



Historic Preservation Commission

Virtual Meeting
July 28, 2021 3:00 PM
Meeting Minutes

JULY 28, 2021 HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

A Pre-Meeting was held virtually at 2:30 PM. Items on the Agenda were presented by Staff, as time permitted and the Commission asked questions. No testimony was received and no votes were taken.

Members Present: Virginia Mobley, Chair
Chelsea Jackson-Greene, Vice-Chair
Kendra Clark
Rebecca Fenwick
T. Jerry Lominack
J. Haley Swindle
Dr. Robin Williams

Member Absent: Darren Bagley-Heath

Staff Present: Pamela Everett, Esq., Assistant Executive Director
Leah Michalak, Historic Preservation Director
Aislinn Droski, Assistant Planner
Olivia Arfuso, Assistant Planner
Monica Gann, Assistant Planner
Sally Helm, Administrative Assistant
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

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

Ms. Mobley called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. She outlined the role of the Historic Preservation Commission and explained that staff will present each application with a recommendation; and then the petitioner will 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.

II. SIGN POSTING

[2. Sign Posting](#)

[3. Site Visits - July Report](#)

[📎 July 2021 - REPORT.pdf](#)

The Site Visit Report is attached to today's agenda.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

CUYLER-BROWNVILLE DISTRICT

[4. Petition of Jinesh Patel | 21-003876-COA | 912 West 38th Street | After-the-Fact Porch Alterations](#)

- [📎 Cuyler-Brownville Staff Recommendation 21-003876-COA.pdf](#)
- [📎 Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)
- [📎 Submittal Packet - Narrative, Pictures, and Drawings.pdf](#)
- [📎 Staff Research.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the after-the-fact alterations of the front porch at 912 West 38th Street as requested, because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Not Present

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

[5. Adopt the July 28, 2021 Agenda](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby adopt the July 28, 2021 Agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Not Present

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

[6. Approval of the June 23, 2021 Meeting Minutes](#)

- [📎 06-23-2021 Minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the June 23, 2021 Meeting Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Not Present

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

IX. REGULAR AGENDA

VICTORIAN DISTRICT

[7. Petition of Merkur Properties LLC, Matt Follis | 21-003515-COA | 1311 Lincoln Street | After-the-Fact Alterations with Special Exception Request](#)

[☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation 21-003515-COA.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[☞ Violation Report and Timeline.pdf](#)

Mr. Matt Follis was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for after-the-fact alterations for the property located at 1311 Lincoln Street as follows:

- All siding replaced with new wood siding in a different configuration.
- All wood single-paned windows replaced with clad double-paned windows.
- The historic roof form was altered.
- The front and rear stoops were removed and partially replaced.

Ms. Michalak stated additionally, work proposed includes completing the alterations as currently designed, installing a 6-foot-high dog-eared fence to enclose the rear yard, and painting the trim, siding and fence white, while the window sashes and fascia will be painted black. The applicant stated that existing front and rear entry doors will remain. The applicant is also requesting Special Exceptions from the following standards in order to leave all alterations in their current state:

7.9.10.v.1.a. and b. – *“Windows shall be repaired rather than replaced, provided however, if the degree of degradation does not allow repair, the degradation of each window shall be photographically documented and verified by the Planning Director, and the new window shall be of the same materials and configuration as the original (including single-glazed and true-divided*

lights, when appropriate).” and “Solid vinyl windows are prohibited”.

7.9.10.ix.1.a.i – *“Original roofs shall be repaired rather than replaced provided however, if the degree of degradation does not allow repair, the degradation shall be photographically documented and verified by the Planning Director, and the new roof shall be the same material and configuration as the original (except wood or asbestos).”*

Ms. Michalak said although the applicant did not request a Special Exception for the following standards, Special Exceptions would also be needed from the following standards in order to retain the alterations.

7.9.10.iv.1.a. – *“Exterior walls shall be repaired rather than replace, provided however, if the degree of degradation does not allow repair, the degradation shall be photographically documented and verified by the Planning Director, and the new wall shall be of the same materials and configuration as the original wall.”*

7.9.10.vi.1.a. – *“Porches shall be repaired rather than replaced, provided however, if the degree of degradation does not allow repair, the degradation shall be photographically documented and verified by the Planning Director, and the new porch materials and configuration shall be of the same material and configuration as the original.”*

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends denial for after-the-fact alterations and special Exceptions requests for the property located at 1311 Lincoln Street because the Preservation and Design Standards and special Exception criteria are not met.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Follis said he was instructed by the courts to submit an application for an after-the-fact review for the work that was previously done. He explained that they are seeking the after-the-fact request because the original roofline of the house is not there. It was not functioning correctly and therefore created improper drainage. During the staff's presentation, the Commission saw the rear portion of the house that was an addition. The total roofline did not provide proper drainage and this created a constant on-going water intrusion problem within the house. It was revised in such a way to provide proper drainage off the back end of the house. The original part in the back which is not visible from the street has been removed.

Mr. Follis said the windows are not vinyl. The windows shown in the presentation were removed and replaced with clad windows. They are not 6-over-6 windows, but as he has said they are clad. He said regarding the porches on the front of the house, they were removed because of rot issues. Mr. Follis said the porches were not properly flashed when they were originally added to the house. This caused significant damage to the exterior wall and, therefore, they had to be removed. The porches were rebuilt and put back in the same location with the same pitch. But, they are not completed because the work was stopped. The renovation is not complete. The porches on the front were rebuilt and put back up because the original porches were not salvageable. He said the original windows and the original siding were so degraded that as soon as they were touched, they fell apart.

Mr. Follis said they are seeking approval for after-the-fact exemption based on the fact that the house as originally configured was not functional and was not built in a way to stand up to inclement weather. The siding is wood siding such as the house across the street. It has the same exposure. The HVAC units were on the roof before and they are on the roof presently.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said their Architectural Review Committee [ARC] has been following this case closely since it began more than a year ago. This case unfortunately is not unique in regards to a lot of constructions that are underway in the local historic districts. This HPC as well as the HDBR have seen a large increase in after-the-fact applications. Mr. Arvay said he knows this has been troubling to these Boards. The ordinances are clear and MPC staff does community outreach to ensure that the property owners are aware of what is required. This project in particular continued several times after the applicant was made aware of the violations.

Therefore, it is not just that these changes and the proposed design that the Commission is reviewing now is visibly incompatible, but additional damage was done even after the initial violations were issued. He said for these reasons and many others, the HSF and ARC strongly endorse the staff's recommendation for denial. The plans as submitted do not meet the standards and further drawings are needed detailing how the porches are to be rebuilt. The drawings that were submitted are insufficient in terms of detail. Mr. Arvay said he agrees with the staff's assessment that it is unlikely that portions of the front porch were necessarily original, but they were visually compatible. Consequently, something equal to or better needs to be suggested for the porches, including proper handrails, sub-rails, proper balusters, and porch posts. There should be no room at all to consider compromise on the windows. The 6-over-6 wood sash windows are what needs to be in the house. The current windows may be clad, but they are not appropriate and do not meet the standard.

Mr. Arvay said his biggest sticking point is the alteration of the distinctive roofline. He said he has no doubt that this house had issues that needed to be rectified; and he sympathizes with the property owner in this regard, but there were ways and are ways to maintain the historical integrity of this original design, make it functional, and make it water tight. They have done it on HSF's property and have worked with other property owners who have done likewise. Therefore, this property owner should be held to no lesser standard than what all the fellow property owners in this area have endeavored to do and still do. The HSF feels that this petition should be denied and that more detailed drawings should be submitted pertaining to how the house will be restored appropriately.

Ms. Mobley said this project dates back to 2019. She asked Mr. Follis that when he interacted with the MPC staff, why has it been so difficult for him to follow the Standards.

Mr. Follis answered that when they initially interacted with the staff, everything the Commission saw in the current picture had already been done. It was more of an after-the-fact situation. The roofline had already been revised; the new roof had already been put on; the windows were already changed, and it was not until a year later that the Code Enforcement got involved. They had to put siding on the house. The project was at a standstill at the first interaction with the MPC staff. Then, all of a sudden, after a year later, they had to do a lot of tiebacks. Code Enforcement got on their case about the house not being sided. So, they put siding on the house and ensured that it was wood siding. The second time they interacted with the MPC staff was what the Commission saw in the last pictures where everything is boarded up.

Ms. Mobley said Mr. Follis's first request was in June 2019 requesting to do in-kind siding repair to the rear of the house. A request to repair/replace windows was not made. She said Mr. Follis was aware of the process for submitting an application.

Mr. Follis said they did not chose to repair the siding on the rear until they started the repairs and found that none of the siding was salvageable. He explained that fiber cement siding was on the rear, however, this is a material that is not permissible by the HPC. They went out of their way to ensure that wood siding would be on the house all the way around. As they got into the work, as he has said, none of the siding was salvageable. The windows were installed in such a way that they held water. Therefore, they, too, were not salvageable. Consequently, the sills were aimed towards the building and the water caused damages that could not be repaired. When you are repairing old houses, you never know what you are getting into. You just have to keep on going until you solve the problem. This is why the scope went just a little beyond the intended scope of work.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission was in agreement with the staff's recommendation for denial of after-the-fact alterations and Special Exception requests for the property located at 1311 Lincoln Street because the Preservation and Design Standards and Special Exception criteria are not met.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby deny the petition for after-the-fact

alterations and the Special Exception requests for the property located at 1311 Lincoln Street because the Preservation and Design Standards and Special Exception criteria are not met.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: Robin Williams

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Not Present

CUYLER-BROWNVILLE DISTRICT

[8. Petition of City of Savannah Code Compliance | 21-003726-COA | 1703 Ogeechee Road | Demolition of a Contributing Building](#)

📎 [Cuyler-Brownville Staff Recommendation 21-003726-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Research.pdf](#)

Officer Joshua Downs of the City of Savannah Code Enforcement Department was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Olivia Arfuso gave the staff's report. The applicant is requesting approval for the demolition of a contributing building at **1703 Ogeechee Road** in the *Cuyler-Brownville Historic District*. The City's Inspection Worksheet from **April 7, 2021**, states that there was, "...apparent excessive wall rot, front façade in disrepair and separating from the main structure, possibility of collapse into City right-of-way, remainder of structure in excessive state of neglect and disrepair with minor portions of collapse, open and unsecured." The Inspector recommends demolition. On **June 9, 2021**, the Recorder's Court of Chatham County ordered the demolition of the structure.

Ms. Arfuso stated that due to the findings, a building observation was requested. On **April 7, 2021**, Michael Rose with the City of Savannah conducted a building observation and noted on the City's Inspection Worksheet that there was, "...apparent excessive wall rot, front façade in disrepair and separating from the main structure, possibility of collapse into City right-of-way, remainder of structure in excessive state of neglect and disrepair with minor portions of collapse, open and unsecured." The Inspector recommends demolition. On **June 9, 2021**, the case went to the Chatham County Recorder's Court; the Plaintiff being *the Mayor and Alderman of the City of Savannah* verses the Defendants, *Jimmie William, Robert Bell and Joseph Bell*. The Court made the following findings, "The Defendants are in violation of several sections of the Property Maintenance Ordinance of the City of Savannah and is also in violation of Section 8-1037 (e) of the Code of the City of Savannah" and "The Defendants have consented to demolition of the subject property..."

Ms. Arfuso said it was determined that "the structure located at **1703 Ogeechee Road**, Savannah, Chatham County, Georgia 31415 is dilapidated; structurally unsound; unsafe; unsanitary; is dangerous to human life; is a public nuisance; and constitutes a hazard to safety and health by reason of inadequate maintenance, dilapidation, obsolescence and abandonment." The building was ordered to be demolished on **June 9, 2021**. The petitioner formally applied for the demolition of the contributing building on **June 21, 2021**.

Ms. Arfuso said the staff wishes to verbally change their recommendation as on July 28, 2021, staff

received a letter of interest from the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] showing their overall concern and consideration to save this contributing building. She said that Mr. Ryan Arvay of the HSF will give more information regarding this during the public comment section. She said based on the information they received from the HSF, staff is changing its recommendation from approval of the demolition at 1703 Ogeechee Road so that the HSF is given adequate time to contact all necessary parties and further discuss the purchase of the property.

Ms. Arfuso entertained questions from the Commission.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Officer Downs asked that the HPC do not continue this petition. He is seeking the approval of the demolition. As the Commission may remember, they had a similar situation where the Historic Savannah Foundation stepped in with a letter of intent, but only to find out that the building was too far gone and then came back to the HPC and gave way. He believes that the same thing will happen with this property. This property is extremely damaged on the inside and outside. He has had this case open almost the entire time that he has worked in the Cuyler-Brownville area which has been almost four years. He has been fighting with this property monthly since 2018. Officer Downs explained that it was only when the front facade started to pull away from the rest of the structure that he requested a new building observation that actually recommended demolition.

Officer Downs said he did not feel that it would be in the best interest to continue this petition for another month because he believes they will end up in the same situation they ended up the last time that Historic Savannah submitted a letter of intent to purchase the property.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Arvay said he was sympathetic to Officer Down's position in terms of this house. He works in the Cuyler-Brownville Neighborhood and there are a lot of structures in similar condition. This is not an easy position that Officer Downs is in. Unfortunately, they have yet to establish a good enough working relationship with Code Compliance to address some of these properties that go to Recorder's Court. There are far too many properties in this condition for HSF to address all of them. But, when something comes up for demolition, it demands a response; he prefers that they work in a more proactive manner instead of in a reactive manner. However, they are not always afforded this opportunity. Therefore, once again they find themselves reacting to a suggested demotion of a contributing structure.

Mr. Arvay said the HSF mentioned to Ms. Arfuso and concur with her that it is likely that this building could be from the 19th Century. They do not know definitively, but he believes that there is some evidence that would suggest perhaps that this building is much older than what the staff's report has indicated. Officer Downs is correct, they may come back in a month's time and have the same conclusion that Mr. Rose had. But, they will have far more information than what Mr. Rose had and he highly respects Mr. Rose, but if they can work with the property owners to get inside and assess it, which no one has done to date [which is not a part of Mr. Rose's purview] they will have more information to be able to definitively say to the HPC "unfortunately, regrettably it has to be torn down." They cannot do this right now; they do not know what they stand to lose because they do not have enough information. If this property has been a problem for a number of years, they do not believe and are hopeful that it will not be an issue for another three or four weeks. They are committed to go into this property with their contractor and engineer as they did so recently on 38th Street and report back with the best information that they are able to provide to the HPC. They feel that it is worthy of a slight continuance to have the time to do this; even if the results are just as they were last month.

Mr. Arvay wanted to remind the Commission that there was a similar situation on Victory Drive and the HSF stepped in and got the property saved by a tax sale. Now, someone is restoring that property. He believes this is the more aggressive and positive way to move. He was hopeful that the HPC sees fit to give them the extra time they are seeking.

Ms. Mobley stated that she passes this structure three or four times a week and wonders how safe this building is for some one walking down the street. Every time she passes this building, she sees

where something else has fallen off the building. Can someone ensure her that this building is safe to stand?

Officer Downs said he agrees with Ms. Mobley as when he, too, goes by this structure, something else has fallen off. He said he agrees also that there is a safety concern for the sidewalk and right-of-way on Ogeechee Road. This is why he is asking for the demolition in order to remove this risk from the community.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Arvay that if the Commission grants the continuance, would it be possible for HSF to either request that the City temporarily close the sidewalk or stabilize the facade for the month that they are hoping to inspect the building? Is there any intervention that the HSF can do to help alleviate the safety concerns?

Mr. Arvay, in an answer to Dr. Williams question, stated that he would hate to commit to anything without checking with the HSF's Revolving Fund Committee or their Board. He pointed out with regards to Ms. Mobley's question about the siding and soffit trim falling off the house, this is not the same as structural stability. Mr. Arvay said he could not speak to the structure; this is why they are requesting the continuance. As far as public safety, not to pass the buck, but this relies upon the property owner to ensure that the building is at least boarded. He has seen other property owners put caution barriers along the sidewalk. Mr. Arvay was sure that there are measures that can be undertaken. The HSF would be willing to enter into a discussion with the City as to how they can carry this out. He does not want to be hasty and demolish a 19th Century structure without more information. This may not be useful in this particular case, but they have regularly reached out to Code Compliance in hope that when they are getting close to requesting demolition from Recorder's Court, they would love to be involved in the process then. Let the HSF come forth with their contractors at that time. This will allow them the opportunity to be "for" or "against" the demolition. This would provide a much more efficient use of time than finding out about things after the fact.

Dr. Willilams asked staff if they know anything about closing a sidewalk, etc. pertaining to what is being discussed now.

Ms. Arfuso answered "no" that would be left to the discretion of the City of Savannah.

Mr. Lominack said if the building is a hazard to the public and something falls off the building and injures someone, he believes the property owner would be liable, not the City of Savannah, nor Historic Savannah Foundation, or the HPC. Is this correct?

Mr. Downs explained that once Code Compliance gets a recommendation for a demolition, they go through the process with the owners. Oftentimes, the City's contractor actually is the most cost effective contractor to carry out the demolition. Even if they were asking the owners to do it, usually it is their contractor that is the most cost effective to get it done. This is why they bring the demolition to the HPC for approval because their contractors are actually much cheaper than a private owner would be. The owners would be liable for any damages, etc.

Ms. Mobley asked that in the past, have the owners been asked or directed to secure this building.

Mr. Downs answered yes, the owners have been asked to secure this building. Actually, this is a complex issue. There are three owners; this is heirs property - two brothers and one sister. However, Code Compliance has been dealing with the children of the three listed owners. Between the three listed owners, there are 15 children and there are others involved as well. They have been involved with a lot of people pertaining to this property, not necessarily the listed owners, but there are many heirs to this property.

Ms. Mobley asked if all the heirs have been cited that the building is unsecured.

Mr. Downs answered yes. They all have agreed to have one heir represent all of them and he is the one who came to court, Joey Bell, the listed son of Joseph Bell.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission concurred with staff's proposed continuance for one month for the property located at 1703 Ogeechee Road.

Staff verbally updated their research of the property to reflect further findings. Staff determined that there is a building of similar size and configuration on the 1898, and 1916, Sanborn Maps. There is a high probability that the building visible on the maps was relocated to the front corner of the property and became the building we recognize (today) as 1703 Ogeechee Road. However, Staff could not locate any definitive evidence to support this assumption.

On July 28, 2021, Staff received a letter of interest from the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) showing their overall concern and consideration to save the contributing building that is proposed to be demolished.

Staff verbally changed their recommendation to allow the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) adequate time to contact all necessary parties and perform an assessment of the building.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the petition for the demolition of the contributing building at 1703 Ogeechee Road to the August 25th HPC Regular Meeting so that the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] is given adequate time to contact all necessary parties, and further discuss the purchase of the property.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Rebecca Fenwick

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[9. Petition of Sangeeta Kumar | 21-003890-COA | 1023 West 41st Street | After-the-Fact Fence and Demolition, Special Exception Request, Addition, and Alterations](#)

[📎 Cuyler-Brownville Staff Recommendation - 21-003890-COA - 1023 W 41st St.pdf](#)

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

[📎 Submittal Packet - Special Exception for Fence.pdf](#)

[📎 Staff Research.pdf](#)

Ms. Sangeeta Kumar was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Aislinn Droski gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for an after-the fact demolition of a rear addition, an after-the-fact installation of a fence, the construction of a rear new addition, and alterations to the front porch for the property located at 1023 West 41st Street. Additionally, the applicant is requesting a special exception from Section 7.10.10.c.ii.2, as follows:

Fences or walls no more than six (6) feet in height may be installed within the side or rear yards behind the front façade of the building.

To allow for the retention of the eight foot portion of the after-the-fact fence, which is located between the 1021 West 41st Street and 1023 West 41st Street.

Ms. Droski explained that the applicant was issued a Stop Work Order by Code Compliance following the observation of work occurring on the property without permits or a Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant promptly worked with staff to submit a COA application. In addition to this petition, the applicant applied, and was approved, for a change in roofing material, from asphalt to standing seam metal, on the main historic building [File No. 21-003909-COA].

Ms. Droski stated that the applicant has additionally indicated to staff that they intend to submit a separate staff level application for the replacement of the windows on the main historic building. The windows were replaced with an inappropriate material and have since been broken as well. Staff is working with the applicant to submit a window type that is appropriate for a historic building, as well as restores the original configuration of trim around the windows.

Ms. Droski reported that staff recommends approval of the after-the fact demolition of a rear addition, after-the-fact installation of the six foot high fence, construction of a new rear addition, and alterations to the front porch for the property located at 1023 West 41st Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure all wood elements, on the front porch, addition, and fence, are painted or stained.
2. Provide staff with the brick and mortar specification for the foundation piers of the new addition.
3. Remove the eight foot portion of the fence located between 1023 West 41st Street and 1021 West 41st Street.

AND

Denial of the Special Exception from the following standard:

Fences or walls no more than six (6) feet in height may be installed within the side or rear yards behind the front façade of the building.

Which was requested to allow for the retention of the eight foot portion of the after-the-fact fence, which is located between 1021 West 41st Street and 1023 West 41st Street, because the Special Exception criteria are not met.

Ms. Droski entertained questions from the Commission.

Dr. Williams said the drawings of the roof submitted by the applicant makes it look like it is a hip roof. He asked staff to verify whether the porch roof is hipped.

Ms. Droski explained that the porch is not hipped; what is shown is probably a graphic error. The applicant has given staff a written statement that they will not change the configuration of the existing porch.

Dr. Williams said during the staff's presentation, the porch was called a half hip. Can you actually see this in the photograph?

Ms. Droski answered that it is a little difficult to see, but staff went onsite and looked at the property.

Dr. Williams said basically the roof has three phases; not five. Is this correct?

Ms. Droski answered yes, it appears to be three phases.

Dr. Williams wanted to be sure that what was submitted is not a representation of what is going to be here. How does the Commission know that what is going to be here is going to follow what is here and not the drawings?

Ms. Droski said the staff discussed the shape of the roof also. They say half hip and believe it comes to two points. She pointed to an area and said that it is difficult to see, but staff went with the majority

of the applicant's written conformation that the existing configuration would not be altered. The Commission is welcomed to make a request in their motion that the applicant submit a more specific drawing.

Ms. Fenwick asked if the staff is going to require that additional details of the wood columns be submitted of the dimensions and aesthetic.

Ms. Droski said dimensions for the columns are submitted. They may not be to scale in the drawings, but this is what the staff referred to when completing the review.

Ms. Fenwick asked staff if it is not a requirement to include the dimensions and drawings for new elements.

Ms. Droski answered that it is dimensioned in the drawings. It is located here [pointing] and staff was able to find the information.

Ms. Michalak explained that the applicant did the best that she could. She is available if the Commission wishes to ask her some questions.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Kumar asked the Commission to please restate the questions about the roof and the drawings.

Ms. Mobley explained that questions have come up regarding the shape of the roof and scale drawings of the columns. Are there two points or one point?

Ms. Kumar explained that the columns will be 6" x 6" - square wooden columns. The roof will be the same shape as the existing roof. It will be replaced with standing seam metal roof. The shape of the porch, concrete portion, and the roof will remain the same.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Kumar if she is the applicant. The drawings that were submitted are not an accurate representation of the roof. The top view shows it as a five sided shape. The roof is rectangular. How many slopes are on this roof?

Ms. Kumar pointed out the main roof of the house, the porch roof is just above. The bottom portion is the awning.

Dr. Williams informed Ms. Kumar that he was aware of what she pointed out, but the porch roof is rectangular. What was submitted was five-sided half of an octagon.

Ms. Kumar said she gave this for an example of the size. The bottom portion is the awning of the roof, which has been removed.

Dr. Williams said what Ms. Kumar said is obvious, but he questioned if the roof above the awning is structured correctly. The photo shows that the roof is rectangular and clad, but the drawings show it as a half octagon. Therefore, it is not clear what the roof structure is. It is hard to make a determination without the actual drawing.

Ms. Kumar said the roof structure now is asphalt and the shape will remain the same.

Mr. Lominack asked staff that if the submittal package that the Commission is reviewing now had been submitted prior to any work being done, would they have accepted it as a complete submittal package.

Ms. Droski answered that no work has been done to the front porch. This is for future work. She explained that staff does not change what they accept based on whether or not it is after-the-fact or future work. Staff found that they were able to get all the information they need from the drawings. But, the Commission is welcome to make a different decision.

Mr. Lominack said if the drawings they are reviewing are a representation of what was included in the checklist and other things, he was questioning whether the application should have been reviewed as a new application without corrections. Certainly, an after-the-fact application should not be subject to

less standards than a before-the-fact application.

Ms. Mobley explained that the only thing that is after the fact is the fence. It is not the porch; it is not the roof, but is the fence. Is there a comment about the fence?

Ms. Kumar asked if she can shorten the eight feet fence to six feet.

Ms. Droski explained that there is a standard in the Design Standards where there needs to be a minimum of five feet between a fence and a building that are parallel. The fence in this location could not have five feet between it and the building. Therefore, this is why staff is recommending that it be removed.

Ms. Kumar asked Ms. Droski if she was saying remove the entire fence from between the property line.

Ms. Droski explained that a fence can be put up between property lines, but it cannot be less than five feet between the fence and the building. Therefore, the fence would need to be removed from where it is parallel to the building itself.

Ms. Kumar asked could she build the fence along the sidewalk.

Ms. Droski pointed to an area and said the fence would need to be removed from this portion to the entirety of where it is parallel to that building. It can not be built parallel to that building.

Ms. Kumar explained that an existing fence was here. She believes it was a chicken wire fence.

Ms. Droski explained that the fence was probably installed before the ordinance. But, when you remove one fence and install another, the new fence has to come under the new ordinance. This is why staff has made its recommendation. She explained that the fence was probably built before the ordinance was created. But, to reinstall a fence, it would now have to come under the Standards of the new ordinance. This is the reason for the staff's recommendation.

Ms. Kumar said the next door neighbor's children broke the windows and put trash in the backyard. Because of this and for safety purposes, they built the fence. She has attached police reports verifying this. This is why she asked for the Special Exception.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said their Architectural Review Committee [ARC] is sympathetic to this property owner who is obviously trying to improve this property, make it safe, and make it useful. They realize that sometimes working within the parameters of the Ordinance can be challenging. Mr. Arvay said, however, they believe that there are ways to do this in ways that meet the needs of the property owner and also abides by the ordinance.

Mr. Arvay said they agree with the staff that the fence as built is not only visible incompatible, but does not meet the ordinance. However, a fence around the backyard is more than appropriate. There are other measures that you can use on those windows that are between the two properties can provide additional security and will meet the ordinance. Just like the Lincoln Street property, there are legitimate concerns here that the property owner has, but there are means of addressing them without being in violation. They fully understand that not everybody's budget would allow them to hire an architect, but the drawings, though well intended, really do push the limit of what is acceptable for "measured drawings" when this Commission is asked to approve a design that is so inconsistent with the physical existing porch. Also it is in conflict with other statements that staff made in its presentation that they have in writing that the owner is going to install wood with round columns and he believes this is the appropriate column for this vintage house, but yet in the property owner's presentation she said she will use the 6 x 6 wood post. The other problem with this design is not the inconsistent shape of the porch roof, but four posts are an overkill for this house. This house historically would have had two round columns on either corner. If the porch is structured as it should be, this house would not have more than two columns. Therefore, based on the design that was submitted, not only is it lacking details, but the details are in conflict with what the owner is telling the MPC and it is just not visually compatible with the house. Mr. Arvay said he believes this house was built off grade less than three feet or it could be two feet. Handrails and balusters are not needed here.

Mr. Arvay said their ARC is also troubled by the notations on the drawings that they want to basically want to use a 2 x 4 for the handrails. There is no indication as to how high the railing will be. Will they be 36 inches as is required? They need to ensure that the balusters will not be 42 inches as some contractors use. Therefore, they believe that there are not enough details in the porch drawings to make a decision on this today. He believes that the Commission could make a decision on the appropriateness of fence after-the-fact; but with the rear addition, he is not sure whether those drawings give the Commission the ability to properly review it.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams agreed with the HSF. There are some inconsistencies regarding the columns. He also agreed that four columns are too many. In looking at the other houses on this street, two columns appear to be the majority. There is one house here with three round columns. Dr. Williams recommended that the property owner provide a more detailed submission for the porch in order for the Commission to have something tangible to work with. If possible, this can be separated from the issue of the fence.

Ms. Mobley said the Commission can separate this when making the motion.

Dr. Williams made a motion to approve the staff's recommendations, but continue the alterations to the front porch for the property owner to submit a more accurate detail solution. He motioned that the Commission deny the Special Exception. This was seconded by **Ms. Jackson-Greene and carried.**

Mr. Lominack said he believes the rear addition should be a part of the continuance along with the front porch because the information provided is no greater. **Dr. Williams** said he would remove his motion or amend his motion.

Mr. Lominack made an amended motion to include the continuance of the rear addition along with the continuance for the front porch. This was seconded by **Dr. Williams and carried.**

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the petition for the after-the fact demolition of a rear addition and after-the-fact installation of the six foot high fence for the property located at 1023 West 41st Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure the fence is painted or stained.
2. Remove the eight foot portion of the fence located between 1023 West 41st Street and 1021 West 41st Street.

AND

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the petition for the construction of a new rear addition and alterations to the front porch for the property located at 1023 West 41st Street for a maximum of ninety (90) days in order for the petitioner to provide more detailed and accurate drawings of the proposed work.

AND

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby deny the petition for of the Special Exception from the following standard:

Fences or walls no more than six (6) feet in height may be installed within the side or rear yards behind the front façade of the building. Which was requested to allow for the retention of the eight foot portion of the after-the-fact fence, which is located between 1021 West 41st Street and 1023 West 41st Street, because the Special Exception criteria are not met.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

STREETCAR DISTRICT

[10. Petition of James Reardon | 21-003889-COA | 407 West 35th Street | Rehabilitation / Alterations](#)

[☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation 21-003889-COA.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

[☞ Submittal Packet_ Revised Drawings and Materials.pdf](#)

[☞ Correspondence.pdf](#)

Mr. James Reardon was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Olivia Arfuso gave the staff presentation. The petitioner is requesting approval for the rehabilitation of, and the alterations to, the property located at **407 West 35th Street**. All unoriginal exterior aluminum siding is proposed to be removed, and the wood siding (below) will be exposed. All windows are proposed to be replaced with double-hung wood windows. The front entry porch is proposed to have all existing handrails and balusters restored/replaced in-kind. A new wood entry door with sidelights will be installed. The brick porch piers and brick lattice infill will be repaired in-kind, as needed. The second-floor balcony will, also, have new handrails installed that match the style and color of the existing.

Ms. Arfuso said the roofing material will be replaced in-kind with new asphalt shingles, and the exterior wood fence will be replaced with a new wood fence. Regarding alterations, a metal staircase along the rear (providing access to the second-floor) will be removed, as well as an existing rear shed which is non-historic to the property.. Along the West-facing elevation, one (1) window on the second-floor is proposed to

be infilled. *Per the petitioner*, the duplex's current state is because of fire and years of water damage.

Ms. Arfuso reported that staff recommends continue the petition for the rehabilitation of, and alterations to, the property located at 407 West 35th Street to the August 25th HPC Regular Meeting, in order for the applicant to address the following:

the building (not including the front porch).

Ms. Arfuso entertained questions from the Commission.

Ms. Fenwick said the drawings show some of the columns are brick and some without brick. She believed she heard Ms. Arfuso mentioned steel columns. She wanted it to be clarified what material the porch columns will be.

1. Ensure that all repairs and/or replacements match the original elements in design, size, color, texture and materials (when applicable). Ensure that all work is undertaken using the gentlest means possible to avoid damage to any historic materials.
2. Ensure that any deteriorated wood siding is replaced in-kind with appropriate wood boards.
3. Ensure that the original openings (on the principal building) are not altered in any way. Revise the drawings to show all original window openings on the principal building are accounted for, and unaltered.
4. Submit window specifications to Staff for review.
5. Ensure that all lite configurations are historically appropriate and that all glass is transparent with no dark tints or reflective effects. Ensure that framing members be covered with appropriate trim (trim shall feature a header, surrounds, and a pronounced sill, where appropriate).
6. Ensure that the shutters are sized to fit the window openings and operable. Ensure that the place of the horizontal rail(s) correspond to the location of the meeting rail(s) of the window.
7. Submit the proposed door design/configuration to Staff for review.
8. Ensure that the "service yard" is appropriately screened from any public right-of-way.
9. Ensure that the proposed fence is located within the side or rear yard, behind the front facade of the building (not including the front porch).

Ms. Arfuso explained that steel columns are noted in the service area in the side yard.

Ms. Fenwick asked what material will be on the two side columns in the front.

Ms. Arfuso said the material is not noted for the two side columns in the front.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Reardon explained that he did not show texture across all of the columns. He split them from left to right, center through. He is not showing any of the horizontal siding or asphalt shingles. Mr. Reardon said he did not show brick as well, but they will remain as is; all four are brick columns. As far as the ones toward the back where the service yard is located, there is a set of metal stairs which he is removing. There are two round columns from the ground to the balcony above. Instead of leaving the two metal columns exposed, they are proposing to wrap them in wood.

Mr. Reardon said as far as the comments, there are nine and he knows that in the past this is a lot for the Board, but he believes that the comments are more statements than comments. He has the preapproved Marvin wood divided true divided light single window pane. He left the pattern as is on the building. As of today, he does not know if an historic pattern is on the window. Mr. Reardon said, therefore, he left it as 9 over 9. They are not proposing to remove any window openings. So, they are only infilling the openings with what is already here. The front door side lights are similar to what he has drawn and are still intact and are covered up with plywood. The doors are mostly gone. Maybe it was three-quarter glass or probably full glass, but he can't tell what is still here; he guesses when they had the fire, the door was removed, never replaced, and just covered the opening with plywood. Mr.

Reardon said they are trying to keep the house intact. He entertained questions from the Commission.

Ms. Fenwick said no window trim is shown, but she imagines that trim is under the artificial siding. Will this be restored as a part of the woodwork?

Mr. Reardon said as far as they know aluminum siding is here over wood siding. But, they have not explored what's intact around the windows. Obviously, they will have to come back and put some kind of trim around the windows when they install the new windows.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission concurred with staff recommendation to continue this petition to the Regular Meeting of August 25, 2021.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the petition for the rehabilitation of, and alterations to, the property located at 407 West 35th Street to the August 25th HPC Regular Meeting, in order for the applicant to address the following:

1. Ensure that all repairs and/or replacements match the original elements in design, size, color, texture, and materials (when applicable). Ensure that all work is undertaken using the gentlest means possible to avoid damage to any historic materials.
2. Ensure that any deteriorated wood siding is replaced in-kind with appropriate wood boards.
3. Ensure that the original openings (on the principal building) are not altered in any way. Revise the drawings to show all original window openings on the principal building are accounted for, and unaltered.
4. Submit window specifications to Staff for review.
5. Ensure that all lite configurations are historically appropriate and that all glass is transparent with no dark tints or reflective effects. Ensure that framing members be covered with appropriate trim (trim shall feature a header, surrounds, and a pronounced sill, where appropriate).
6. Ensure that the shutters are sized to fit the window openings and operable. Ensure that the place of the horizontal rail(s) correspond to the location of the meeting rail(s) of the window.
7. Submit the proposed door design/configuration to Staff for review.
8. Ensure that the "service yard" is appropriately screened from any public right-of-way.
9. Ensure that the proposed fence is located within the side or rear yard, behind the front facade of the building (not including the front porch).

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Jerry Lominack

Rebecca Fenwick - Aye

Jerry Lominack - Aye

Kendra Clark - Aye

Virginia Mobley - Aye

Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Not Present

[11. Petition of Christine Wacta | 21-003211-COA | 421 West 37th Street | After-the-Fact Alterations](#)

[☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation - 21-003211-COA - 421 W 37th St.pdf](#)

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

[☞ Staff Research.pdf](#)

[☞ Photos from Code Compliance.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Rebecca Fenwick recused herself from participating in this petition. Ms. Wacta is her neighbor.

Ms. Christine Wacta was not present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Aislinn Droski gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for after-the-fact alterations to the front porch and addition of rear steps for the property located at 421 West 37th Street. The alterations to the front porch included the extension of what was originally the porch fascia to be an overhanging eave with no soffit and the addition of wood railing on the front steps. New railing and columns were installed on the eastern façade, towards the rear of the property. The Sanborn Maps indicate the presence of a wrap around, one-story, wood porch with a metal roof on the structure as far back as 1916. However, the original porch was removed, and the existing wrap-around front porch was re-constructed in 2012 [Permit No. 12-1138B]. The project received a variance to allow for the porch to be constructed in the same footprint as was previously existing, which encroached on the front-yard setback [File No. B-120328-41618-2].

Ms. Droski explained that this project received a Stop Work Order from Code Compliance and was docketed to be seen at court on June 2, 2021. Staff spoke with the Code Compliance Officer, received photos of the work that had occurred, and verified that the project would require a COA. Staff then spoke with the applicant, who applied for the project to be heard at the June 23, 2021, meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission. Staff continued the petition from this date, to be heard instead at the July 28, 2021, meeting, due to missing information in the initial submittal.

Ms. Droski reported that staff recommends denial of the after-the-fact alterations to the front porch and addition of rear steps for the property located at 421 West 37th Street because the work is not visually compatible and does not meet the standards.

Ms. Droski entertained questions from the Commission.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Christine Wacta, petitioner, was not present.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said their Architectural Review Committee [ARC] fully supports the staff's recommendation for denial of this petition. They were puzzled by some of the designs for this project. The configuration for the porch is wholly visually incompatible. The extensions of the porch, too, are incompatible. There are clear examples that are around in this district for homes of this size and nature. While there may not be existing historic photos, there are numerous other homes from which inspiration can be drawn. Therefore, the HSF/ARC agree that the after-the-fact elements be denied. Is there any type of statute of limitations on unapproved work? Mr. Arvay said he believes he read or heard that the porches although built on the original footprint were not approved? But, the style of the porch railing, not just on the handrailing coming down the step, the baluster on the actually porches look like something on a more suburban backyard patio. He said generally, you have a hefty handrail or sub-rail and then the baluster which comes down to the bottom rail. He did not know if anything could be done to fix the changes that were

made seven (7) or eight (8) years ago, but at the very least these changes should be denied and a much more appropriate design submitted.

Ms. Mobley asked staff to address Mr. Arvay's question pertaining to whether or not the porch was an approved item.

Ms. Michalak explained that the building was previously in the "Gap" area. This was a non-historically zoned area between Cuyler-Brownville and Mid-City. Whatever was done to the porch design was not under the Historic purview until a couple of years ago. Therefore, the fact that they did not get a review in 2012 was that it was not a requirement. Unfortunately, they can not do anything about the railings that are here now.

Ms. Mobley asked what are the new railings on this project.

Ms. Droski answered that the new railings are the ones that she showed the Commission. Therefore, it will just be the railings on the steps and on the side. They are unpainted.

Ms. Mobley explained that as an owner of a house in this area, the City of Savannah advised them that they must have railings on their stairs. She asked, what would be an acceptable railing?

Ms. Michalak said they can not tell the petitioner how to design anything, but normally what is proposed and approved is usually a simple black metal "L" that you really don't see it when looking at the building. This just a simple little black metal handrail that meets the code.

Ms. Mobley said she has pictures of the house next to her from the 1930s. It shows ornate very large heavy wooden posts and rails going down the stairs. Now this has been lost, but what if the petitioner wanted to replace it.

Ms. Michalak answered that if something was there historically and there is evidence, it could be put back in.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The commission concurred with the staff's recommendation for denial of the after-the-fact alterations to the front porch and addition of rear steps for the property located at 421 West 37th Street because the work is not visually compatible and does not meet the standards.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby deny the petition for after-the-fact alterations to the front porch and addition of steps on the eastern facade for the property located at 421 West 37th Street because the work is not visually compatible and does not meet the standards.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Kendra Clark

Rebecca Fenwick	- Abstain
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Not Present

[12. Petition of GM Shay Architects | 21-001940-COA | 1705 Abercorn Street \(1700 Drayton Street\) | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

- ☞ [Streetcar Staff Recommendation 21-001940-COA.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Part II Submittal Packet - Material List and Cut Sheets.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Part II Submittal Packet - Photos, Drawings, and Renderings.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Part I Submittal Packet - Narrative and Special Exception Request.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Part I Submittal Packet - Photos, Drawings, and Renderings.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Staff Research.pdf](#)

Ms. Mobley recused herself from participating in this petition.

Ms. Jackson-Greene chaired this hearing.

Mr. Patrick Shay was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details for 1705 Abercorn Street, which is one of the three buildings in the 1700 Drayton Street project. On April 28, 2021, the HPC approved New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for three new buildings to be located at 1700 Drayton Street, 104 East 34th Street, and 1705 Abercorn Street as amended and presented by the petitioner at the April 28, 2021, Historic Preservation Commission Meeting. The petitioner's presentation and amendments addressed all of staff's recommended conditions.

AND

Approval for a Special Exception from the standard that states that *building footprints in the TC-1 zoning district are permitted to be a maximum of 5,500sf* in order to allow the footprint of the building at 1700 Drayton Street to be 12,300sf because the Special Exception criteria are met.

Ms. Michalak said staff's recommendation consisted of:

Approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for three new buildings to be located at 1700 Drayton Street, 104 East 34th Street, and 1705 Abercorn Street with the following conditions to be submitted to the Commission for review with Part II: Design Details (within 90 days of this decision) because otherwise the project is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1700 Drayton Street

1. Increase the rear yard setback (along the lane) to 10 feet.
2. Provide electric meter(s) location.
3. Reduce the height of the fence along 33rd street in the front yard to a maximum of 3 feet or pull it back to not extend forward of the front façade of the building.
4. Reduce all fences (except the front yard fence described above) to a maximum of 8 feet high.

104 East 34th Street

1. Provide electric meter(s) location.
2. Provide the required shrubs with the parking lot screening/fence.
3. Wrap all structured parking along 34th Street with residential or nonresidential uses.
4. Reduce all fences to a maximum of 8 feet high.

1705 Abercorn Street

1. Reduce the building coverage to a maximum of 60%.
2. Redesign the square windows above the storefront on the east, north, and portion of the south facades to be transoms as designed on the remainder of the south façade.
3. Provide electric meter(s), HVAC and mechanical equipment, and refuse storage

locations.

4. Reduce all fences to a maximum of 8 feet high.

AND

Approval for a Special Exception from the standard that states that *building footprints in the TC-1 zoning district are permitted to be a maximum of 5,500sf* in order to allow the footprint of the building at 1700 Drayton Street to be 12,300sf because the Special Exception criteria are met.

Ms. Michalak said that the Commission does not have purview over the actual color of the building. The Commission is reviewing the materials and the texture of the materials. She referenced the materials to the exterior elevations.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details for 1705 Abercorn Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

Ms. Michalak entertained questions from the Commission.

Dr. Williams asked if the 2nd floor function is residential.

Ms. Michalak answered that the petitioner will be able to answer Dr. Williams's question, but the floor plans show this floor as commercial.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay said they are excited about moving forward with the project. They agree with the staff's recommendations. He entertained questions from the Commission. Mr. Shay said also that they will be available to answer questions from the public.

Dr. Williams asked why the materials changed between the first and second floor. He said the shift from brick to stucco leads him to believe that there will be a shift in function. If both floors are commercial, why not just have red brick on both floors?

Mr. Shay answered that as they presented Part I, they have tried to consistently use the masonry that identifies the base of the building by trying to differentiate it from the upper stories. The upper story is shown as commercial. It may be the same tenant or may not be the same tenant.

Ms. Jackson-Greene asked Ms. Michalak to explain the context photos.

Ms. Michalak showed a photo and said that here the petitioner has shown some examples of what they are going for sidewise. She showed the commercial buildings that are directly across the street from this building.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said they have followed this project with real interest. He said the Commission may remember that the last time this project was before them, they objected not so much to the scale of the building, but to some of the details which at that time were premature. They are regretful to see that it is very similar to the previous incarnation in style. They hoped that the applicant would have taken some more cues from the surrounding historic context. This is a lovely and historic area and they feel the chosen style and detail is in sharp contrast to its surroundings. It might have been the intent, but they do not believe that it is visually compatible.

Mr. Arvay said they concur strongly with Dr. Williams's comments and, therefore, believe that brick will be a superior material to use rather than the stucco. He said their biggest issue, however, is with the detail of the bulky second floor balcony. They believe that something lighter, perhaps a trellis design might be more appropriate than the heavy element on the second floor. Also, they believe that more brick would help to improve the design from its seemingly coldness. They are also concerned that the HPC has seen this without seeing the totality of the project. There are two other buildings in this design. It would have been nice to see those somewhat completed to be able to review the project in whole rather than review it in piecemeal. They would like to see some alterations to those

details before being approved.

Mr. Shay, in response to Public Comments, said they are always thankful for the input they receive from the HSF. However, when they presented Part I, they presented the logic at that time which is embedded in the Ordinance. The rules for this area are intended to promote the idea of contemporary expressions. Therefore, they followed-through with what was approved in Part I and re-enforced it with the details. His notes show that the Commission's primary concern was that there be a level of detail. Therefore, rather than revisiting Part I Massing which was already approved, they focused on trying to develop a system of detailing which was clearly contemporary, but also lead to complement the interesting historic fabric around it, just as the Ordinance requires. They tried to develop the detailing and re-enforce it rather than revisiting the design altogether. The bulky balcony was approved in Part I. It would be very difficult for them to go back and revisit Part I at this stage. However, they will do their best to try to follow-through with whatever the Commission's recommendations are. But, he does not believe that concern rises to the level of actual visual incompatibility. The image shown on the screen now does not have the capacity to show the fact that there is a precedent in the vicinity immediately to the north and across the street at the restaurant for the second floor there are balconies that are similar in mass to the main body of the building.

Mr. Shay explained that as far as the issue of not being presented in its totality, they look forward to bringing back the details of the apartment buildings, but they will pause on this regard now as they are waiting for the determination from the Department of Community Affairs [DCA] as to whether or not this year they get selected for the housing tax credit. Savannah usually gets one per year. Mr. Shay said regardless whether they are selected or not, the developer intends to go forward with the project, but they would like to wait to receive the comments from DCA as to whether it is approved or whether it is with recommendations for revisions and resubmittal. They want to ensure that they are in compliance with DCA's requirements before they submit the final details for the two apartment buildings. Hopefully, they will be able to come back to this Commission sooner than later. He said he believed that the totality that was presented in Part I and today what they will do is come back and show the Commission that they have followed the Ordinance and bring back to them the details. This Commission has not seen the color, but they will have a contrast to bring out the massing between the ground floor and the upper floor. The precedent will allow them to have some element to work with on the two apartment buildings. Mr. Shay thanked the Commission for the opportunity to respond and he looked forward to the Commission's comments.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Ms. Fenwick remarked that something interesting is happening with the front wall of the store front with the building behind it. She sees that it is asymmetrical as it is broken up. The facade looks like it is detached or standing alone. She agreed with Dr. Williams in that she, too, would love to see more brick. Ms. Fenwick said she has a major concern for large uninterrupted faces of walls, particularly stucco walls. While she did not see any, she was hopeful that no scuppers are in this design as this is why so many blank facades get soiled. She is aware that the Commission will not be commenting on color, but she knows by many other instances where there are large stucco walls. Ms. Fenwick said she would rather that they saw all the elements together as she has concerns about approving this piecemeal. It would be easier for the Commission to make a decision if they saw it all together.

Dr. Williams said his concern is about the dropping of the cornice. He said evidently the dark areas in this elevation on the second floor and the full height towards the left, creates the illusion that the front wall on the second floor is a false front. Dr. Williams asked if the Commission has already voted on this in Part I. In looking at it now, a simple solution might be for the cornice, not change out the dark vertical material pieces, but may be have the cornice to be continuous along the side elevation rather than have a break in those two spots might resolve the illusion that the facade is not integrated in the rest of the building. He said when the Commission was reviewing the whole project, he does not remember them getting into such a small detail in the context of Height and Mass. To him, this is a design detail not a height and mass issue.

Ms. Michalak said the the context is different, plus the contrast, she does not think that this is something that the Commission can not comment on.

Dr. Williams said if the cornice line was continuous from front to back [leave all the changes in

materials], might resolve the issue. This is something that the petitioner could bring back to staff if the Commission decides that this will help. He said he understood that they were trying to break up the massing, but he does not understand the rationale of doing this here, neither did he see this happening on the building in the background. When they were reviewing the buildings in the context, he did not see any of the modest buildings that are the cues for this building having two different materials on different floors. Since the functions are the same, regardless of what happens to the second floor, all the other buildings that are being used is a point of reference for modernism and have continuous materiality from bottom to top. They do not treat the first floor as a foundation to the second floor. Now, this does not mean that the petitioner can not explore different materiality in the apartment since it is going to be a different type anyway. They are dealing with a single building in isolation. Dr. Williams said to him, the shifting of materiality is not compatible with the contemporary context based on the images that the Commission has seen. He wanted to be shown a contemporary building where the second floor material is different from the first floor on a modernist building. He asked if any Commission members share his concern.

Ms. Jackson-Greene said she was understanding what Dr. Williams said. At one point she believed the applicant referenced the building where as a commercial building with an apartment building on top. Although the uses are different, the materiality should be the same. Even in some of the other residential and commercial buildings that are two-story in this area, the materiality remains the same. Therefore, she concurs with Dr. Williams's concern. The proposed design is slightly misleading if the use is going to remain commercial on both floors. She understood the applicant's intention, but because this is a separate building from the rest of the other buildings in this proposed 1700 Drayton plan where all will be residential and this is commercial, she believes they should remain consistent with the materiality.

Ms. Jackson-Greene pointed out that the only two story buildings are the library and Arnold Hall. Is this correct?

Ms. Michalak answered she believes that the applicant was showing Starland Lofts also.

Ms. Jackson-Greene said that Starland Lofts bring up one of Ms. Fenwick's concerns about how stucco looks over time with weathering.

Ms. Michalak said this is concrete paneling, but the point still remains.

Dr. Williams stated that some materials are meant to age and acquire patina. Concrete actually does change color with time, but stucco when it gets dirty is not a flattering look. Therefore, he believes that the comparison to the Starland Lofts and the concrete discoloring is different. There is not a lot of stucco in this neighborhood. He said unlike the HSF, is not opposed to the modernism as he likes the projecting frames on the doors and windows. Dr. Williams said he appreciates the applicant's attempt to come up with a slightly modern building. But, nonetheless, he believes the consistency with materiality of how it rises up the full height of the building. This is what he would like to see.

Mr. Lominack said the Starland Lofts is a good project. He believes the consistency of the materials is a real issue. He believes that a brick building has a lot merit. However, he was concerned that a large amount of brick would be where the three windows are and how heavy this might look. Is there some way that another material could be used in those squares? This would help to reduce the mass.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue New Construction: Part II, Design Details for 1705 Abercorn Street for a maximum of 90 days in order to the petitioner to address the following:

1. Revise the second-floor material to brick.
2. Revise the design of the "broken" cornice.

3. Revise the design of the area above the second-floor windows on the south facade.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Jerry Lominack

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Abstain
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Not Present

[13. Petition of Ward Architecture + Preservation | 21-003225-COA | 302-308 West 38th Street | New Construction Townhouses: Part I, Design Details](#)

[☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation 21-003225-COA.pdf](#)

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

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

Mr. Josh Ward was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the presentation. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part I: Height and Mass for six (6) attached single-family residences for the vacant parcels located 302, 306, and 308 West 38th Street. The building will be two-stories high and will have attached one-story two car garages at the rear of the property along the lane which is detached from the main building. The applicant intends to recombine the three existing parcels and then subdivide them into five (5) 20-foot-wide parcels and one (1) 22-foot-wide parcel at the western end (Unit 312). The building is designed with setbacks between every two lots which makes the building read as three detached duplexes. The applicant is in the process of acquiring a portion of the property to the west of this site in order to accommodate the required 3-foot side yard setback for Unit 312.

Ms. Michalak stated that this project was first heard by the HPC at the June 23rd meeting where staff recommended:

Approval for New Construction, Part I: Height and Mass for six (6) attached townhouses for the vacant parcels located 302, 306, and 308 West 38th Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II: Design Details for review by the Commission within the next 90 days because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Increase the west side yard setback (for the main building and the garage) to a minimum of 3 feet to meet the standard.
 2. Add 30% fenestration on the ground floor of the west façades of the main building and the garage.
 3. Reduce the overall height of the main building to be more compatible with the historic buildings on the block face to the east.
 4. Reduce the pitch of the main building hip roof.
 5. Increase the front porches to a minimum width of 50% of the front of each unit.
- However, concerned with the large quantity of conditions, the Board continued the petition.

Ms. Michalak said that demolished sometime after the 1973 Sanborn Map, historically, three single-family wood-framed, two-story houses existed on these sites. The surrounding historic context

consists of one- and two-story high residential buildings from one-three family. Directly across 38th Street to the south is the monumental former school building which is currently vacant.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction, Part I: Height and Mass for six (6) attached townhouses for the vacant parcels located 302, 306, and 308 West 38th Street with the following condition to be submitted with Part II: Design Details for review by the Commission within the next 90 days because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the westernmost side yard fence so that there is 5 feet between fences and buildings.

Ms. Michalak entertained questions from the Commission.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Ward said that they concur with staff and will revise the side yard fence as described. He entertained questions from the Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] commended the applicant on incorporating some of the changes that were recommended during the time this project was heard. He said now that they have reviewed this project, they believe the wider front porches are preferable. They are glad that staff recommended this. Mr. Arvay said their Architectural Review Committee [ARC] still wishes that there was a little more to break up the buildings so that they will not be such a large building on this block. He said they will have more comments probably during Part II in terms of design details. The porch posts could be more nuanced; the brackets could be carried across the entire facade and there are some other elements. But, he will wait for the future design. Overall, they are glad to see that the overall height of the project was brought down. He commended the applicant for doing so. Hopefully, they will be able to work with the applicant on improving some of the details so that the project will be a little more dynamic and has a little more street appeal.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Ms. Fenwick asked if there is window and door trim.

Ms. Michalak answered that this would be a question for the applicant.

Mr. Ward explained that they do not show the trim at this point, but it will be on their next set of documents.

Dr. Williams made an observation concerning Mr. Arvay's concern about the ensemble and massiveness. He stated that two blocks between Barnard and Whitaker Streets between 38th Street, the five buildings form quite a formable ensemble. More than anything, it seems as if this project evolves these row of five, which he believes is actually ten houses. Dr. Williams believes the spirit of the project they are looking at is similar to these houses. He also wanted to echo Mr. Arvay's words to the applicant in making adjustments to the project.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve New Construction, Part I: Height and Mass for six (6) attached townhouses for the vacant parcels located 302, 306, and 308 West 38th Street with the following condition to be submitted with Part II: Design Details for review by the Commission within the next 90 days because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the westernmost side yard fence so that there is 5 feet between fences and buildings.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jerry Lominack

Second: Robin Williams

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Not Present

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

[14. Petition of St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church | 21-003314-COA | 10 West 31st Street | Staff Approved - Mechanical screening](#)

[☞ Streetcar Staff SIGNED Decision - 21-003314-COA - 10 W 31st St.pdf](#)

[15. Petition of Esteen Williams | 21-003541-COA | 2101 Ogeechee Road | Staff Approved - Roof repair/replace with conditions](#)

[☞ 21-003541-COA SIGNED Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[16. Petition of Greenleaf Construction & Restoration | 21-003586-COA | 211 West Henry Street | Staff Approved - Door/Windows with condition.](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec 21-003586 211 West Henry Street.pdf](#)

[17. Petition of Ward Architecture | 21-004004-COA | 629 West 37th Street | Staff Approved - Alterations and Rehabilitation](#)

[☞ Cuyler-Brownville Staff SIGNED Decision 21-004004-COA.pdf](#)

[18. Petition of Tom Hensley | 21-003867-COA | 1402 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Fence](#)

[☞ Staff SIGNED Decision-21-003867 1402 Habersham Street.pdf](#)

[19. Petition of Sangeeta Kumar | 21-003909-COA | 1023 West 41st Street | Staff Approved - Roof replacement](#)

[☞ Cuyler-Brownville SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-003909-COA - 1023 W 41st St.pdf](#)

[20. Petition of Brenda Steadman | 21-003868-COA | 1602 & 1612 MLK Jr. Blvd | Staff Approved - In-Kind Roof replacement](#)

[☞ Staff SIGNED Dec 21-003868 1602 MLK.pdf](#)

[21. Petition of Your Exterior Pros | 21-004158-COA | 1502 Price Street | Staff Approved - In-kind Repair and Repaint Siding](#)

[☞ Staff SIGNED Dec - 21-004158 1502 Price Street.pdf](#)

[22. Petition of Christopher Failing | 21-004205-COA | 203 West 35th Street | Staff Approved - Emergency Demolition of front porch with conditions](#)

[☞ Staff SIGNED Dec - 21-004205 203 West 35th Street.pdf](#)

[23. Petition of Nathaniel Snyder | 21-004121-COA | 2305 Price Street | Staff Approved - replacement of attached, accessory structure's roof](#)

☞ [Staff SIGNED Decision Packet 21-004121-COA.pdf](#)

[24. Petition of Matthew Thomas | 21-003908-COA | 120 West 37th Street | Staff Approved - Window replacement with conditions](#)

☞ [Staff SIGNED Decision Packet 21-003908-COA.pdf](#)

[25. The Savannah Historic Commission does hereby acknowledge the Approved Staff Reviews.](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Commission does hereby acknowledge the Approved Staff Reviews.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Kendra Clark

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Not Present

XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

[26. Stamped Drawings - July Report](#)

☞ [July_REPORT.pdf](#)

[27. COA Inspections - July Report](#)

☞ [July 2021 - REPORT.pdf](#)

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

☞ [July 2021 - REPORT.pdf](#)

Ms. Mobley reported that she accepts the resignation of Ms. Kendra Clark. Ms. Clark is moving to Texas and this will be her last meeting. Ms. Clark has been a beneficial member to the HPC and they will miss her.

Ms. Clark said it was an honor for her to be on the Historic Preservation Commission.

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

XV. ADJOURNMENT

[29. Next HPC Pre-meeting: Wednesday, August 25, 2021 at 2:30pm](#)

[30. Next HPC Regular Meeting; Wednesday, August 25, 2021 at 3:00pm](#)

31. Adjourn

Mr. Lominack stated that he has thought about this for quite some time, but he is resigning from the Historic Preservation Commission. This is his last meeting. Mr. Lominack said he believed that he might be effective in influencing high level of designs from the applicants, but he does not believe that he has been successful in doing so. He was also hoping that he would be effective in making changing to the Bylaws to decrease the disincentive for the design professional requirements for design for new boards in this city. He made his decision based on one primary thing: He wants to practice architecture in each of the historic districts that this Commission passes judgement on. He can not do this effectively if he can not represent his clients and their projects before the Commission by presenting their projects. It is unfair to his clients and it puts him at a huge disadvantage when being considered by potential clients for his or her project. Certainly, a Commission member should not participate in the deliberation or vote, but he believes he should be able to present and answer questions.

Mr. Lominack said he will submit his formal letter of resignation to Mayor Johnson and City Council tomorrow.

Ms. Mobley thanked Mr. Lominack for his service the last ten months. The Commission looks forward to seeing him on the other side of the podium.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Ms. Mobley adjourned the meeting at approximately 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Leah G. Michalak
Historic Preservation Director

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.