aye

Jerry Lominack - Aye

Kendra Clark - Aye

Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

STREETCAR DISTRICT

[15. Petition of Chris Norman | 20-003353-COA | 212 East 32nd Street | Fence and Special Exception Request](#)

📎 [Drawings and Photos.pdf](#)

📎 [Application, Checklist, photos, 212 E. 32nd Street.pdf](#)

📎 [Metal Fences in Streetcar.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation 20-003353-COA.pdf](#)

Mr. Chris Norman was present on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Ryan Jarles gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for an amendment to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness [20-003202-COA] for a fence at 212 East 32nd Street. The applicant is also requesting approval for a Special Exception from the Design Standard that reads:

Fences and Walls.

Materials.

Prohibited: Vinyl, PVC, and corrugated metal.

To allow for a horizontal corrugated metal fence.

Mr. Jarles explained that the fence was originally approved to be constructed of horizontal wood and to be 8'-0" in height. The center of the fence was to include a 10'-0" wide and 7'-6" high aluminum garage door to allow for vehicular access. The existing mechanical equipment was to be replaced on the lane facing portion of the fence. The amended proposal is for a horizontal corrugated metal fence to be 8'-0" in height. The center of the fence is proposed to include a 10'-0" wide and 7'-6" high aluminum garage door to allow for vehicular access and was approved in the previous Certificate of Appropriateness [20-003202-COA].

Mr. Jarles reported that staff recommends denial of the amendment to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness [20-003202-COA] for a fence at 212 East 32nd Street because the proposed material is not visually compatible and does not meet the standards.

Staff is also recommending denial to the request for a Special Exception from the Design Standard:

Fences and Walls.

Materials.

Prohibited: Vinyl, PVC, and corrugated metal.

To allow for a horizontal corrugated metal fence, because the Special Exception criteria are not met.

Mr. Jarles entertained questions from the Commissions.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Jarles if he said the interior of the fence is already corrugated metal. Is this correct?

Mr. Jarles answered yes, it has been installed on the interior of the existing fence. It is not visible from the public right-of-way.

Dr. Williams asked if the material that was previously approved has not been installed. Is this correct?

Mr. Jarles answered yes, the existing wood fence is still there.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Norman stated that when the images were shown of other fences that were used, most of them were a corrugation that is a raised style. The picture that was shown on the right hand side looked like a five-V channel. He believed that a previous project on Lorch Street between Tattall or Jefferson Streets near Montgomery Street has a surface plating on the back addition. It has a horizontal applied surface and he believes it looks good. However, in this instance, they are trying to go with something that is not a raised style but a stronger corrugation that read more of a shadow line.

Mr. Norman explained that they are trying to create a continuous band of rhythm around the house. The relation between the house and a fence to get some type of continuity almost in the situation with a brick structure. Trying to find a way to react with something different is what they really want to do here. They believed that it would look like what they wanted it to look like. But, after seeing it, his and client and he agreed that they thought it would be a really nice, attractive feature on the exterior. Therefore, this is why they brought it to the Commission. The horizontal condition of wood on the exterior would be similar and certainly the picture that they are looking at now is shown in wood. This could be applied just as wood, painted or stained. He said he was curious to find out and get a little more feedback about what is another option and what he has submitted is not an option.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] stated they appreciate the homeowner's desire for a fence that aesthetically meets their taste. Since this seems to be an aesthetic condition and based on this context, certainly the staff had laid out adequately the argument that this particular product is not visually compatible, not only with the context, but with the house, itself. It is a far more modern application and has an industrial look. It is really visually incompatible. Therefore, the HSF believes that the staff's recommendations are appropriate.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission agreed with the staff's recommendation. The fence is visually incompatible in this neighborhood.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby Deny the amendment to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness [20-003202-COA] for a fence at 212 East 32nd Street because the proposed material is not visually compatible and does not meet the standards.

AND

Deny the request for a Special Exception from the Design Standard:

Fences and Walls.

Materials.

Prohibited: Vinyl, PVC, and corrugated metal.

To allow for a horizontal corrugated metal fence, because the Special Exception criteria are not met.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jerry Lominack

Second: Robin Williams	
Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Nay
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

[16. Petition of Colleen Willoughby | 20-003450-COA | 222 East 32nd Street | Staff Approved - Fence](#)

[📎 20-003450-COA Signed Decision.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[17. Petition of Susan McCullen | 20-003520-COA | 209 East 33rd Street | Staff Approved - removal of security bars - repair existing windows](#)

[📎 Streetcar Staff Signed Decision 20-003520-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[18. Petition of Mary McCrory | 20-003628-COA | 2211 Florence Street | In-Kind repair of wood siding and windows](#)

[📎 Cuyler-Brownville Staff Signed Decision 20-003628-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[19. Petition of Timothy Urso | 20-003678-COA | 118 Brady Street | Staff Approved - Roof Replacement](#)

[📎 20-003678-COA SIGNED Decision.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[20. Petition of Susan McCullen | 20-003772-COA | 209 East 33rd Street | Staff Approved - New Exterior Light Fixture & Replace Privacy Fence](#)

[📎 20-003772-COA SIGNED Decision.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[21. Petition of Rose Miller | 20-003796-COA | 507 West 36th Street | Staff Approved - Installation of metal railing, for safety purposes, front stairs](#)

[📎 20-003796-COA Signed Decision.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[22. Petition of Eric Taylor | 20-003774-COA | 601 West 37th Street | Staff Approval of in-kind roof and window repair, and doors.](#)

[📎 20-003774-COA Staff SIGNED Decision.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[23. Petition of De'Andre Prescott | 20-003417-COA | 617 Kline Street | Staff Approved Roof Replacement and In Kind repairs.](#)

☞ [Signed Decision 20-003417-COA.doc.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[24. Petition of Colleen Willoughby | 20-003906-COA | 222 East 32nd Street | Staff Approved - Amendment to previous \(20-003450-COA\) Fence material change](#)

☞ [Staff SIGNED Decision 20-003906-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[25. Petition of The House Doctor/ Charles Angell | 20-003963-COA | 515 West 39th St | Staff Approved- Roof Repairs, repair of Exterior wood features, and repainting all to be completed in-kind, with conditions.](#)

☞ [20-003963-COA SIGNED Decision.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

XV. ADJOURNMENT

[26. Next Regular HPC Meeting - September 23, 2020 \(Virtual Meeting\)](#)

[27. Adjourn](#)

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Ms. Jackson-Greene adjourned the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Leah G. Michalak, Director
Historic Preservation

LGM:mem

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.