



## Historic Preservation Commission

---

Virtual Meeting  
June 23, 2021 3:00 PM  
Meeting Minutes

### JUNE 23, 2021 HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

A Pre-Meeting was held virtually at 2:30 P.M. 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  
Rebecca Fenwick  
T. Jerry Lominack  
J. Haley Swindle  
Dr. Robin Williams

Members Absent: Kendra Clark  
Darren Bagley-Heath

Staff Present: Melanie Wilson, MPC Executive Director  
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. Site Visits - June Report](#)

[📎 June 2021 - REPORT.pdf](#)

**Ms. Mobley** believed that a staff member found a site that was not posted.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that the site was not posted and, therefore, the petition was removed from the agenda. Later, staff was told that the petitioner redesigned his plan and had actually changed their design to the point where it became a staff level review. Consequently, this petition was removed from the HPC's agenda.

### III. CONSENT AGENDA

### IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

#### [3. Adopt the June 23, 2021 Agenda](#)

##### **Motion**

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby adopt the June 23, 2021 Agenda.

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

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Not Present
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

### V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

#### [4. Approval of the May 26, 2021 Meeting Minutes](#)

[📎 05-26-2021 Minutes.pdf](#)

##### **Motion**

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the May 26, 2021 Meeting Minutes.

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

Motion: Virginia Mobley

Second: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Not Present
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

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

### VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

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

**Motion**

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

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Second: Jerry Lominack

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Not Present
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

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

**Motion**

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

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Second: Jerry Lominack

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Not Present
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

**VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION**

**IX. REGULAR AGENDA**

**VICTORIAN DISTRICT**

[7. Petition of Array Design, Shauna Kucera | 21-002527-COA | 520-522 East Anderson Street | New Construction, Small, Parts I & II](#)

[📎 Victorian Staff Recommendation - 21-002527-COA - 520 E Anderson St.pdf](#)

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

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

**Ms. Aislinn Droski** gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Small, Parts I and II, for an accessory dwelling unit for the property located at 520-522 East Anderson Street. The proposed accessory dwelling unit (ADU) is to be 19'-10" from the rear of the principal structure,

5'-0" from the lane, and to have a western side yard setback of 3'-0" and an eastern side yard setback of 9'-0". The proposed ADU is to be 22'-10" in depth and 18'-0" in width, for a total of 412 square feet. The structure is to be 14'-6" in height and shall be subordinate to the historic principal structure, which is about 21' high. Additionally, new fencing and two (2) pedestrian gates are proposed to be installed, with one gate on each side of the new construction ADU.

**Ms. Droski** reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction, Small, Parts I and II, for an accessory dwelling unit for the property located at 520-522 East Anderson Street as requested because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

**Ms. Droski** entertained questions from the Commission.

### **PETITIONER COMMISSION**

**Ms. Kucera** thanked staff for her report. She entertained questions from the Commission.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF]** said they were happy to see the redesign of the main dwelling after not being favorable of the recent design. However, the HSF thought it was odd that the building, itself, did not have its primary entrance on the lane. In looking at similar structures, they felt that this facade should address the lane. Mr. Arvay said they understood that this had some impact on the interior layout. But, looking at this, they believed that if the layout was slightly turned 90 degree clockwise, nothing would need to be changed on the interior layout. The front entranceway would not only front the lane, but windows would also be allowed on either side of the door. The HSF believes that not having windows on that side was odd and visibly incompatible.

**Ms. Kucera**, in response to the public comments, want to ensure that when the drawings were being reviewed, that they were looked at correctly. She explained that the north elevation faces the lane and two windows are there. The entry door is preferred to be on the side elevation because of security and privacy reasons.

**Mr. Arvay** said they understood that, but they thought the front door to the dwelling should front the lane.

**Ms. Kucera** thanked the HSF, but said they wanted to keep the design as they have proposed. She solicited the Commission's opinion on this matter.

### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

The Commission was in agreement with the staff recommendation.

#### **Motion**

The Savannah Historic Preservation commission does hereby approve the petition for New Construction, Small, Parts I and II, for an accessory dwelling unit for the property located at 520-522 East Anderson Street as requested because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

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

Motion: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Second: J. Haley Swindle

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Not Present

[8. Petition of Sawyer Design | 21-002656-COA | 512 East Anderson Street | Addition](#)

- [📎 Victorian Staff Recommendation - 21-002656-COA - 512 E Anderson St.pdf](#)
- [📎 Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- [📎 Submittal Packet - Labeled Interior Photos.pdf](#)
- [📎 Submittal Packet - Exterior Photos and Updated Information.pdf](#)
- [📎 Staff Research.pdf](#)
- [📎 HPC Board SIGNED Decision - 21-002656-COA - 512 E Anderson St.pdf](#)
- [📎 Previous Submittal Packet - May 2021.pdf](#)

**Mr. Jonathan Leonard of Sawyer Design** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Aislinn Droski** gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for the removal and reconstruction of the eastern section of the rear addition and alterations to the western section of the rear addition for the property located at 512 East Anderson Street. The existing flat roof portion of the rear addition on the property is to be removed and a new addition is to be constructed, which extends an additional 4'-3". The existing gabled portion of the rear addition is to be retained, with the new addition to be inset behind.

**Ms. Droski** stated that this project was initially heard and continued at the May 26, 2021, regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission. While no additional conditions were added to the continuation of the petition, the following comments were made by the Board:

"The Board discussed that while alterations had certainly taken place on the rear addition, it appeared to retain much of its historic form per the 1916-1973 Sanborn Maps. It appeared to the Board that portion of the addition with the flat roof may be the enclosed open porch depicted in the Sanborn Maps. The Board indicated that they would like to see more information regarding the materials that currently exist on the rear, such as the foundation, as well as photographic evidence of the integrity of the structure. "

**Ms. Droski** explained that staff received updated drawings and additional exterior and interior photos of the existing rear addition at 512 East Anderson Street on June 2, 2021. The following items have been altered in the updated drawings:

- The new addition is to be inset behind the existing gabled portion of the rear
- The gabled portion of the rear is to be retained and new corner trim is to be added
- The window on the gabled addition is to be widened to accommodate a new window

**Ms. Droski** said that the applicant indicated that they agreed with and would follow the recommendations that were presented by staff at the May 26, 2021, meeting. Many are reflected in the updated drawings as well. The previous recommendations included:

1. Remove the boards on all openings.
2. Submit a COA which contains the required repairs and replacements for the main historic portion of the building.
3. Ensure that no portion of the historic main building is removed in order to accommodate the reconfiguration of the roof of the rear addition.
4. Provide the material specification for the rear addition windows.
5. Ensure that the foundation of the addition, existing and new, is finished with stucco.
6. Ensure all new wood elements are painted or stained.
7. Ensure the distance between the balusters of the exterior stair does not exceed four (4) inches

on center.

8. Ensure the gable end rakes of the reconfigured roof of the rear addition overhang at least eight (8) inches.

**Ms. Droski** entertained questions from the Commission.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Leonard** came forward and entertained questions from the Commission.

**Mr. Lominack** asked staff to show the regular floor plans again. He said it appears that the offset from the existing gable roof to the other part in the elevation does not read the same in the plan. Only one corner board is shown. Consequently, Mr. Lominack believed that there is a conflict between the plan and the elevation. The offset looks very small. Maybe the petitioner could explain this.

**Mr. Leonard** explained that the offset is six inches. However, Mr. Lominack is correct as only one cornerboard is shown on the drawings, but there should be two. They will add the other cornerboard.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Lominack if he was suggesting that the element that came off of the building should be more than six inches from the building.

**Mr. Lominack** explained that he was suggesting that the element not come out that far. If he understood it, the gable portion is the original portion. He was suggesting that the other part not come out close to this.

**Dr. Williams** said the portion that is being torn down comes out flush with the historic addition. As they two are flush, does this constrain them as to the length of the new addition?

**Ms. Droski** explained that staff did not find that this would need to be flush. There is historic evidence that there was an open porch at one time that was behind the facade.

**Mr. Leonard** asked the Commission to please give them the dimensions so they can include them in their drawings for the next submission.

**Mr. Lominack** said that he believes if the total was 12 inches, it would be appropriate.

**Ms. Mobley** asked that if these changes are approved, would this petition be able to come before the Commission at the next meeting.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that this project has been redesigned many times and it keeps coming back. But, this would depend on the motion.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF]** said their Architectural Review Committee (ARC) feels that the existing rear wing of the building, though it has been obviously altered over time, still expresses the original design of that portion of the house. Yes, there have been some alterations and the porch has been enclosed and there has been a loss of fabric. But, they feel that as the building currently exists, it is expressing the original design. Ideally, they would rather see this retained. If the HPC sees fit to allow for the new addition that is being proposed, they understand the petitioner's desire for some increased square footage, the HSF and ARC ask for two things: 1) It is what Mr. Lominack has already pointed out; which is the reveal be at a minimum 12 inches. 2) They find that the height is a little troubling. Their understanding of the ordinance is that the addition should be subservient to the primary structure. This is a small cottage and they understand that the petitioner is trying to match the roof pitch of that original addition, but it seems that the roof's height is tall. It is almost as tall as the original historic portion of the house. Could this be made slightly lower?

#### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Lominack and Dr. Williams** discussed the recess of the new construction addition from the existing gabled addition. The Commission came to the consensus that a minimum of a 12-inch recess would ensure that the new work was differentiated from the historic form of the gabled rear. The Commission amended staff's recommendation to include this item as a condition.

#### Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the removal and reconstruction of the eastern section of the rear addition and alterations to the western section of the rear addition for the property located at 512 East Anderson Street with the following condition because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Recess the new construction addition a minimum of twelve (12) inches from the end of the existing gabled addition.

#### Vote Results ( Approved )

Motion: Jerry Lominack

Second: Robin Williams

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Not Present
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

#### [9. Petition of GM Shay Architects | 21-001270-COA | 212 East Park Avenue | Rehabilitation, Alterations, Addition, and Construction of Accessory Structure](#)

[📎 Victorian Staff Recommendation 21-001270-COA.pdf](#)

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

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

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

[📎 Staff Research.pdf](#)

[📎 HPC Board Decision - April 28th Meeting.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet - April 28th Meeting.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Olivia Arfuso** gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for the rehabilitation and alterations of **212 East Park Avenue** with a rear addition. The applicant is also proposing the construction of a rear Carriage House. Two, non-historic rear additions are proposed to be altered. The first addition will be “refurbished,” while the second rear addition is to be demolished and newly constructed. The principal, historic building is proposed to be preserved. The deteriorated two-story front porch will be reconstructed, and a new rear deck will extend from the principal structure. The uncovered rear deck will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

**Ms. Arfuso** explained that the proposed Carriage House will be located along the lane and will be 18-foot-wide, 20-foot deep and (at its tallest point) 25'-1” in height. It will consist of a garage and a second-floor studio apartment.

**Ms. Arfuso** explained that at the April 28, 2021 HPC Regular Meeting, the Commission voted to continue the petition for the rehabilitation, alterations, rear addition, and construction of a Carriage House at 212 East Park Avenue in order for the applicant to address the following meets the standards:

1. With regard to the front façade and porches of the historic main building:
  - Revise the front porches to match the old in design, texture, materials, and other visual qualities by using physical, pictorial, and contextual evidence.
  - Revise the front façade door design/configuration to be historically appropriate for this contributing resource and compatible with the neighboring historic buildings.
  - Revise the design of the windows on the front façade to have lite patterns that are historically appropriate for this contributing resource and are compatible with the neighboring historic buildings.
2. Revise the "fixed" windows on the rear facade to match the double-hung windows proposed on the Carriage House.
3. Ensure that the shutters are sized to fit the window openings, operable, and that the placement of the horizontal rail(s) correspond to the locations of the meeting rail(s) of the window.
4. Ensure that the eaves extend no less than 12 inches beyond the supporting walls, and that the roofs have a metal drip edge covering all edges and a maximum seam height one (1) inch.
5. Submit information regarding the location of the electrical meters, mechanical equipment, and refuse storage to staff for review, and ensure that they all are appropriately screened from any public right-of-way.
6. Ensure that lighting specifications are submitted to staff for review prior to installation, and that the appropriate fence checklist/information is submitted to staff for review.

**Ms. Arfuso** informed the Commission that the petitioner provided staff with updated drawings on May 28, 2021. Staff has determined that the revisions made to their submission are compliant with the conditions from the April 28, 2021 HPC Meeting.

**Ms. Arfuso** reported that staff recommends to approve the petition for rehabilitation, alterations, rear addition, and construction of a Carriage House at 212 East Park Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that all wood siding on the principal, historic structural is repaired/replaced in-kind with wood.
2. Ensure that the custom-built windows have transparent glazing with no dark tints or reflective effects, and that the lower sash rails are wider than the meeting and top rails.
3. Ensure that the location of any necessary mechanical equipment is submitted to staff for review, along with an appropriate screening method so that it is not visible from a public right-of-way.

**Ms. Arfuso** entertained questions from the Commission.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Shay** stated that Ms. Latoya Waters was accompanying him at today's meeting. They are available to answer questions from the Commission. They are committed to meeting all of staff's conditions.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF]** complemented the petitioner on the changes made to their petition up to this point. They believe it is much improved. On behalf of their Architecture Review Committee, he wanted to point out four things. 1) Since the building was changed to a two-story porch in the early 20th Century, those porch columns on the second floor balcony have always been full length columns. This is currently what is there. They strongly feel that the columns on the second floor balcony should remain full length, floor-to-ceiling columns, and not placed on top of wood pedestals; 2) They also want to ensure that the baluster is no more than 36 inches high; 3) They have an issue with the porch roof. It is from the early 20th Century renovation and now, just like the columns, have retained its own historical significance. They believe that all effort should be made to retain and repair the existing porch roof along with the full length columns. If the porch roof has to be reconstructed, they believe that



it should be done just as it is now. The drawings, the renderings, currently adds a little more nuance to it. Mr. Arvay believed that the crown molding should not be built with a blocky-flat fascia, but should replicate what is here if it will be rebuilt. 4) If they look at all the elevations in the proposed design, there is a hodge-podge of windows. This is an accumulation of history over the decades as things have changed. It appears that the petitioner wants to leave most of the windows in place, which is fine, except they are changing the front windows. Mr. Arvay said if they scroll down to the "as is" drawings, they will see a multi-pane sash over a signal sash. They believe these should remain in place if the applicant intends to keep the other windows "as is" then why change these.

**Mr. Arvay** said they were hopeful that these four things would be added to the staff's recommendations.

**Mr. Shay**, in response to public comments said pertaining to the roof, the second story porch and columns they have found no evidence that they can point to except a photograph from the late 1970s or early 1980s. During this time, it was partially enclosed and, therefore, was not an open porch. They were persuaded that it was up to them to decide whether they wanted a single height or double height porch. It was recommended that they take inspiration from the surrounding neighbors. Ms. Waters and he have done an extensive survey of other two-story porches that were in the surrounding neighborhoods. There are quite a few such porches in the neighborhood. But, they tried not to replicate something that they had no evidence was actually historic. As he has said, they tried to do something that was compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

**Mr. Shay** said they do not have any evidence that the existing porch columns on the second floor are historic, but they do know that there are different types on the ground floor and they do not align. He knows nothing about the second floor roof that is there now and the columns that support it or the balusters. They have looked at some of the studies using full-height columns, but they were much happier when they compared it with the solution that has been presented today which was to create the concept of a major and minor order covering the columns that are on the second floor. They are not full height because the columns on the ground floor, the proportions are a bit skinny. The columns on the second floor look heavier than the columns on the first floor. He will not say that there might not be merit to some other solution or study, but they are much happier with the solution that has been presented to the Commission. Likewise, a conglomeration of windows that have been added to the building over time is an incongruity to the fenestration. But, on the front facade, they decided that since the major windows were on the ground floor and a very large one-over-one, that in order to provide continuity to the overall facade they want to use the one-over-one windows. Their clients were more interested in having something that presented the street with a facade that was in keeping with the other facades that are in this particular block face and have continuity. They are not trying to rebuild what's here, but they are trying to do what they were asked to do at the last meeting, which was to take a look at the surrounding neighborhood and get inspirations from the neighborhood. Mr. Shay said they do not prefer the full height columns because they believe they will end up looking heavier. If the Commission feels strongly about the multi lite windows, he believes this is something they can do.

### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

The Commission felt that full-length of the columns would better align with what remains of the second-story porch, and would more successfully adhere to the intent of the Preservation Standards. **Ms. Fenwick** motioned to amend staff's recommendations and add a 4th condition requiring that the second-floor porch columns be full-length. The motion was seconded by **Dr. Williams** and passed by the Commission.

#### **Motion**

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the petition for the rehabilitation, alterations, rear addition, and construction of a Carriage House at 212 East Park Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to Staff for final review and approval, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that all wood siding on the principal, historic structure is repaired / replaced in-kind with wood.
2. Ensure that the custom-built windows have transparent glazing with no dark tints or reflective effects, and that the lower sash rails are wider than the meeting and top rails.
3. Ensure that the location of any necessary mechanical equipment is submitted to Staff for review, along with an appropriate screening method so that it is not visible from a public-right-of-way.

4. The second-floor porch columns must be full-length in height.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: Robin Williams

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Nay
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Not Present
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

**CUYLER-BROWNVILLE DISTRICT**

[10. Petition of City of Savannah Code Compliance | 21-002481-COA | 631 West 38th Street | Demolition of a Contributing Building](#)

- 🔗 [Cuyler-Brownville Staff Recommendation 21-002481-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Application.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Signed Court Order.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Staff Research.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [HPC Board Decision - May 26th Meeting.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [HSF Letter of Intent - May 26th Meeting.pdf](#)

**Officer Joshua Downs of the City of Savannah Compliance Department** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Olivia Arfuso** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for the demolition of a contributing building in the Cuyler-Brownville Historic District located at **631 West 38th Street**. The City's Inspection Worksheet notes that a fire occurred within the building, and states that there is currently, "extensive interior fire damage, roof collapse, partial wall collapse." The inspector recommends demolition. The demolition of the building was ordered in Recorder's Court on **April 21, 2021**.

**Ms. Arfuso** explained that at the **May 26, 2021**, HPC Regular Meeting, the Board continued the petition for the demolition of a contributing building in the Cuyler-Brownville Historic District located at 631 West 38th Street to the June 23rd HPC Regular Meeting so that the *Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)* was given adequate time to contact all necessary parties, and further discuss the purchase of the property.

**Ms. Arfuso** stated that the historic building was constructed in **1925** and is a contributing resource within the National Register Cuyler-Brownville Historic District and the local Cuyler-Brownville Historic District. **631 West 38th Street** is an example of a shotgun-form house. On **April 6, 2021**, Michael Rose from the City of Savannah inspected the property and recommended demolition. On **April 8, 2021**, the property owners were notified that the Building Official of the City of Savannah had deemed the property to be unsafe, due to the 15 Code Violations listed in the Inspection Report. Therefore, the

building was declared condemned.

**Ms. Arfuso** explained that on **April 21, 2021**, the case was heard in the Recorder's Court of Chatham County. The Defendants (Derrick and Eric Brantley) were found to be "...in violation of several sections of the *Property Maintenance Ordinance of the City of Savannah*, as well as **Section 8-1037 (e)** of the *Code of Ordinances of the City of Savannah*." **631 West 38th Street** was considered, "...dilapidated; structurally unsound; unsafe; unsanitary; is dangerous to humane life; is a public nuisance; and constitutes a hazard to safety and health by reason of inadequate maintenance, dilapidation, obsolescence and abandonment." The Defendants agreed to the demolition of the building. On **May 19, 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. They have begun the process to reach out to the owners with the intent of purchasing the building.

**Ms. Arfuso** said as of **June 10, 2021**, no formal walk-through had been completed by an engineer and the *Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)*; therefore, there are no further updates regarding a protection plan for this threatened, contributing resource. She reported that staff recommends to approve the petition for the demolition of the contributing building at 631 West 38th Street as requested.

**Ms. Arfuso** entertained questions from the Commission.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Officer Downs** said they want the Commission to approve the demolition so they can move forward.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF]** reported that they were able to have an engineer go through the building. They looked at a couple of different options. But, unfortunately due to the extensive fire damage to the structure, rehabilitation of the existing building is not possible. They also talked about the feasibility of building a house within the current shell and could they engineer this. Mr. Arvay said anything is possible, but not within reason. The amount of time, money, and effort that are needed to do this, would be cost prohibitive. They had a contractor and an engineer go through the structure and look at several different options to possibly save the structure, but reluctantly he has to admit that this structure is beyond the ability to be saved.

**Mr. Arvay** thanked the MPC and the HPC for affording them the time and opportunity to look further into this. He believes this should always be done, but in this particular case, although it is disappointing, they do not have an outright objection to the demolition recommendation.

#### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

The Commission was sad to hear that the building will be demolished. They regretted that the type of house that was here will not be able to be built today. Hopefully, at a later time, the Commission will be able to discuss how people would be able to use historic precedent on vacant lots and have more variety. The house that was here was such a small house, but they imagine that the house that will be built here, will be much larger. How do they learn from this and be able to help the neighborhood?

The Commission thanked the Historic Savannah Foundation for doing its due-diligence.

#### **Motion**

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the petition for the demolition of the contributing building at 631 West 38th Street as requested.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: Jerry Lominack

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Not Present
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

**11. [Petition of Eco Friendly Contracting | 21-003243-COA | 2204-2210 Burroughs Street | Rehabilitation](#)**

🔗 [Cuyler-Brownville Staff Recommendation - 21-003243-COA - 2204-2210 Burroughs.pdf](#)

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

🔗 [Staff Research.pdf](#)

🔗 [January 2021 HPC Decision - 21-000077-COA - 2204-2210 Burroughs St.pdf](#)

**Mr. Andre Gadson** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Aislinn Droski** gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for the rehabilitation of the property located at 2204-2210 Burroughs Street. The rehabilitation includes the following work:

- Repair of all rotted/damaged materials on porches, replacement of all handrails, and installation of new wood columns
- Removal of existing metal siding to expose existing wood siding, to be repaired in-kind, as needed
- Coating the existing standing seam metal roof
- Repairs to the brick foundation
- Removal of the boards on all windows and doors

**Ms. Droski** explained that the work proposed for 2204-2210 Burroughs Street [File No. 21-000077-COA] was reviewed and then continued at the January 27, 2021, Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission in order for the petitioner to address the following:

1. Provide a material specification for the brick repairs.
2. Provide the configuration and location of the new wood handrails and ensure that they are consistent on both levels and in-keeping with the height of the handrails on the first floor of the porch.
3. Provide the configuration and location of the new wood porch columns and ensure that they are in-keeping with the historic columns on the second floor of the porch.
4. Provide information regarding the existing windows on the first floor. If the windows are wood, staff requests that they be repaired and/or replaced with wood in a historically appropriate configuration.
5. Provide information regarding what is existing and what is proposed for the boarded-up doors on the front façade.
6. Revise the material for the roof replacement to be a standing seam metal roof in the same configuration as the original and a metal drip edge covering all edges.
7. Ensure that any repair to the eaves and soffit is done in-kind, using wood.

**Ms. Droski** stated that additionally, the following comments were made by the Commission during Board Discussion:

*The Commission concurred with Staff's recommendation of a continuance in that there was not enough information provided to do a complete review of this project. Additionally, Dr. Robin Williams and Mr. Jerry Lominack, as well as other Commission members, discussed the originality of the wooden handrails and porch columns, as there appeared to be several different configurations present on the porch currently.*

*The Commission, along with staff, determined that the historically appropriate height for the handrails was present on the first floor and modified Staff's recommendation to include the condition that the applicant would present information showing the new handrails with a consistent height in the historically appropriate configuration. The Board, along with staff, also determined that the rounded porch columns on the second floor of the porch were likely original, or early replacements in a historically appropriate configuration. The Board added a condition to staff's recommendation to ensure that the new porch column's configuration was in-keeping with the rounded columns present on the second floor of the porch.*

**Ms. Droski** stated that following this decision, staff did not receive any updated information for this project and the application/petition for 21-000077-COA expired on April 28, 2021. On June 2, 2021, staff received a new submission for this address. Staff has reviewed this petition as a new project, due to the expiration of the previous submittal.

**Ms. Droski** explained that prior to today's meeting, staff received a call from a member of the public, **Mr. Ryan Arvay of HSF**, commenting about a hole in the elevation of the building as well as other concerns about the project which he will speak about during the public comment section. Staff visited the site this morning and found that a large portion of the structure is missing. Therefore, staff is now verbally revising their recommendation to request that the applicant provide a written description and materials specification for the repair to the hole on the northern side of the building. Additionally, she stated that staff is also verbally adding a condition that the petitioner ensure that no vinyl windows are installed in the building.

**Ms. Droski** reported that staff recommends to approve the rehabilitation at 2204-2210 Burroughs Street, with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Provide the brick and mortar specification for the foundation repairs.
2. Ensure that no vinyl windows are installed on the building.
3. Provide a complete list of the windows and doors that are proposed to be repaired/replaced along with the appropriate material specifications.
4. Provide a written project description and material specifications for the repair to the hole on the northern side of the building.

**Ms. Droski** entertained questions from the Commission.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Gadson** said the vinyl windows that were shown belong to the persons that are presently living at the residence now. The windows were against the building, but they are not a part of the requested rehabilitation project. The hole on the northern side of the building will be repaired. Once the metal siding is removed, they will use matching material to repair this side of the building.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF]** thanked the MPC staff for taking another look at this project. While they are grateful that the petitioner has supplied more material and information than they did at the last meeting, the HSF's Architectural Review Committee [ARC] is still

greatly concerned that there is not much detail in these drawings. There is so much deteriorated fabric on this building that is within the scope of work that to just simply say "we will repair in-kind" leaves far too much latitude for mistakes and/or willful disregard what is there. Mr. Arvay said there is so much deterioration on this one facade that if you notice is not included in these drawings. When there is that much fabric lost, there needs to be more detail that someone, HPC, MPC, or Code Compliance that if the work is not done probably that you can refer to. If there is not some reference to it in the plan and it is just a simple "verbal" agreement, then it makes it hard to enforce it later on. Therefore, whether it is siding, eaves or any other thing, they feel there needs to far more information in these drawings. He said the HSF/ARC are glad that the staff is requesting a narrative, but if more information is not put on paper, it is hard to hold an applicant accountable in the future if things are not done properly.

**Mr. Arvay** said consequently, they would like to see more detailed annotations and drawings.

**Mr. Gadson** in response to the public comments, said he has been doing this type of work more than 20 years. Whatever is on the building, they will replace with the same type of material. There is no need for them to put this on paper as they are only replacing what is there.

### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

The Commission discussed the in-kind concerns. They questioned whether an examination has been done on the building to see what material is below. This examination would be highly useful with photographs showing what will be done and how the work will look when completed. Ms. Fenwick asked staff to please respond to the photograph/examination statement.

**Ms. Droski** stated that this is not a requirement and she does not believe that it has been done as the petitioner was not asked to do this.

**Ms. Fenwick** asked the petitioner if he could speak on the exploration of covered materials.

**Mr. Gadson** explained that they pulled off the materials on the rear section to see what was underneath. From their exploration, they saw that lap-siding was used in this section. However, he is not sure if this sample type of material was used for the entire building.

**Mr. Lominack** agreed with the HSF/ARC that the drawings did not show enough information. He said the application does not provide enough information that is necessary to make a good judgment.

**Dr. Williams** stated that the windows are lacking details. He suspects that the windows have casing around them that are not shown in the drawings and that the current siding probably covers the casing on the windows. Dr. Williams recommended that exploratory work be done on all four facades. It is possible that the rear facade is different and should not be used as definitive information to show how the front and sides appear.

**Ms. Mobley** asked staff to please respond to this.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that staff believes it is highly inappropriate to have a petitioner draw existing conditions that are proposed to remain. These houses are low-income housing with expensive drawings that are being asked to be drawn of conditions that are existing and are not proposed to be changed. Whatever trim is there is proposed to stay; whatever windows are under the boards are proposed to stay.

**Ms. Fenwick** asked that for a building permit, is an architectural engineer stamp not required.

**Ms. Droski** answered that an architectural engineer stamp is not required for in-kind repairs.

### **Motion**

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the rehabilitation at 2204-2210 Burroughs Street, with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval

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

1. Provide the brick and mortar specification for the foundation repairs.
2. Ensure that no vinyl windows are installed in the building.
3. Provide a complete list of the windows and/or doors that are proposed to be repaired/replaced, along with the appropriate material specifications.
4. Provide a written project description and material specifications for the repair to the hole on the northern side of the building.
5. Ensure that existing conditions of the building are preserved even if not represented in the drawings.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Rebecca Fenwick

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Nay
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Not Present
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[12. Petition of Sasha Reyes | 21-001803-COA | 922 West 42nd Street | Alterations and Addition](#)

[📎 Cuyler-Brownville Staff Recommendation 21-001803-COA.pdf](#)

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

[📎 Submittal Packet - Door Specification.pdf](#)

[📎 Previous Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[📎 Before and After Photos.pdf](#)

[📎 Petitioner Presentation.pdf](#)

**Ms. Sasha Reyes of Acro Renovation LLC** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for after-the-fact alterations and an addition for the property located at 922 West 42nd Street. The historic building was constructed in 1930 and is a contributing resource within the National Register Cuyler-Brownville Historic District and the local Cuyler-Brownville Historic District.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that several months ago, Code Compliance placed a Stop Work Order on this property for work without a Building Permit and a COA. A COA application was received in March 2021. Major alterations and additions have occurred to the historic building. This project was first heard before the Commission on April 28, 2021; the Commission continued the petition in order for the petitioner to provide and redesign the following because the proposal was incomplete, was not visually compatible, and did not meet the standards:

1. Redesign the addition to:

- Have a 20-foot rear yard setback
- Reinstate the historic location of the rear wall of the main building
- Be differentiated yet compatible with the historic building.
- Be reversible.

- Be subordinate in height from the historic main building (and distinguish the historic exterior walls from the new exterior walls with an addition offset).
- 2. Provide the existing and proposed lot coverage (after redesigning the addition).
- 3. Remove the vinyl windows from the historic building and reinstall the previous wood, double-hung, single-paned windows with a 6-over-6 true divided lite pattern.
- 4. Provide a specification for the addition windows; ensure that they are a material and operable type permitted by the ordinance.
- 5. Provide a design for the new rear door on the addition.
- 6. Retain and repair the historic metal standing seam roof.
- 7. Provide the locations for:
  - Electrical meter.
  - Refuse storage.
  - Mechanical equipment.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends to approve the request for after-the-fact alterations and additions for the property located at 922 West 42nd Street with the following conditions because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the drawings and clarify that the replacement windows on the historic building will be wood, single-paned, double-hung, 6-over-6 true divided lite.
2. Revise the addition elevation drawings to show the proposed window.
3. Provide a specification for the addition window; ensure that it is taller than it is wide and that they are a material and operable type permitted by the ordinance.
4. Provide the location for the refuse storage and ensure it is screened from view of the public right-of-way.

**Ms. Michalak** entertained questions from the Commission.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Reyes** commented that all the pictures the Commission saw were done by a previous contractor. All the work that she is doing is paperwork to ensure that the project is done correctly so that they can begin the work. They want to ensure that the project complies with the requirements of the Cuyler Brownville area. Ms. Reyes entertained questions.

**Ms. Fenwick** asked staff if porch details were included in the drawings.

**Ms. Michalak** replied "no."

**Mr. Lominack** asked that the work that was done without approval be shown again on the screen.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that she wanted to reclarify the answer given relative to the porch drawings. She stated that there are more detailed drawings.

**Ms. Fenwick** asked if there were detailed dimensions pertaining to height or width.

**Ms. Michalak** answered "no," but she believes this could easily be achieved by the drawings.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes the rail is higher than three feet.

**Ms. Michalak** answered she believes that all of this is proposed to be removed.

**Dr. Williams** said the original building photo shows that the porch piers are centered on the asymmetrically located door, but in the presentation elevations and the proposed rebuilt porch has symmetrical piers that do not align with the door. The proposed front elevation is not consistent with the historic nature of the



building. The railing on the left is shorter than the railing on the right.

**Ms. Michalak** said Dr. Williams was correct. This would be a good condition.

**Dr. Williams** said he agreed with Ms. Fenwick. The proposed porch piers look slightly thinner than the original piers. Is enough of the porch's beam here?

**Ms. Reyes** explained that the bottom porch area where there is brick, the foundation is still here and she has all of the brick. They will redo this again as shown in the original picture.

**Dr. Williams** asked is there any evidence that the middle two piers had post columns that might have disappeared over the years. The span looks awfully wide. The piers are no longer available to use as evidence, but there still may be some evidence in the beams.

**Ms. Reyes** said she has not seen anything up top and on the whole structure, but she did see this in the wood porch version. There is some sort of white paint on it, she will look for that piece on the property and try to figure out if there was.

**Dr. Williams** said the building has two chimneys, but the drawings only show one chimney.

**Ms. Reyes** answered that there is only one chimney and it is shown on the drawings.

**Dr. Williams** stated that he does not know when the photo was taken, but the Google photo from 2019 shows a second chimney in the back.

**Ms. Reyes** said she was on the Google Street view and a second chimney was not shown.

**Dr. Williams** said the rear section of this building is new. May be the chimney was torn down then.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

The Commission discussed the front porch posts, pier dimensions, and chimney. They were in agreement with staff recommendations 1, 2, and 3. They deleted staff's recommendation #4 to provide the location for the refuse storage and ensure it is screened from view of the public right-of-way." They added two conditions 1. That the petitioner "provide front porch post and pier dimension to ensure they are consistent with historically appropriate posts and piers; and 2. "re-align the two center front porch piers and posts to be off-center to align with the front door."

#### **Motion**

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the petition for after-the-fact alterations and additions for the property located at 922 West 42nd Street with the following conditions because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the drawings and clarify that the replacement windows on the historic building will be wood, single-paned, double-hung, 6-over-6 true divided lite.
2. Revise the addition elevation drawings to show the proposed window.
3. Provide a specification for the addition window; ensure that it is taller than it is wide and that they are a material and operable type permitted by the ordinance.
4. Provide front porch post and pier dimension to ensure they are consistent with historically appropriate posts and piers.
5. Re-align the two center front porch piers and posts to be off-center to align with the front door.

### Vote Results ( Approved )

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: Robin Williams

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Not Present
J. Haley Swindle	- Not Present

## STREETCAR DISTRICT

### [13. Petition of Architecture 101 | 21-002871-COA | 2425 Bull Street | Amendment to Previous COA](#)

📎 [Streetcar Staff Recommendation 21-002871-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Mr. Steven Stowers of Architecture 101** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval to amend a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitation and alterations for the building located at 2425 Bull Street [File No. 20-002691-COA]. The amendment consists of: where new openings are proposed in historic and non-historic walls, the new windows will be wood clad, double-paned, SDL, double hung windows per the State Historic Preservation Office's comments regarding the tax incentives application.

**Ms. Michalak** gave the following background information: On September 22, 2017, Staff approved alterations with conditions at 2425 Bull Street including window and door replacement, exterior façade repair, replacement of the 2-story portion of the north side of the building and new framing and roof at the southwest corner of the building. [File No. 17-005511-COA]. On January 31, 2019, Staff approved the renewal of a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness [17-005511-COA] for alterations, as well granted approval for revisions to materials following feedback from the SHPO, at 2425 Bull Street, also known as the Starland Dairy [19-000323-COA]. With this submittal Staff received information regarding the review by the SHPO; "SHPO has requested that no PVC clad windows be installed and that the previously approved reclaimed wood siding be revised to a material that does not evoke a false sense of historical development. The previously proposed materials have been revised and are addressed under the visual compatibility factors regarding materials and textures."

**Ms. Michalak** explained that on August 26, 2020, the Commission approved the rehabilitation and alterations to this building again because the previous application has expired [File No. 20-002691-COA]. They approved the application with the following conditions:

1. Revise the window selection for new windows in historic or new openings to be wood, single-paned, double-hung, TDLS.
2. Provide a storefront specification.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval to amend a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitation and alterations for the building located at 2425 Bull Street [File No. 20-002691-COA] with the following condition to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Provide a manufacturer's window specification.

**Ms. Michalak** entertained questions from the Commission.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Stowers** said they are just trying to ensure that they all are clear on the rehabilitation and alterations of this building as they do not want to jeopardize the client's historic tax credits for this project. He said what was not being shown on the screen is a new wall with new openings which helps to define an entertainment venue for the hotel from a courtyard space in the back. Mr. Stowers explained that what was recommended to the Commission by staff was for approval that the windows be double hung and match the historic windows on the front. However, the recommendation and guidance they received from SHPO for Part 2 was that the windows should be differentiated in size and/or configuration from the historic windows. This is their third attempt as to what the windows should be. They are only trying to keep the windows a little more industrial to match the existing context in the courtyard and make them clearly differentiated from the existing historic openings on the principal facade of the building.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that this was staff's misunderstanding that the windows would be double-hung. Staff recommendation is that window specifications be provided regardless. Ms. Michalak believes that staff recommendation stands as is because they did not have an actual specification.

**Ms. Mobley** asked staff if the petitioner has the specifications that they need for the tax credits.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that staff is requesting this as a condition. Staff understands that this is to be a jalousie window; but, they do not have an actual specification.

**Mr. Nathan Fuller, Owner,** said Mr. Stowers summarized exactly what they are trying to do. He thanked the staff and Commission for hearing the petition.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**None.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

The Commission was in agreement with staff recommendation.

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve to amend a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitation and alterations for the building located at 2425 Bull Street [File No. 20-002691-COA] with the following condition to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Provide a manufacturer's window specification.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Jerry Lominack

Second: Robin Williams

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Not Present
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[Construction Townhouses: Part I, Design Details](#)

- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Project Description.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Research, Photos, and Drawings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [CONTEXT HEIGHTS.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Streetcar Staff Recommendation 21-003225-COA.pdf](#)

**Mr. Josh Ward of Ward Architecture + Preservation** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. 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 six (6) 20-foot-wide parcels. The building is designed with setbacks between every two lots which makes the building reads as three detached duplexes.

**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 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.

**Ms. Michalak** entertained questions from the Commission.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ward** thanked staff for the recommendations and for helping them to work through some design solutions during this process. He said regarding staff's recommendations #1 and 2, they are confused as the previous recommendation was to allow one foot setback with a special exception. This is actually what they were going to try to do. He said regarding staff's recommendation #3 - Reduce the overall height of the main building to be more compatible with the historic buildings on the block face to the east;" they prefer to keep the overall height of the main building as drawn. There are other buildings in close proximity with this height. Regarding #4 - Reduce the pitch of the main building hip roof; they feel the pitch is not too high; they prefer to keep it as drawn as well. In their experience, the pitch is not seeable from the street. They would like to keep the pitch height as submitted. Mr. Ward said regarding staff's recommendation #5 - Increase the front porches to a minimum width of 50% of the front of each unit; they will certainly increase the front porches to meet the minimum size and will probably extend it across the front bays.

**Ms. Michalak** clarified that the staff's recommendation changed. This is what she spoke of earlier. This was discussed with the Executive Director that they not recommend one foot as the petitioner would also need a variance from the 30 percent fenestration. Therefore, they decided to start at the actual requirement which is three feet side yard setback with 30 percent fenestration and then the Commission could discuss this at their meeting.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said their Architectural Review Committee [ARC]** agrees strongly with the staff on height. There may be other examples of comparable buildings within the overall neighborhood, but within the immediate context of the area, these buildings dwarf everything around it, not just the obvious smaller single story houses adjacent to it; but even the other two story historic structures. Mr. Arvay said he did not believe that the drawings show any context elevations of the proposed buildings in relationship to the old historic school building. This is the prominent monumental building in this neighborhood and these simple townhomes should not compete with it. They strongly encourage the HPC to address this matter.

**Mr. Arvay** said he does not know if it would be considered that the overall geometry of the building is massive, but they are somewhat disappointed in the overly simplistic geometry. He did not want to get into the comments that would be relative to phase 2. But, this is a prominent site and their ARC hoped that the design would be drawn from the rich tapestry of architectural design of the neighborhood; and that of itself is a lost opportunity. Mr. Arvay stated that the overall massive height of the building is too tall. This needs to be addressed first.

**Mr. Ward**, in response to the public comments, said they went back to the site and took some measurements along the eaves. The building that sits directly to the north at the corner of Jefferson and 37th Streets is 20'- 4". They realize that the buildings directly to the east are smaller, but he is talking about in the vicinity and there are buildings here that are actually as tall or taller. Mr. Ward said they are not trying to compete with the monumental building across the street, but this shows them that to its parapet, it is taller than the peak of their building. When you look at elevations, you are looking at a flat ridge that will be tall in the drawing, but in perspective it will not be perceived that way. He clarified that there are buildings here that are compatible with their building. He was hopeful that a lot of the concerns would be resolved in the next phase in the detailing of the building.

### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

The Commission was excited to see something come to this vacant lot. They were concerned about the height. Ms. Fenwick believed that it might be advantageous to have a full width porch. Mr. Lominack said the roof overhang pitch is encroaching into the neighbor's property. He agrees with staff recommendation about the three feet setback. Dr. Williams was concerned about the position of the hip roof. He said probably, this petition needs to be continued.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that if a Special Exception is granted, this would be granted by the HPC not the ZBA.

**Ms. Mobley** said the Special Exception has not been applied for at this time. She believed if the HPC is looking forward to continue this petition, the petitioner needs to be given some specifics pertaining to the continuance.

**Dr. Williams** said the Commission has not requested the Special Exception for the 1 foot setback.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that the petitioner would need to apply for the Special Exception. She said if the Commission is leaning towards the petitioner applying for the Special Exception, then the petition needs to be continued.

**Ms. Mobley** asked Mr. Ward how he felt about the direction of the discussion.

**Mr. Ward** said he appreciated all the comments and they are trying to keep the project moving, but if the petition needs to be continued at this point, he is willing to do so. They do not want to get too far ahead of themselves and find that some things have not been addressed.

**Ms. Melanie Wilson, MPC Executive Director**, explained that when the other Boards run into a situation where other information is needed, they continue the petition and have the petitioner come back to the next meeting with information based on what he/she has heard.

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the petition 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 to the July 28, 2021 HPC Meeting.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Jerry Lominack

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Not Present
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

**X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS**

[15. Acknowledge Staff Decisions](#)

**Motion**

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby acknowledge the approved staff decisions.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Jerry Lominack

Second: Rebecca Fenwick

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Not Present
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[16. Petition of Eco Friendly Contracting | 21-002993-COA | 519 East 40th Street | Staff Approved - Repair/Replace Siding and Windows](#)

[☞ Streetcar Staff Signed Decision - 21-002993-COA - 519 E 40th St.pdf](#)

[17. Petition of Eco Friendly contracting | 21-003006-COA | 520 East 40th Street | Staff Approved - Repair/Replace Siding and Windows](#)

[☞ Streetcar Staff SIGNED Decision - 21-003006-COA - 520 E 40th St.pdf](#)

[18. Petition of Delaney Erks | 21-002589-COA | 1813 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Signs](#)

[☞ Streetcar Staff SIGNED Decision - 21-002589-COA - 1813 Bull St.pdf](#)

[19. Petition of Bragg Enterprises | 21-002850-COA | 214 East Duffy Street | Staff Approved - Repair/Replacement](#)

[to rear garage with conditions](#)

[21-002850-COA SIGNED Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[20. Petition of Bragg Enterprises | 21-002851-COA | 910 West Victory Drive | Staff Approved - In-kind exterior repairs/replacements](#)

[21-002851-COA SIGNED Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[21. Petition of ECO Friendly Contracting | 21-003181-COA | 2116 Bulloch Street | Staff Approved - Windows, Roof, Siding/Repair/Replace with conditions](#)

[Cuyler-Brownville Staff SIGNED Decision - 21-003181-COA - 2116 Bulloch St.pdf](#)

[22. Petition of Sawyer Design | 21-003343-COA | 530 East Park Avenue | Staff Approved - Amendment to previous COA \(20-002613-COA\)](#)

[Streetcar Staff SIGNED Decision 21-003343-COA.pdf](#)

[23. Petition of Larry Watson | 21-003322-COA | 318 West 39th Street | Staff Approved - Roof repair/replace, replace siding, paint](#)

[Staff SIGNED Decision 21-003322 318 West 39th Street.pdf](#)

[24. Petition of Larry Wilson | 21-003321-COA | 315 West 40th Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair/Replace, wood siding in-kind repair](#)

[Staff SIGNED Decision 21-003321 315 West 40th Street.pdf](#)

## XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

[June 2021 REPORT.pdf](#)

**RECORD OF STAMPED DRAWINGS:** 1. 6-3-2021 | 525 East 39th Street | 21-002028-COA | Digitally Stamped for James Reardon | ORA 2. 6-3-2021 | 2602 Barnard Street | No COA Required | Digitally Stamped for Jerome Elder (Foundation Plans Only) | ORA 3. 6-4-2021 | 1813 Bull Street | 21-002589-COA | Digitally Stamped for Delaney and Ron Erks | AJD 4. 6-16-2021 | 530 E. Park Ave. | 21-003343-COA | Digitally stamped for Jonathan Leonard | LGM 5. 6-16-2021 | 607 W. 39th St. | 21-001973-COA | Digitally Stamped for Ryan Arvay | AJD 6. 6-21-2021 | 101 E. Anderson St. | 20-001867-COA | Digitally Stamped for Haley Linville (Signs Only) | ORA

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

[June 2021 - REPORT.pdf](#)

**RECORD OF INSPECTIONS COMPLETED FROM May 26 – June 21:** 1. 5-28-2021 | 19-006751-COA | 1815 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. | Passed (Two Permit Numbers for Apartment #A and #B) | AJD

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

[June 2021 - REPORT.pdf](#)

**Ms. Michalak** gave the report on the items deferred to staff. The report is attached to today's meeting agenda.

## XII. OTHER BUSINESS

[28. Plan 2040 Presentation: Historic Resources Element - Aislinn Droski, Assistant Preservation Planner](#)

This item was moved to the meeting of July 28, 2021.

[29. Gable End Rakes Discussion](#)

📎 [Gable End Rakes.pdf](#)

**Ms. Michalak** reported that at the last meeting, an interesting discussion was had regarding gable end rakes. She has done some research on this subject. Ms. Michalak read the Standard as written in the Ordinance which says that "gable end rakes shall overhang at least eight inches."

**XV. ADJOURNMENT**

[30. Next HPC Pre-Meeting: Wednesday, July 28, 2021 at 2:30pm](#)

[31. Next HPC Regular Meeting: Wednesday, July 28, 2021 at 3:00pm](#)

[32. Adjourn](#)

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Ms. Mobley adjourned the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Leah 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.***