



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
April 14, 2010 2:00 p.m.  
Meeting Minutes

**APRIL 14, 2010 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING**

**HDRB Members Present:** Brian Judson, Chair  
Sidney Johnson, Vice-Chair  
Reed Engle  
Dr. Nicholas Henry  
Richard Law, Sr.  
James Overton  
Linda Ramsay  
Ebony Simpson  
Robin Williams. Ph.D

**HDRB Members Not Present:** Ned Gay  
Gene Hutchinson

**MPC Staff Present:** Thomas Thomson, Executive Director  
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Director  
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst  
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

**City of Savannah Staff Present:** Mike Rose, City Building Inspector  
Tiras Petrea, City Zoning Inspector

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. [Approve March 10, 2010 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [03-10-10 Minutes.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval of meeting minutes of March 10, 2010. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle	
Second: Ebony Simpson	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

2. [April 14, 2010 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [04-14-10 Minutes.pdf](#)

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

3. [Petition of Haberdashery Eco-Fashion Supply - Katie Wells and Ashley Newsome - H-10-4211-2 - 225 West Broughton Street - Sign and Color - withdrawn at petitioner's request](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval withdrawal at petitioner's request. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle	
Second: Nicholas Henry	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

**IV. SIGN POSTING**

**V. CONTINUED AGENDA**

4. [Petition of Richard O. Mitchell - H-09-4196-2 - 625 Tattnell Street - Fence - Continue to May 12, 2010 at petitioner's request](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval to continue to the meeting of May 12, 2010. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Linda Ramsay  
Second: Nicholas Henry  
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Ned Gay - Not Present  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Brian Judson - Abstain  
Richard Law, Sr - Aye  
W James Overton - Aye  
Linda Ramsay - Aye  
Ebony Simpson - Aye  
Robin Williams - Not Present

**VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

5. [Petition of Brian and Jennifer Huskey - H-100325-4231-2 - 17 Lincoln Street - Projecting Principal Use Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of a two-sided projecting principal use sign.

**Board Action:**

Approval of the projecting principal use sign as submitted. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Linda Ramsay  
Second: Reed Engle  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Ned Gay - Not Present  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Brian Judson - Abstain  
Richard Law, Sr - Aye  
W James Overton - Aye  
Linda Ramsay - Aye  
Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye

6. [Petition of Morgan Godwin - H-100325-4234-2 - 101 Bull Street - Projecting Principal Use Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

**Board Action:**

Approval of the projecting principal use sign as submitted. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

**VII. REGULAR AGENDA**

7. [Amended Petition of Brian Robin - H-09-4201-2 - 313-317 West Broughton Street - Principal Use Projecting Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Present for the petition was **Mr. Brian Robin**.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report.

The applicant requests approval of a projecting principal use sign as follows:

1. The sign is a two sided 42" x 42" x 2" mahogany panel (12.25 square feet) with a V-cut silver stripes around the copy "The Crypt Pub" flat, 2-tone red sand finish letters. The scull logo is carved with a red-brown sand background and V cut silver stripe arch.
2. It is proposed to hang the sign from a laser cut steel batwing design bracket for a total sign height of seven feet. The bracket and sign are 10' above the sidewalk. The total projection is 3.5 feet from the building.

3. External illumination will be mounted on the brick wall on either side of the sign, downlighting the text. The light source indicated on the building elevation is the correct proposal. Information about lighting on the sign drawing is not proposed.

The historic commercial structure at 313-317 W. Broughton Street was constructed in 1917 and is a contributing building to the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. Modifications overtime have altered the original storefront entry designs within all bays of the building. A rehabilitation to restore the storefronts was approved by the Board on January 13, 2010.

The business maintains approximately 40 linear feet of frontage on Broughton Street. The property is zoned BC-1 (central-business) and the Broughton Street Sign District ordinance (8-3119) applies.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the petitioner has met the requirements for a sign upheld to the Broughton Street Sign District ordinance. However, it is restricted to place any signs on a structure that would disfigure or conceal any significant detailing of the building. Ms. Ward reported that the staff is recommending approval of the projecting principal use sign with the condition that it be relocated so as not to obscure nor attached to the cornice and that external lighting should be resubmitted to staff for final approval.

**Mr. Engle** asked when does the bracket become more significant than the sign. There is more square footage of bracket on this sign than there is actually square footage of sign. He asked if there is any guidance in the Sign Ordinance pertaining to this. They could end up with ten foot tall brackets to hold a four foot square sign.

**Ms. Ward** answered that a very large bracket that was put up for the Outback Steak House, but she believes this sign met some controversy when it came before the Board. She believes that the bracket that is being added to the building is a significant feature and adds to the design of the sign. They could calculate this into the square footage and she believes they would be within the allowable footage for the site. Projecting signs may have a maximum of 20 square feet. But this is not to say that this would necessarily be compatible. The petitioner showed her an image showing that the bottom is actually a little different. It is only 16 inches tall as opposed to the 20 inches.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Robin** stated that from the bottom of the sign to the bottom of the bracket is actually 16 inches.

**Mr. Engle** believes a projecting cornice is shown in the elevation, yet there is no cornice shown on the drawing. Either the sign will stand out a foot from the front of the building and, therefore, the brackets have to be wider.

**Mr. Robin** stated that the bolts bolt onto the top, above the cornice and below the cornice.

**Mr. Engle** said it is shown as a straight line.

**Mr. Robin** agreed and said that the cornices on this building has about three details and

stick out approximately an inch, but the remainder is a flat metal that is flush with the building. Therefore, it won't actually be affixed to the cornice, but to the brick above and below the cornice. Consequently, it will actually start at the top of the cornice and finish below the cornice. But, it should be no further than an inch away from the cornice .

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if he had any objections of moving it to comply with the staff's recommendation so that it would not obscure the cornice.

**Mr. Robin** believes the problem would be that when it goes up into the building it would be so far up in the air they would not notice that it is a sign for the business. If the bracket is put above the cornice, they would actually be starting about 20 feet off the ground. He believes if it was up higher, it would be too high. The problem with going below on the column, with the size of the sign, someone could actually touch the sign; someone's head could hit the sign or it could be damaged and it is an expensive, nice sign.

**Mr. Engle** said the sign would only be moved five feet higher. Presently, the top of the sign is above the cornice. The sign is only 42 inches, plus 16 inches. The maximum it would be moved is 58", which is less than five feet. Therefore, the sign will not be 20 feet in the air unless it is 15 feet in the air now.

**Mr. Robin** stated that all the other signs presently on Broughton Street are much lower. They all are below the cornices. He believes that when they get up this high on the building, it really would not be noticeable that this is the business; it would look like it is on the second floor.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Robin if this is the first time that he has seen the staff's recommendation.

**Mr. Robin** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** wanted to know if Mr. Robins had a profile of the cornice since a part of the project is to restore the cornice over the two storefronts. They need to see how deep it is. The drawings show it flush, but he has said there is one inch reveal. However, the photo on page 4 shows the cornice and he believes it is more than an inch.

**Mr. Engle** stated it appears that the sign was designed without any consideration of the building and will be superimposed on the building.

**Dr. Williams** stated that the drawing shows a section view, but it is not labeled in terms of its depth. Is it one or two inches?

**Mr. Robin** answered that he believes it is one inch thick.

**Dr. Williams** stated that even at one inch, the drawing on page 2 does not show this.

**Mr. Robin** stated that the sign would be brought out flush. They would not push the sign up against the cornice. They are not trying to damage their new cornice; it would be affixed above and below, but would be the same level all the way down just giving them that little area between the cornice and the bracket.

**Dr. Williams** stated that this is not represented in the drawing. He asked Mr. Robin if he has studied alternatives to the proposal of how low the sign would hang relative to the other signs. On page 4, there is a sign that is low at the last shop under the cornice. It is almost 13 feet to the bottom of the cornice. Dr. Williams asked Mr. Robin how many feet total is his sign.

**Mr. Engle** stated that according to the drawing, it is a total of seven (7) feet. It is a big sign.

**Mr. Robin** stated that he did not see how they could put the sign lower without a problem. They are trying to get a tenant in here that would be able to succeed.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the staff is recommending that the petitioner either lower or raise the sign not to cover the cornice as it would be a straight horizontal line across the building. If the petitioner lowered the sign, they would still need to meet the ten foot clearance that is required under zoning. Therefore, the petitioner would most likely have to redo the design, possibly eliminating the bottom portion of the bracket. Projecting principal use signs were on the building historically, but the brackets may be the problem and how they are affixed to the building as opposed to the sign.

**Mr. Robin** said they actually want to put their sign directly under the old Leed's sign.

**Dr. Williams** stated that if the cornice was existing, they would still be able to read the sign as it would not be superimposed on it.

**Mr. Engle** believes that if the lower wings were eliminated and the bottom of the sign was mounted at that level, they could have the upper back wings above the sign and it would still work.

**Mr. Robin** asked if the sign would hang from the cornice.

**Mr. Engle** stated that the sign would be a way from the wall. It needs to be redesigned so that it sticks out a little further. The wing could be above it, but it would not interrupt the cornice.

**Mr. Robin** stated historically the signage was hung from the metal cornices. He has documentation showing this, therefore, he did not see a problem have the sign in this area. Obviously, they don't want to put the sign in the cornice as they did during the old times as they don't want to damage the new materials. His concern is if they eliminate the bottom bracket, the sign would be swinging. They would be putting up a \$5,000 sign that would be swinging in the wind as it wishes and he believes this would be a disaster.

**Mr. Johnson** wanted to know what the staff recommends.

**Ms. Ward** explained that the staff recommends approval of the sign with the condition that it be relocated not to cover the cornice. The staff is comfortable to work with the petitioner to reach a solution as to where it should be located. Maybe the bottom bracket could be reduced or eliminated and still have some kind of mounting not over the cornice.

**Mr. Johnson** said the entire issue is not to cover the cornice. Possibly, the petitioner will come up with some other design not to cover the cornice.

**Mr. Robin** stated that he would be happy to work with staff and try to get the cornice issue resolved.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** asked if the way the historic sign is hung, clear of the facade, is permitted under the Sign Ordinance. Does it need to be physically affixed to the wall as proposed or can it be essentially suspended clear of the wall?

**Ms. Ward** stated that they are allowed to have a fascia sign mounted directly to the building or a projecting principal use sign. The projecting principal use sign would have to meet all the test for hurricanes, but there are signs in the district that are hanging that do not have a bottom bracket. They are usually under awnings, especially along Broughton Street, but they are permitted.

**Dr. Williams** asked that in the redesign if the petitioner was interested in revisiting the idea of having a hanging sign if it was clear of the building by a certain number of feet, could the sign hang down onto the cornice?

**Ms. Ward** stated that the staff is not objecting to this, they just don't want the bracket mounted over or on top of the cornice.

**Mr. Engle** said page 4 shows that the original sign brackets are still there. The brackets are also shown on the left of the first set of double windows on the brick. One bracket is at the top and one bracket is at the bottom. This is where they were historically. The cornice is approximately one foot below.

**Board Action:**

Approval of the projecting principal use sign with the following conditions: 1. Relocate sign so as not to obscure or obstruct the projecting cornice; - PASS  
and 2. External lighting to be resubmitted to staff for final approval.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Sidney J. Johnson

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye



W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

8. [Petition of Stratton and Mary Leopold - H-10-4212-2 - 720-722 Habersham Street - Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Attorney Harold Yellin** was present for the petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval to replace the exterior vinyl siding on the building at 720-722 Habersham Street with smooth finish Hardi-plank siding with a seven inch exposure and Hardi-trim with a pronounced sill on the window surrounds. The existing vinyl siding is damaged and has begun to deteriorate. The Master Shield vinyl siding product is no longer available and the applicant states that this request is consistent with a request for in-kind repairs.

The building at 720-722 Habersham Street was constructed in 1888 and was designated a historic structure in 2007 by the Mayor and Aldermen due to its contribution to the history of Savannah.

In 1983, the Historic District Board of Review approved the replacement of the wood siding that had deteriorated beyond repair with Master Shield vinyl siding, designed to look like weatherboard (File No. HZ-1167-83).

The standards in the Historic District Section (8-3030) of the Savannah Zoning Ordinance state:

*Where wood siding has been determined to be appropriate smooth finish fiber cement siding may be used on new residential construction, which includes additions. The use of fiber cement siding is prohibited on historic buildings as a replacement for existing wood siding.*

Hardi-plank has been approved on historic buildings as a replacement material for masonite siding and could be used in this case to replace vinyl siding; provided, that it is not used as a replacement material for wood siding.

At the request of staff, the applicant continued this petition from the February meeting to remove portions of the vinyl siding to investigate if the original wood siding was in fact removed, as was approved in 1983. Site inspection conducted on April 1, 2010 revealed that the wood lap siding is still existing in the areas where the vinyl was removed.

Deteriorated or rotted wood siding should be repaired in-kind to match the existing. If the wood siding cannot be repaired at this time, the vinyl siding may be replaced in-kind, preserving the wood siding beneath. This is a reversible treatment and, thus preferred. Hardi-plank cannot be used as a replacement material for wood siding.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends denial for the request to replace the siding with Hardi-plank.

**Mr. Engle** asked if there has been a discussion about window replacement on this building

**Ms. Ward** answered that she believes the petitioners intend to keep the present wood windows.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Attorney Yellin** stated that he was representing Stratton and Mary Leopold, the owners of the property. The Leopolds are in California on a family medical emergency. Attorney Yellin stated that this property has been owned by the Leopold family since 1919. As a matter of fact, this location was their first ice cream shop. In 1983, the Leopold family requested permission to replace rotten wood siding with vinyl siding. He showed the decision from the Historic Review Board and said that the Board will see that this decision does not require that the Leopolds replace all of the wood on the building with vinyl siding. Quite simply, permission was given to put vinyl siding on the building and this is exactly what happened. As a result of the 1983 decision, this building, as Ms. Ward mentioned is legally allowed to have vinyl siding.

In a meeting he had with Ms. Ward and Ms. Reiter, he believes that there are three buildings in the Historic District with vinyl siding. All three of the buildings are grandfathered and can keep the vinyl siding on its face and as the vinyl gets bad, they can simply put new vinyl siding on the building. Attorney Yellin stated that he is present today because they would like for this number to be reduced. They want the three examples of vinyl siding in downtown Savannah to be reduced to two buildings and then they could eliminate this building. As he is sure the Board is aware, the initial report was for a recommendation for "approval." At that time he does not believe that the staff was aware that there was wood under the vinyl siding and as a result, the recommendation is for "denial" because there is still wood under the vinyl siding.

Therefore, it seems that they are at a crossroad where what they need to discuss is what is meant under the ordinance by "existing wood siding?" He showed a photo taken from the Gwinnett Street side of the property looking north and said he was the Board could see just above the cornice, there are some places on this building under the vinyl siding there is no wood. The view shows that the vertical beams are actually in tremendous disrepair and falling apart. As customary with vinyl siding, there are many seamlines that run throughout the building face. There are some sections that do have wood. Some of the boards are different type and finish. He believes that over time since the late 1800's, the boards have been replaced randomly and some are rotten.

Attorney Yellin stated that he asked the contractor who will be doing this work to come with him today. He specifically asked the contractor if he tried to salvage the wood from this building, what percentage he felt would be salvageable? The contractor told him approximately ten percent. Attorney Yellin believes that the ten percent is a subjective number. He believes that all the wood siding would need to be pulled off the building. As they know, if someone tries to put a nail in existing wood siding, the wood splits. Therefore, they have rotten wood with splits. There is a patio area that is only accessible from the second floor and many boards are split. There appears to be all kinds of moisture damage to

the existing wood siding and there are areas with no wood siding where there ought to be wood siding. This brings him back to the discussion of the existing wood siding on the building. He stated again that in 1983, there was existing wood siding and a decision was made to allow the Leopolds to put vinyl siding over the wood siding. Now, 27 years later, there is still existing wood siding. They know from their inspection that some of the boards are good, but they also know that there are some split boards and many rotten boards. The request before the Board today is to replace the vinyl with Hardi-plank. The request is not to put wood siding by back up. Attorney Yellin stated that he knew that many of the Board members would love to see only wood siding, but this is not the request.

If the petition is denied today by the HBR, this will be their recommendation that will go the ZBA as well that they prefer to see the building in vinyl. He said there is a precedent. In 2008, the Historic Review Board approved Hardi-plank siding as a replacment for rotten masonite that was on the propety at 457- 467 Montgomery Street. There is no discussion at all in the report about the fact that masonite is a wood product. It is not a very good wood product. He could not tell the Board that the wood product that was removed from this building in favor of Hardi-plank is any better or worse than the wood they found on their existing building. He showed photos that he took of the properties in Hardi-plank so that the HBR could see the quality of the construction. He also showed a photo of the window treatment as well as the Hardi-plank siding.

Attorney Yellin believes the ordinance makes sense if they had a property in the Historic District tthat was entirely wood. It would not make sense to allow any petitioner to come before the HBR and ask to remove all the wood in favor of Hardi-plank. He believes that they have before the HBR today a unique set of circumstances. He stated again that he does not know of anyone else who has a 1983 decision from the HBR allowing vinyl siding. They also have a petition that has a deplorable state of affairs that the wood under the existing vinyl that is about ten percent salvageable. They come before the HBR with a very clear choice, which is vinyl or Hardi-plank. It is unfortnate that this is the situation that they find themselves in, but they believe that given the choice that Hardi-plank, just as what the HBR saw in the photo, is far more desireable than the existing vinyl siding or if they do continue the pattern of replacing, repairing and maintaining the existing vinyl siding, the existing manufacturer has gone out of business and they will find themselves actually trying to come close to matching the existing vinyl siding.

**Mr. Johnson** asked if the buildng has been inspected for termites as rotten or damage wood creates termites.

**Attorney Yellin** responded that this has been his experience also, particularly when it is behind vinyl siding as it almost closes the material and traps moisture. He brought the contractor with him today who might be able to answer Mr. Johnson's question much better than he. He went to the site and personally found that the wood is in terrible condition. Attorney Yellin stated that he believed that there could have been some termite damage, but the contractor said it looked more like moisture damage to him. He, therefore, believes that this is consistent with Mr. Johnson's question that there is moisture trapped behind the vinyl siding and it is also consistent with what the contractor says that most of the boards are not reuseable.

**Mr. Judson** thanked Mr. Johnson for his expertise, but be believes that the HBR is moving one layer deeper into the building that is not really their purview. As critical as the

structural considerations are they are for the building and zoning department and do not fall under the purview of the HBR.

**Mr. Engle** stated that in 1983, this building was not listed as an historic structure. Therefore, approval was given for vinyl on a non-listed structure and this is not the same thing. The Leopolds requested that this building be listed as an historic structure which is why the HBR is dealing with it. They are dealing with two different things and what Mr. Yellin has shown is that the deplorable condition is in the two-story section and not in the gable roof section. If they look at photo 5, north elevation, there is almost a flat roof two-story section. There is no wood left on it; it is rotten; there is no siding, no vinyl, there is nothing as it all has been ripped off. What is shown is a little bit of the gable on the north elevation and it is all cladboard. The entire elevation has been covered. Two months ago he went and looked at this building and called Ms. Ward. Nothing has been taken off the building in two months to justify to him the claim that only ten percent of the wood is usable. What they see is five percent of the surface and it has insulation with vinyl on top of it and they see a little bit of flaking paint on wood. Every historic house in the district has this situation. Mr. Engle stated that he did not see where this is unique. The two-story section is horrible and Hardi-plank would possibly be appropriate on that section, but he cannot see it here. It is explicit in the ordinance.

**Attorney Yellin** stated that he spoke with Ms. Ward and Ms. Reiter between the two hearings. The only real way to make a determination and be sure is to remove all the vinyl siding. This is something that they elected not to do. They went all over the building with sample areas and left exposed places that showed wood. They were not trying to hide anything; they could have easily just showed the corner and said this is how everything is.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the Hardi-plank was to go over the vinyl siding.

**Attorney Yellin** said that the vinyl siding at some point would need to come down. But, if the HBR determines that the Hardi-plank is not suitable, they are going to go ahead and put up more vinyl.

**Mr. Engle** replied that they would have to take off the vinyl anyway.

**Attorney Yellin** stated that they would not take down all the vinyl siding, just the pieces of vinyl that are buckling and the pieces that are in bad shape will be replaced with other pieces of vinyl as they are permitted to do with their grandfathered building. He believes that the Leopolds would rather not keep the building in vinyl; they want to be one of the property owners that actually removes vinyl from historic structures. It is unfortunate geographically if they were across Gwinnett Street, they would not be here today. Across the street, the old Rite-Aide building permits Hardi-plank as a matter of right. Whatever reason that Gwinnett Street was chosen as the dividing line and they have to abide by that, but the only true way to determine absolutely beyond a doubt is take every bit of siding off the building and it simply did not make sense to do this. They took down what they believed were reasonable samples and showed the good and bad.

**Dr. Henry** asked Attorney Yellin if he was saying that if the HBR votes against the use of the Hardi-plank, then under the law, they are allowed to use vinyl?

**Attorney Yellin** stated that either way, they will go from the HBR with a recommendation

to the ZBA because he believes that this would be a variance. If they are truly looking for Hardi-plank and the HBR recommends approval, obviously they would love to go the ZBA with the HBR's approval. If the HBR recommends denial and this is agreed to by the ZBA, the only thing they can do is to leave the building in vinyl. Leaving the building in vinyl would be unfortunate since the manufacturer has gone out of business. They would do their best to match the vinyl that is 27 years old with new vinyl. He believes that this would be a difficult thing to do. They have some concerns of how this would look, but the petitioners have made the election that they do not want to put wood siding on the building. The Leopolds' decision is to either keep the vinyl siding or to put on new Hardi-plank that looks a great deal like the Montgomery Street property.

**Mr. Engle** stated that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards say to allow the replacement in-kind. The real issue is that to put Hardi-plank here, they would have to take all integrity away. They would have to remove all the existing wood siding underneath the vinyl down to the bare stud and put on Hardi-plank. There would be no integrity left in the building. If vinyl is put back to replace vinyl, the original wood would still be there and someday could be restored.

**Mr. Judson** explained that at this point he is trying to focus on questions for the petitioner. He asked Mr. Yellin to read along with him the letter that the petitioners received in 1983 from the HBR.

**Attorney Yellin** stated the letter reads, "to replace rotten wood siding with master shield white vinyl double 5 horizontal siding." He said that the HBR also approved changing the color of the trim from blue to white.

**Mr. Judson** asked Attorney Yellin if at that time the wood was replaced with vinyl siding or was the wood covered with vinyl siding?

**Attorney Yellin** answered that he could only assume that the wood was covered based on the photos that he has shown the HBR today. There was no requirement that the wood come off. The decisions in 1983 were handled very differently than how they are handled now. Prior to his coming before the HBR today, in his meeting with Ms. Ward and Ms. Reiter they confirmed that vinyl siding is grandfathered for this building. Attorney Yellin stated that he agrees with this opinion. As long as vinyl siding is on this building, they can continue to repair, maintain, patch or do whatever they want to do because of the 1983 decision. However, he was not saying that this is a good thing, but merely telling the HBR what the petitioners are able to do. He believes that this building is one of three vinyl siding buildings in our Historic District and they believe this is their opportunity to reduce this number to two.

**Mr. Overton** asked Attorney Yellin if he would share with the HBR the Leopolds' feelings regarding replacing the vinyl with wood siding?

**Attorney Yellin** answered that the Leopolds' decision was that this was not an alternative for them. Replacing this building in wood, either means ripping all the wood off the building and putting new wood siding up or it means trying to salvage some of the existing wood boards, which would be very difficult to match. There is also the issue of the existing wood which is useable, but is not. The contractor has assured him that there are boards that you put the first nail in will split because of the age and quality of the wood. The petitioners

have expressed to him that they do not want to re clad this building in wood. The option that they have elected for this building are either to keep it in vinyl or Hardi-plank. He apologized that they were not here to tell the HBR personally.

### PUBLIC COMMENTS

**Mr. Gordon Varnedoe** read a letter from Dr. Stubbs who lives next door to the property informing the HBR that they are supportive of the renovation and reopening of the business at 720-722 Habersham Street.

**Mr. Jeremy Johnson**, foreman, stated that it is not feasible to try to save the wood siding. In 1983, when the Leopolds got approval for the vinyl, the wood was in such disrepair but Mr. Leopold wanted to do something quickly to make the property presentable. The product that the Leopolds want to put on the building will last for many years and is a low maintenance product. The product looks just as good, if not better than wood.

**Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation** stated that his greatest difficulty is trying to understand the Leopolds' motivation as they petitioned to have the building listed in the district as a contributing building. Now, this is really somewhat wrong in the sense that the vinyl that was allowed initially was a mistake. In 1983, perhaps this was not understood, but the vinyl siding is no doubt a contributing problem to the rotting of the wood underneath. He finds it hard to believe that the Leopolds would want to perpetuate this and believes they would want to correct this. Mr. Carey stated that he also believes that a false choice is being presented as he does not think it is necessarily vinyl or Hardi-plank. The proper thing to do is pull the vinyl siding off, examine the siding, make a known and not a speculative determination about what is salvageable. Then make a commitment to replacing the vinyl with wood. He understood that Attorney Yellin was representing the Leopolds interest that they would not want to do this, but this may be based on speculation that the wood underneath is not salvageable.

This building is in the Historic District whether it's in by an inch or a mile. On a prominent corner such as Habersham and Gwinnett Streets, they are trying to educate the community about important techniques in preserving and caring for buildings. Vinyl is discouraging; it is a toxic material and has been approved to be an ineffective material. Mr. Carey said he believes that the opportunity to replace the vinyl with wood would be great. There are many salvage shops in Savannah and Historic Savannah Foundation has salvage materials available and they would be glad to donate the materials if they can be used. He objects to the notion of the choice between vinyl and Hardi-plank. The Leopolds care about this building a lot and he believes that if they take their time, consider it and make a really informed decision when looking at the siding underneath and consulting with others, they could make a decision to rehab what is here, repair, do some partial replacement where necessary and really have a "show place" when they are finished.

### BOARD DISCUSSION

**Dr. Henry** said the letter of 1983 specifies the type of vinyl to be used and the manufacturer. With the manufacturing company gone out of business, what legal difference does this make? He believes that if the petitioners were to follow the letter, he would be saying that he has to use the particular manufacturer's product as this is what the HBR gave him permission to do.

**Mr. Judson** stated that obviously there is a challenge in real logistic.

**Mr. Engle** stated that the Leopolds asked to come under the jurisdiction of the HBR.

**Mr. Judson** asked the staff to clarify this. He said it was his understanding that the address qualifies it has a part of the Landmark Historic District. It matters not to the HBR whether it is a rated structure or not.

**Ms. Ward** answered that the building is in the district, but being a contributing structure makes a difference. Hardi-plank is permitted on new constructions and additions. Hardi-plank is not permitted on historic buildings as a replacment for wood siding. Therefore, it does matter that it is listed.

**Mr. Engle** stated that if it was not a contributing building and was just in the district would be one thing, but this is a contributing building and the Leopolds requested this. Whatever reason this was done, they cannot ask to have the building listed and then come back later and say they don't want to listen to the HBR or go by the ordinance. The ordinance says that the Hardi-plank is not allowed. The new ordinance is only four months old and the HBR is already being asked to ignore it. The Secretary of Interior's Standards say repair before replace and before you construct. They are not repairing.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she did not see how the HBR could vote to allow the request. She said that Attorney Yellin has stated that no matter what, they would appeal it anyway.

**Attorney Yellin** injected that he did not mean that they would appeal no matter what. The procedure requires that they go to the ZBA no matter what.

**Dr. Henry** said it is still not clear to him as to whether this is presented with an accurate set of choices. He was not sure if the petitioners would have the alternative of putting up vinyl and a manufacturer was specified in 1983.

**Mr. Judson** stated that to be clear, the choice the HBR has is to approve or disapprove the petition before them. He explained that the petition is to replace the vinyl with Hardi-plank. They may think about other options, whether they restore in wood, or whether they locate a manufacturer that makes a like vinyl, but the petition before the HBR today is whether or not to approve a replacement with Hardi-plank.

**Dr. Henry** stated that he understood what is before the HBR, but it is relative to their thinking of how this will play out in the future.

**Mr. Judson** said he believes that it is relative however misinformed that the 1983 decision might have been said to replace rotten wood. It was his understanding that wood was not removed, but covered with vinyl. Therefore, they do not have a situation that is irreversible. He does not believe the letter of that decision was followed and further compounded by the fact that the letter of that decision cannot be enforced at this time because of the inavailability. The HBR's motion today needs to address the petitioners' request to replace with Hardi-plank.

**Mr. Thomson** offered that the choices are the applicant can under the maintenance

provisions of the district, replace the vinyl. He does not know whether it has to be the same manufacturer and this could be argued if they applied for a permit. Or the petitioners can say they will replace with wood and then they would need approval from the HBR. Mr. Thomson explained that the choice of the HBR is to approve a finding of fact in favor of the Hardi-plank; or finding in fact not in favor of the Hardi-plank which will go before the ZBA.

**Attorney Yellin** stated that he believes they are looking at the issue from two different perspectives. He believes that some of HBR members are looking at whether hardi-plank is an appropriate replacement for wood siding. The Leopolds are looking at it as an appropriate replacement for vinyl siding. He believes the Leopolds believe that based on the 1983 decision, the building itself is a vinyl clad building. Now, they have to make a decision as to whether to keep vinyl siding in the Historic District or remove it. The way to remove it is by considering the choices before the HBR. The choices are should or should not Hardi-plank be allowed at this site. He said that the Leopolds truly believe the Hardi-plank is an appropriate replacement for vinyl siding.

**Dr. Williams** asked for clarification if the Leopolds are going to replace just the vinyl or replace the vinyl and wood with the Hardi-plank.

**Attorney Yellin** answered that the contractor has said that it would require replacing both.

**Dr. Williams** asked that not only would the vinyl be removed, but also all the original wood.

**Attorney Yellin** answered that it is the contractor's opinion that the 10% salvageable wood would also be removed.

**Mr. Engle** noted that if the HBR looks at drawing 10, all the trim around the windows would also be removed and replaced with Hardi-plank. They do not know what would happen with the cornices as there is no mention of them. However, he assumes that the Leopolds would want to replace the cornices with Hardi-plank also.

**Dr. Williams** stated that the letter of 1983 does not mention anything about the trim. It says they could replace the siding, but not the trim.

**Mr. Engle** said that the entire core of preservation is about fixing up the wood. He stated that he would be in favor of Hardi-plank on the two-story flat roof portion because there is no wood siding left and something has to go back on it. Vinyl cannot be put on bare studs. However, he is not in favor of putting Hardi-plank on the bulk of the building.

**Attorney Yellin** stated that he wanted to understand Mr. Engle's comment. He asked if he was saying that he would be okay with Hardi-plank on the eastern portion of the structure.

**Mr. Engle** answered yes, but not the gable roof section. The two-story section with gable is the original 1880 building would be his guess as the photo they saw contained no wood. They would not be replacing anything in this section as there is nothing to replace. If the Leopolds might want to consider coming back and saying they will restore the wood and they want to use Hardi-plank on the two-story section, he would be much more comfortable with it.



**Board Action:**

Denial of the request to replace the siding with  
Hardi-plank because it does not meet the standards  
in the Historic District ordinance (Section 8-  
3030). - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

9. [Amended Petition of Danielle Williams for McDonald's USA LLC - H-10-4219-2 - 246 West Broughton Street - Alterations, Awnings, and Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Mr. Judson** explained to the public that the jurisdiction of the HBR are the elements of development, rehabilitation, preservation or demolition that effect the exterior, visual quality of the Historic District. Specifically, including exterior appearance of structures within the Historic District. The HBR shall not consider the interior arrangement of structures. He pointed out additionally that it is not for the HBR to deal with the use, business operation, public right-of-way and other things that are the purviews of other boards. The HBR welcomes public comment and he expects that there may be public comments on this issue. But, the HBR will only deal with signage and architectural changes to the building. As much as the HBR welcomes public comment, he asked that any comments from the public be limited to the specifics of the architectural design as submitted.

Present for the petition was **Ms. Danielle Williams**.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report.

The petitioner requests approval of alterations at 246 West Broughton Street as listed

below. Changes from the previous submittal are identified in **bold underlined** type.

1. Repair or replace in-kind existing one-over-one wood frame double-hung windows.
2. Replace storefront windows with YKK and impact glazing on the existing masonry base.
3. Retain and restore original commercial doors on Jefferson Street.
4. Install new window opening on Jefferson Street. **The window will be a custom-made one-over-one, single-pane glass, double-hung, wood frame window to match the historic windows on the second floor. It is vertically aligned with a window above on the same elevation.**
5. **Proposed heat pumps have been relocated to the rooftop to be screened by the existing elevator shaft and parapet wall.**
6. Projecting striped awnings over storefronts, side entry and ground floor window on Jefferson Street and over the rear entrance at the lane. Astrup, Weblon Coastline Plus vinyl laminated canvas awnings in alternating stripe of **CP2707 Portlight Red and CP2709 Rust. Letters for "McDonald's" in yellow are located on the valance and the McDonalds logo at each principal entrance. Awnings maintain an 8' vertical clearance above the sidewalk and project 3' from the face of the building.**
7. Signs:
  - a. Projecting principal use sign: Translucent yellow prismatic arch attached to pigmented red background, four square feet. The "M" is illuminated by LED's the red background **is opaque and not illuminated.** Located on the southwest corner of the building mounted on a steel bracket. **The sign is 4' tall by 4' wide (16 square feet), projecting a total of 4'-4" from the corner of the building and maintaining a 10'-8" vertical clearance over the sidewalk.**
  - b. Fascia principal use sign: 17" reverse channel halo illuminated letters, copy: "McDonalds" to be **placed on Broughton Street elevation centered over the storefront. It is a total of 16.5 square feet.**
  - c. **Announcement signs, three square feet, to be at each entrance.**
  - d. **An announcement menu sign, three square feet, is proposed next to the ground floor window on the Jefferson Street elevation.**

The historic commercial building at 246 West Broughton Street was constructed in 1924 and is a contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. The property is zoned BC-1 (central business) and is within the Broughton Street Redevelopment Area. The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and the Historic District Section (8-3030) of the City of Savannah Zoning ordinance apply.

The proposed rehabilitation seeks to restore the historic structure while having minimal impacts on the exterior historic fabric. The Secretary of the Interior Standards states that new openings, if required by the new use, should go on secondary facades. The proportions of the proposed new opening on the west elevation have been revised to meet the 5:3 requirement in the Historic District ordinance. A new custom double-hung window to match the existing historic windows (one-over-one, single glazed, double-hung sash, wood frame) is proposed.

The petitioner has provided a thorough and complete amendment to their application going through each of the standards and how they were met. This information is available for the HBR's view.

**Ms. Ward** reported that the petitioner proposes to have two menu signs, however, the staff is recommending that the 4 feet square announcement menu sign be eliminated. Therefore, the staff is recommending that they have only one menu sign instead of two menu signs. The petitioner is presently undergoing the site plan review process with the City. A general development plan is not required for this project, however, the applicant is working with the City infrastructure departments including Zoning, Traffic Engineering, Park & Tree and Tourism and Film as a part of the sidewalk cafe program to develop an operations management plan that evaluate aspects of the business that may impact the public's right-of-way; specifically the walk-up window on Jefferson Street. A revised sight plan has been submitted and all the parties involved appear to be in agreement and are working together to reach a unified approach on how this will be handled.

Staff is recommending approval of the rehabilitation, alterations and signage as proposed with the following conditions: that the supplemental sign be eliminated next to the new opening on the west elevation because it does not meet the ordinance and to note that the approval of the awnings does not preclude the encroachment agreement that will be required of the City. Also to note that internally illuminated awnings are not appropriate.

**Dr. Williams** asked that on page 15 of the petitioner's submission was the awning there initially.

**Ms. Ward** believes that the awning plan has changed.

**Dr. Williams** stated that he remembers they had the issue with the heaters projecting out. He asked what is the ordinance regarding projections out into the lane because delivery trucks will be here and so forth.

**Ms. Ward** said there is nothing specific in the ordinance to relate to this. The petitioner will require approval by the Mayor and Aldermen. There is another extra level of approval because it is an encroachment over the right-of-way. She stated that recently, the HBR approved a balcony with area handlers on the back of the lane.

**Mr. Engle** asked what are the regulations regarding lettering on awnings and windows when the awning becomes a sign.

**Ms. Ward** answered that when an awning has a logo or lettering that is over 6 inches, it is considered an awning sign. They are allowed an awning sign at each entrance into the building. Anything less than 6 inches is not considered a sign.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the walk-up window would be considered an entrance.

**Ms. Ward** referred Dr. Williams's walk-up window entrance question to Mr. Tiras Petra, City Zoning Inspector as this is a zoning issue.

**Mr. Petra** stated that he would refer this question to the City Zoning Administrator.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Williams** stated that with regards to the announcement signs and the menu signs, the access window is considered public access because they will be receiving something out of the window. They would be allowed the signage on the awning as well as an additional announcement sign that is three square feet for credit card signs, business hours, hours of operation. The four square feet sign is actually for the menu board. At the access window, they would be allowed two pieces of signage. One as the menu board and the other as an announcement sign. If it is considered public access, the awning logo sign on the awning, they are showing this on the front of the building. Regarding the awning at the rear of the building over the delivery entrance, this is considered a stoop and they are allowed an awning at the rear entrance as long as they get the encroachment permit. They are allowed three feet of encroachment in the rear. Most of the stoops in this area project with concrete slopes out three into the lane.

They are in the process of developing a management plan for the public access and right-of-way. They have talked with Bridget Lidy, Randolph Scott, and Gordon Denny. She explained that the seating in front is still the same and actually gives the dimensions according to the sidewalk cafe permit and the dimensions of clearance of getting around the seats. Ms. Williams stated that she knew before discussion was held regarding the public access and right-of-way which is under the jurisdiction of zoning. The tree wells are under the jurisdiction of the landscape architect. They worked with Gordon Denny and he will allow at least three feet six inches of pavers in the tree well around the queing line at the window. She stated that they actually reversed the que to go back towards Broughton Street to alleviate the traffic around the tree well. They still have to submit a site plan when they apply for their permit. Ms. Williams stated that she will forward a copy of this to Ms. Ward. She stated that Ms. Ward addressed everything else in her staff report.

**Mr. Judson** stated the dimensions of the service window on Jefferson Street have been modified. He asked if this window will be recessed into the wall.

**Ms. Williams** answered that it is actually three inches as the ordinance requires. It will be recessed within the wall.

**Mr. Engle** stated that Ms. Williams said she reversed the que direction. He asked how was this done. How do they make people line up the other way.

**Ms. Williams** said they wanted to actually show the direction they intend for the people to line up. When people line up they will technically stand where they want, but with regards to developing a physical plan and management plans, actually handle five people standing in line. The HBR asked them to develop a plan and they took all this in consideration and worked diligently with the City through planning, cafe permitting and the landscape architect so that they don't impact the right-of-way traffic on the sidewalks as well as maintain the tree well and not harm the tree.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** believes that the projecting sign at the corner of Jefferson Street and Broughton Street is being proposed as the red square with the yellow "M." However, in one of the other drawings, it is proposed with simply an "M." He believes this could be from the previous application. However, they would prefer just the simple M without the red background. HSF remains opposed to the

walk-up window because a hole would have to be cut into the historic building and this is unnecessary. Mr. Carey does not believe that putting a window in has anything to do with the future of the building. It is not providing a hypen to a new building adjacent to it or providing some other use that would enable this building to be used. Therefore, regardless of the use for ordering food and any congestion on the sidewalk, HSF is opposed to it because it is an unnecessary intrusion into a history building and the historic fabric without good cause which does not have anything to do with economics, but has something to do with the building.

**Ms. Ward** stated that she believes Mr. Carey is correct as it is a carryover. She said they have received several amendments to the drawings.

**Ms. Williams** clarified that the submission is only in reference to the channel letters on the building.

**Mr. Judson** asked Ms. Williams if it was correct to understand that the projecting sign is the square.

**Ms. Williams** answered this was submitted in the other submission and is what they submitted initially. She said that one sheet is for the channel letters and the other is for the projection sign.

**Mr. Carey** stated he was wondering if the petitioner would consider using just the M sign; it must exist; it must be a possibility; this would be their preference.

**Ms. Williams** stated after presenting this as an option to their signage manufacturer because this is a high wind zoned area (hurricane zone), they could not guarantee a sign that would actually be structurally sound enough with just the small logo at the top connection without it being a hazard or liability to the company.

**Mr. Carey** stated that if the petitioner reduced their square footage area, it would become a much smaller item and would be more wind resistance.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Ms. Simpson** stated she believes that this is a wonderful design in terms of addressing and respecting the historic character of the building, but she is concerned with creating a window on the Jefferson Street elevation.

**Mr. Engle** stated that, he, too, is concerned about the window. He said he stated at the HBR's last meeting that the window was not meeting the 3 by 5 standards, but now that he sees it, he believes that it comes to what was said by Ms. Ward. How do they define Jefferson Street? Is it really a secondary elevation? It is obvious from Broughton Street, from Jefferson Street and is longer than the Brought Street elevation. Therefore, is it truly secondary? If it is secondary, the window does not matter. If it is a primary elevation, the window does matter as openings are not to be put in the primary elevations.

**Mr. Judson** stated that given both that the principal street is Broughton, the address is Broughton, and most of the defining architectural features of the building face Broughton. He believes that Jefferson is secondary. He stated that Dr. Williams might have a historical

perspective that he could share with the HBR on this issue.

**Dr. Williams** stated that he believes that Mr. Judson made some good points regarding the hierarchy facades on the building. He guessed, however, it is what the Secretary of Interior meant for secondary to mean. Does it mean that if the facade has limited public visibility such as three (3) to four (4) spaces between buildings where there is secondary facade or is it a publicly permanent facade? Dr. Williams stated that he believes this is the point Mr. Engle was making. He said the new aperture would be punctuating a design feature. It is not a continuous blank wall. It appears to be a recessed brick panel and runs four (4) bays of six (6) on the side elevation. Dr. Williams stated that on page 14 is the elevation view. It shows that the designer of the building took some pains to make the recessed brick area align with the windows above it and with the central four (4) bays. In effect it changes the character of the facade; altering the symmetry that exists in just this one case. Is it an improvement, serves a neutral effect or is it a detrimental effect on the building? Then, the larger issue is, do they want to condone the idea? Once they do so, they will be setting precedence.

**Mr. Judson** stated that no where do we have this view of this building; given the narrowness of Jefferson Street, you are either viewing it from Broughton Street or from somewhere along Jefferson Street and in no way would you have this distance from the building.

**Mr. Engle** said in looking at page 12 of the submission, you will actually get that view from Broughton Street; looking straight onto the corner, you will see both elevations. He said that two Secretary standards are applicable according to what Dr. Williams said. Mr. Engle read, "Number 2 - the historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations, features, spaces or spatial relationship that characterize the property will be avoided." Mr. Engle said, therefore, the HBR needs to decide if the long brick recessed with no fenestration has a spatial relationship to the rest of the elevation. He read that number 9, "new additions, exterior alterations or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features or spatial relationship that characterize the property." They are dealing with, "does this change the spatial relationships that are significant to this property?"

**Mr. Engle** asked Dr. Williams if he believes that the awning over the window further accentuates the intrusion of the window or does it soften it?

**Dr. Williams** answered that it definitely accentuates it. However, his concern is does it alter the design of the side elevation. Is the side elevation important enough to them as a side elevation. Undeniably, it is changing the elevation. The elevation is publicly visible and it all comes to whether this is a significant enough change to warrant at least a denial of that aspect of the request.

**Ms. Williams** stated that in looking at the overall design in this elevation, they tried to be very sensitive as to where they placed the window in relation to how close it was to the actual projection of brick that is in the expansive blank space. She said that she and Ms. Ward spoke about balancing the elevation more by adding an additional window on the opposite end of the building. However, in doing so, they would impact a larger percentage of square footage on the historic facade. Consequently, in being sensitive to the actual opening in the facade of the building and minimizing the square footage, the actual Secretary's verbiage states that you should impact the smallest amount of square footage on

a building as possible in creating new openings. Now, in placing the second window, they will more square footage, but it would balance the elevation. Therefore, they would be willing to go this route, but being sensitive to the building itself they would rather impact the smallest amount. On the original submission they had two awnings to balance the elevation and did not include the other window in trying to be sensitive to balancing the elevation in actual use of it. Ms. Williams said adding another awning to them would be a much more sensitive approach than adding an additional opening in the building. If this helps the HBR in their decision, they would be willing to add an awning if the HBR feels the awning makes a bigger impact of being here as far as visual perception of the elevation.

**Mr. Walker** stated that he is the owner of the building and when they look at the old pictures of the building as it currently exists, boarded up versus the new intentions of what is hoped to be accomplished, clearly from what he sees, improvements are better. They don't want to change the historical nature of the building. The changes has proposed are a minor intrusion. Mr. Walker stated that from the prior meeting they had, the McDonald's representatives indicated that it is a significant economic need to have the walk-up window; it is not just to put a window here as it might help. As he has stated, they said it is a significant amount. He believes if the line was long outside, people would walk around the corner and go inside. The entire idea is to get in and out. His experience with McDonald's is that they have fast service. From the drawings he has seen, cafe tables will be on Broughton Street, subject to approval. Savannah is a pedestrain city. People are everywhere; they don't want congestion, but he believes that this is an opportunity to have the building that has been vacant for 18 to 20 years significantly improved. A part of the reason why it has not been improved is that it will take a significant amount of money and McDonald's is willing to do so. While details are important, there are other things to look at.

**Mr. Judson** injected that he allowed Mr. Walker some flexibility because this is his building. However, they are at point in Board discussion where they are focusing only on details.

**Board Action:**

Approval of the rehabilitation, alteration, and signage as proposed with the following conditions:  
1. Eliminate the supplemental sign next to the new opening on the west elevation (Jefferson Street) as if it is determined by the Zoning Administrator to not meet the ordinance. - PASS  
2. Approval of the awnings does not preclude the encroachment agreement required from the City of Savannah. Internally illuminated awnings are prohibited.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle  
Second: Linda Ramsay  
Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Nay
Robin Williams	- Aye

10. Continued Petition of Shannon Lancaster - H-10-4220-2 - 322 East Harris Street - Demolition and New Construction of a carriage house

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Present for the petition was **Ms. Shannon Lancaster**.

**Ms. Ward** gave the staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to demolish a rated carriage house based on the structural condition and for new construction Part I Height and Mass of the replacement structure. This hearing is continued from the last meeting as the HBR officially cannot grant a certificate of appropriateness to demolish without the approval of the replacement structure. The petitioner has begun the application for the replacement structure.

The rear building at 322 East Harris Street is a two-story carriage house built ca. 1869. The carriage house has been vacant for a number of years and is a shell with considerable deterioration of the walls and roof. The City of Savannah has condemned the building as unsafe. A structural report has been submitted. The applicant is requesting to demolish the carriage house, and reuse the salvaged brick on the lane elevation of a new carriage house to be built on the same footprint.

The proposed replacement structure is to match the existing carriage house on the same footprint at the same height. The carriage house is two stories at 20'-8" and is 30' by 16'4" deep. The property is zoned RIP-A-1 (residential, medium density) and the Historic District Section (8-3030) of the City of Savannah Zoning ordinance applies. The petitioner has provided documentation on their plans that they are still within the 75% lot coverage. Therefore, it is permitted within the district.

**Ms. Ward** said that based on the structural engineering report submitted and the lack of remaining historical fabric that the structural integrity of the building no longer exists, the conditions for demolish have been met. When they start the new construction, we will be looking for them to salvage whatever materials they can from the demolition to use on the buildings which the petitioner intends to do. They will have to use new bricks in the building and the petitioner is proposing to match the existing brick.

She reported that staff is recommending that brick be used on the west elevation as opposed



to Hardi-plank. It is readily visible from the public right-of-way and should be consistent with the lane fronting elevation. The petitioner is proposing to construct a built up shed roof. Staff wants to know the colors and the materials to be used. Two-over-two double hung wood frame windows, three feet wide x six feet tall are proposed and will be recessed three inches from the face of the brick. Staff needs to receive the manufacturer's specification. If the windows are to be custom made, the staff needs something stating this. The doors are wood panel overhead doors with two, nine (9) foot wide openings. A six panel wood pedestrian door is proposed. Ms. Ward reported that the staff is recommending approval with the note that the apron to the garage must be on private property and not extend out into the public right-of-way in the lane as it could impact emergency vehicles and other vehicles. The staff is recommending approval of the demolition pending approval of the replacement structural and recommending approval for the new carriage house. Staff recommends approval in its entirety for Part I and Part II because it is such a small building with the following to be resubmitted to staff for final approval: restudy of the west elevation to be comprised of brick to match the north wall; provide a brick sample to show how it will match the existing brick; and provide manufacturer and colors for the roof and windows.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Lancaster** stated that due to Mr. Wiggins health, he is unable to attend the meeting. They made a few changes from last month's meeting. They are now proposing to use some of the building materials that are already in the carriage house. Last month there was discussion on having their carriage house look like the carriage house next door. In her research she looked at a Sanborn fire insurance maps and discovered that the next door carriage house has always been a dwelling and their carriage house has been used as a stable with apartments upstairs. There this confirms that using the first floor as a garage has historic merit. They considered having the brick on the west elevation based on the staff's recommendation and will be happy to submit more details on the colors and materials to be used.

**Mr. Engle** stated that presently a window is basically over the door. He asked why is it being eliminated in the new carriage house. This gives light to the interior stairway.

**Ms. Lancaster** stated that if they look at the floor plan, this shows where the proposed kitchen will be located. They did not feel that a window was needed here.

**Mr. Engle** stated that the interior layout is not a concern of the HBR. The fact is there is an existing window in the elevation and now it has been eliminated which is questionable if they are reproducing the carriage house, it should have the same fenestration pattern that is here now.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Lancaster if they would be willing to keep the window.

**Ms. Lancaster** stated that they will look into keeping the window. If it is feasible, they will put a window in the kitchen.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Lancaster that when she made her comment about what she found from the Sanborn records, one carriage house was a dwelling and one was a stable, was she saying that this would be justification for not having them mirror one another.

**Ms. Lancaster** answered that the window was never exactly mirrored. The carriage house next door has always been a dwelling with an entrance onto the side and has a building height higher than their carriage house.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Engle if there was an illustration that he saw that shows the existing elevation.

**Mr. Engle** said it is shown in the aerial photograph. He believes the carriage house next door has two filled-in carriage doors. He believes the two openings are now closed with brick. However, he does not believe that the two carriage houses were that different. Mr. Engle said if they look at the aerial photo, they will see the window more or less above the door.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Jessica Pedigo of Historic Savannah Foundation** stated that Mr. Carey had to leave due to having to make a presentation. Mr. Carey asked her to relay the HSF's concerns. The HSF does not believe that the demolition is necessary and, therefore, opposes it. If it is found otherwise that demolition is approved, they want to note that the demolition must be executed extremely carefully as there is an adjoining neighbor. HSF also agrees with staff that if the proposed plan is approved, the west side siding should be changed from the existing proposal to possibly brick.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** stated that if the demolition is to be approved, he believes that the petitioner needs to put back the two elevations as they are now. The fenestration should be identical; the wall should be brick as the staff recommends. The presentation is that it will be put back the way it is, not based on having a bathroom on the second floor.

**Dr. Williams** asked if it is HBR's decision whether or not the demolition be approved. He asked has it been determined categorically that the building is a threat to the public and public safety.

**Mr. Judson** stated that the building has been condemned and asked Ms. Ward if she wanted to further clarify.

**Ms. Lancaster** stated that the City has condemned the building. They have actually been on their case for the past six (6) months. Their building has affected the carriage house next door. Therefore, something needs to be done. They will take great care when demolishing as they are connected to another carriage house.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Lancaster if she made a commitment to reusing as much of the material as possible.

**Ms. Lancaster** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** asked if this is written anywhere and if this is enforceable?

**Mr. Judson** stated that may be staff could elaborate on this.

**Ms. Ward** recommended that this be included in the HBR's motion. Staff will require that this be noted on the petitioner's drawings. The staff will work with the petitioner as stated to come up with a brick that matches the present brick.

**Mr. Judson** explained that they need two motions. One motion would be to approve the demolition and one motion to approve Part 1 and 2 of the proposed replacement project.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the demolition approval would not be effective unless they approve the new construction.

**Board Action:**

Approval for the new carriage house with the following to be resubmitted to staff for final approval: a. Install new window opening over pedestrain door to match the historic house that is being demolished; b. Reclaim and incorporate as much of the historic fabric of the carriage house to be demolished as possible in the new construction; c. Restudy the west elevation to be comprised of brick to match the north wall; d. Provide a brick sample to match the esisting brick; and e. Provide manufacturer and colors for the roof and windows. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Ebony Simpson

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

**Board Action:**

Approval of demolition of the historic carriage house with the condition that all salvageable materials be retained and incorporated into the new replacement building. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

11. Petition of Pat Shay - H-10-4222-2 - 701 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard - Demolition and New Construction

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Sample Panel Guidelines 120309.pdf](#)

Present for the petition were **Mr. Pat Shay**, **Mr. Robert James** and others.

**Ms. Ward** gave the report.

The petitioner is requesting demolition of the existing Carver State Bank building and approval for New Construction, Part II Design Details, of two adjoining structures for Carver State Bank and Food Lion Grocery Stores. The proposed grocery store has a ground floor footprint of 25,018 square feet and is defined as Large-scale Development within the Historic District Section (8-3030) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance. The existing building at 701 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd was constructed sometime after 1975. It is occupied by Carver State Bank. It is not listed as a rated structure in the historic district and does not meet the criteria for historic listing due to its age.

The new Carver State Bank will front onto the property line at Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd and the Food Lion Grocery Store will front into the parking lot within the site. The businesses will share parking with St. Phillip AME Church to the north. All properties are zone B-C (community business).

Proposed signage for the church and details for the freestanding teller indicated on the plans will be submitted to the Board at a later date for approval. Details for the grocery signage must be submitted for review by the Board.

Part I, Height and Mass was approved on March 10, 2010 with the condition that the lintels on the Morris Brown Boulevard elevation be reduced or eliminated and replaced by glass to meet the minimum standard requiring 55% of transparency on the ground floor. Ms. Ward stated that the lintels were reduced, but it does not appear that the glass was increased. Therefore, the petitioner needs to meet this standard. The windows need to be inset a minimum of four inches and the glazing has to be recessed four inches from the facade to meet the commercial design standards as opposed to three which are residential standards.

We need specification that the proposed pearless windows meet the standards and will be recessed. We have approved the pearless window before in commercial buildings. However, the ordinance has been revised. Therefore, a specification sheet is needed to ensure that they are consistent with the existing ordinance. The proposed awnings will have metal brackets and are covered in metal to match the proposed roofing material. The height of the proposed parapet on the northeast corner of MLK is 8'-11" tall. The shed roof portions on the center will be covered with the pac-clad metal roofing and the awning material will match the roofing material. It is mostly a parapet, but there are some shed portions that are covered with metal.

The demolition was heard at the last meeting, but the HBR did not officially record a vote. Therefore, today a separate vote needs to be done regarding the demolition.

The staff is recommending elevating the string course at the base of the parapet. The parapet is extremely tall, but the height and mass has been approved. The actual shape and form of this is approved, but the staff is recommending that the petitioner elevate the string course three or four feet so that it will reduce the appearance of the height of the parapet. The string course would not be resting on the top of the windows as there will be a space. Then it will appear that the parapet starts above in order to be more consistent with parapet height of buildings in the district. Ms. Ward stated that this district generally has an ordinance and the parapets that are over four feet' tall in height are considered an actual story. She said the staff needs a specifications and a sample of the roofing material. The petitioner has provided material and color samples for the color of the roof and brick color and some of the other finishings, but they actually want to see how the ribs connect on the metal roofing and see whether there will be a coping at the edge. Brick is proposed for the main body of the building of the bank and the grocery store. The grocery store has 30' wide center portions of true stucco over masonry on the north and west elevations. Caststone lintels and sills are proposed within the masonry facade. The south elevation is concrete masonry units covered with fig ivory and brick piers.

The staff is recommending that the petitioner draw the line back and brick one be used for the bank, thus indicating the use of the bank building and then use brick two for the rest of the grocery store on the other portion of the facade to show that it is a part of the grocery store. The staff is recommending further that the CMU wall be painted to match the proposed vegetation of the brick color so that it does not stand out so much as CMU wall. Reclaimed wood is used on the sliding gate on the Morris Brown elevation to enclose this area when it is not being used for loading and unloading purposes. Ms. Ward believes that the trash containers will be located in this area and are required to be screened. The facia, windows, and storefront are antique white; the roof is penny color (bronze or copper), the parapet coping, metal railings and metal bracket are dark bronze. The mortar stucco and caststone are sand color, called tuscan sand, and the bricks are Georgia Maroon and Cherokee Red. The staff is recommending that a sample panel be erected which is generally the requirement for large-scale development in the district to see how the materials, colors, and so forth comes together and to serve as a quality control measure on the site during the construction of the project.

Ms. Ward stated that the petitioner has revised the site plan to meet all of the standards for the parking areas. Staff could not find on the site plan the area for the HVAC equipment. Therefore, staff is recommending that this there will be a parapet that the HVAC be located on the roof and screened by the parapet. Ms. Ward stated that staff is

recommending approval to demolish the non-historic non-rated building that is on the site. Staff is also recommending approval of Part II Design Details with a number of conditions that she has covered in the staff report.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Ward how high is the parapet as she stated it should be raised.

**Ms. Ward** answered that the parapet is 8'-11".

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Ward if she was suggesting cutting this in half and have a four feet parapet and string course.

**Ms. Ward** said the parapet could be a little over the four feet, but 8'-11" is excessive.

**Dr. Williams** wanted to know if Ms. Ward was speaking of the corners.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes. The height of the wall was approved and the staff does like that it is a different height than the rest of the building. However, the string course could be elevated a little more to reduce the appearance of the height of the parapet.

**Dr. Henry** stated that he thought that once the height and mass were approved that it was final.

**Ms. Ward** explained that she was not asking the HBR to change the height of the wall. What she is recommending is that the row of brick headers, which is a design detail, be relocated three feet or four feet up to give the windows some breathing room. This would reduce the appearance of the parapet.

**Dr. Williams** said there appears to be recessed panels in the parapet on the angle corner that looks like it could be signage.

**Ms. Ward** stated that there are a number of indications about signage. It says bracket and blade signs, but the specific details of the signage were not submitted and are not a part of this review.

**Dr. Williams** stated that this is a different panel.

**Ms. Ward** said staff is not recommending approval of it because the details were not submitted for staff's review.

**Dr. Williams** asked, "what is it?"

**Ms. Ward** answered that this would be a question for the petitioner. However, she believes it is a part of the signage package that would need to be submitted at a later time.

**Dr. Williams** asked how close to ceiling height is the current string course? Do the windows go right up to the ceiling or is the string course actually corresponding to the wall height? Is the ceiling somewhere behind the recessed panels?

**Mr. Judson** stated that may be the petitioner could answer these questions.

**Dr. Williams** said he asked these questions because string courses are historically a way to allow the outside the legibility of places where floors and ceilings are located.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Patrick Shay** stated that accompanying him today were representatives of the Coastal Legacy. He said that Mr. Robert James, II was present, but was called to an emergency meeting at Chatham County. Present also were Attorney Harold Yellin, representatives from St. Phillips AME Church, Food Lion, and Carver State Bank. Mr. Shay stated that they agree with the staff report and are willing to do all of the things that are in the staff's recommendations. As far as increasing the amount of glass area in the areas that were indicated on the approved height and mass, he and staff just need to get together to make sure that their calculations agree. They have no problems with raising the lintels and getting more glass in the area. Mr. Shay said they did not have a chance to do their calculations together, but they will ensure that they meet this standard. He stated that today he has the revised details that shows the windows and their distance from the face plain of the materials, which in all cases are a minimum of four inch offset. From the face of the brick to the face of glass will be at least four inches and in most cases will be more than four inches in accordance with the standard. He stated that the plan also shows details of how the muntins are handled on the Peerless windows above. The muntins are 7/8th of an inch wide and have the muntin bar between the panes so that it has the appearance of a true divided light, although it is an aluminum window.

**Mr. Shay** stated that it is not a problem for them to take the string course and move it up so that the portions of the recessed panels are the same and insert caststone lintels above the windows that would match the lintel pattern that is in the other area. The ceilings that are behind do not exactly match. He stated visually this is not a problem and he believes it is a good suggestion. It still differentiates this corner from the rest of the building mass and makes the building look a little taller. Mr. Shay said he believes that anything that makes the vertical more accented is a good thing. He pointed out that as the HBR will see the designation for the type of brick they initially had the type one brick coming to another point, but because they wanted the body of the corner to look more massive than it really is, they moved it back. Therefore, the facade will be the same color brick from that corner up to the point where on the inside of the building the transition is made from the grocery store on the inside to a bank on the inside. The difference between the brick on the grocery store and the brick on the bank will be subtle. They wanted to break up some of the massing along the broken facade. They agree with staff and will comply with their recommendation. Regarding the roofing materials, is the pac-clad which is a standing seam flat panel. It is one inch high and they will confirm that it is 12" between the panels. Therefore, it is a relatively traditionally look. He said the metal panel roofs were passed to the HBR for review. The color is copper penny. As far as the HVAC equipment on the roof it is, in fact, the solution that is preferred. He did not believe that they would be visible from any of the adjacent public rights-of-way. They will be submitted to HBR today for review. They would prefer to build the sample panel as this gives them the opportunity to build it out and make sure that everybody loves it before they build the entire building. This is an advantage to all parties involved. Mr. Shay said again that they agree with the staff's report and will do everything the staff says they need to do.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Shay if the brick for the recessed panel would be the same brick.

**Mr. Shay** answered yes.

**Mr. Engle** asked if they considered using the tapestry pattern on the two brick types to give it a little richer feeling.

**Mr. Shay** said he would consider it, but he does not know how to start once they get started. He could see the lighter color brick being darker because it would make it look more like a shadow. If this was the only place that it would be done, but he does not want to get to the point where they are mixing brick everywhere and string courses different colors. He believes that the sunlight would probably do enough to show the difference. As he stated, he would be willing to consider it, but does not believe that it is necessary in order to get the kind of depth in the detailing.

**Ms. Simpson** asked Mr. Shay to address the question the HBR has about the blank panel.

**Mr. Shay** explained that on the corner, it is a little smaller. On the height and mass drawing that they submitted this was shown as caststone. This is something that they would like to come back to when they do the signage. They will show that it will have "Carver State Bank" and may be the year "2010." It has to say 2010 not 2011. This would be insized into the panel so that instead of being a sign, it would be something more as what is seen on traditional buildings.

**Dr. Williams** asked if this is the area where the staff is recommending raising the string course.

**Mr. Shay** answered that it is already shown in the raised condition. It was in line and they sort of pushed it up so that the parapet still looks like it is approximately 4' high. The proportions are the parapet are the same, but the building steps up a little.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Shay if there would still be enough room for his signs to have the words.

**Mr. Shay** answered yes.

**Ms. Simpson** asked what are the dimensions.

**Mr. Shay** replied that the height of the panels is not quite three feet.

**Dr. Williams** wanted to know that where the brackets in black if that is to be an awning.

**Mr. Shay** said it is a bracket and he will be back at a later time to show the details of this.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Robert James, Sr., President of Carver State Bank**, wanted to assure the HBR that they met with the neighborhood groups so that they were aware of what they were doing. Mr. James said they have had no objections from any of the property owners on MLK. They had a massive community meeting where they used Ms. Lise Sundrla's mailing list of the property owners in the area. They invited all the public officials and had a great turnout at St. Phillips AME Church. They showed their preliminary elevations and had no real



objections. Mr. James said they are excited about the project and believe that it is a historic project. They believe, too, that it will change the character of this entire neighborhood.

**Mr. Judson** said at the last meeting it was obvious of the support from the community.

**Dr. John Foster, Pastor of St. Phillips AME Church**, said as Mr. James stated, they have been a part of many reviews and presentations. Dr. Foster said they enthusiastically support the project. It will be so much to the culture of their neighborhood and the ability for St. Phillips to reach out to more people. Many church members were present along with Dr. Foster.

**Ms. Lisa Sundrla, Executive Director of Savannah Development and Renewal Authority**, shared that they have had an amazing working relationship with the James family, St. Phillips AME Church, and the Food Lion Corporation.. It was wonderful working with JDH and others who are working on the project. She said over this five year period of time that the project has been going on, is a true commitment to this community in wanting to make sure that they are doing everything the right way with regard to redevelopment and being a pivotal business in the community and a catalyst for other redevelopments and revitalization. Ms. Sundrla congratulated Mr. Pat Shay, the James family, St. Phillips AME Church for all their commitment and their willingness to do the right thing for the community.

**Mr. Judson** thanked everyone for their comments, but pointed out that the public comments address the design issues specifically that are before the HBR.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Judson** reminded the HBR that they need a motion to approve the demolition as a part of their consideration today as they did not do so last month.

**Dr. Williams** stated that although Carver State Bank building is officially non-historic, he asked if there is a provision that this could be made as a part of the demolition approval for some kind of documentation to this effect. He stated that at some point in the future, someone may look back at the building and say although it was the right decision at the time, it is sad that they did not make the effort to document it. Dr. Williams said 25 or 30 years later, someone looking at the building might say it was a really fine example of 70's modernism.

**Mr. Judson** asked Ms. Ward for comments on Dr. Williams' question.

**Ms. Ward** answered that the ordinance does allow that in granting a certificate of appropriateness for demolition the Board may impose such reasonable and additional stipulations as will best fulfill the purposes of the ordinance. Therefore, she believes that allowing a photo documentation or some type of survey of the demolition would be within the HBR's purview.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the original architectural drawings exist for the bank.

**Mr. James** stated that they have the architectural drawings.

**Board Action:**

Approval to demolish non-historic Carver State Bank. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Not Present

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

**Board Action:**

Approval of Part II, Design Details with the following conditions: a. Glazing on the ground floor, west façade, maintains windows or doors over 55% of the façade. b. Windows to be inset not less than 4" from the face of the building. c. Demonstrate that the standards for windows, specific to muntins, are met. d. Elevate the height of the string course at the base of the parapet on the northeast corner 3-4' to reduce the overall height of the 8'-11" tall parapet. e. Provide specifications or material sample of the proposed metal roofing material and the brackets below the shed roofs on the north and west elevations. f. Revise the brick on the north elevation to be consistent with the building layout. g. Locate HVAC equipment on the roof. h. Sample Panel to be erected on site and approved by staff prior to installation of finish materials. See attached Sample Panel Guidelines for further specifications. - PASS

Approval does not include any signage (for the bank, grocery, or church) or the freestanding teller.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

12. Petition of Neil Dawson - H-100325-4232-2 - 109 East Oglethorpe Avenue - Rehabilitation and Alterations

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Present for the petition was **Mr. Neil Dawson**.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report.

The applicant requests approval on rear elevation to: remove existing metal fire stair; remove existing concrete stair; remove existing masonry planter; remove existing window 4<sup>th</sup> floor second from west and wall down to floor level to install a door. Remove existing door 4<sup>th</sup> floor. Install new four story full width wood porch with 10 “ square posts (cap and base mold). The porch will project ten feet. The base columns will be stuccoed. At the second and third floors install louvered privacy wall and louvered door at location specified on the plans. Also install new louvered wood panels between posts at top of second and third floors. Install new wood access stair within the confines of the porch.

Front (Oglethorpe Avenue) elevation: Remove the existing awning and metal posts at basement level; remove non-historic window and door at the basement level shop entrance; remove 5 non-historic two-over-two and one-over-one windows at 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors. Install a new custom wood door with glass lites to fit within existing opening at basement level. Install 6/6 wood true divided light windows in openings to match those at 4<sup>th</sup> floor level. The basement level opening will be increased slightly in length to allow more light into the interior.

The structure was built in 1820-1821 by Matthew Lufburrow and Thomas Clark. It is a fine example of Federal architecture in Savannah and has gone through a number of alterations including the addition of a 4<sup>th</sup> story, Victorian entry doors and window replacements. A non-historic metal porch was added at the basement entry.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends elimination of the black canvas awning as proposed and replace with a black awning over the door. This will give greater exposure to the new shop window and will reveal character-defining features of the façade such as the

brownstone water table band. The ground floor window size could also be increased to match those at the parlor level to allow more light and greater exposure. Staff recommends approval for the proposed alterations to the rear as submitted; approval to the proposed front alterations with the condition that the awning be reduced and not obscure any character defining features and that the revised drawings of the changes be submitted to staff for final approval.

**Dr. Williams** asked what is the age of the 2-over-2 windows on the 3rd floor.

**Ms. Ward** answered that the applicant could answer this question better than she. However, the windows may be when the Victorian alterations were done.

**Dr. Williams** asked that if an alteration was done more than 50 years ago, it could technically be historic even if it is not from the original date of the building.

**Ms. Ward** replied yes.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the changes are older than 50 years and/or deemed to start, the Secretary of Interior may recommend keeping them?

**Ms. Ward** answered yes, in some cases. But, she believes it is reviewed on a case-by-case basis. If they are historic, they continue to tell the story of the building. Staff is comfortable with the proposed replacement of the windows to better take the building back to its date. However, there is another point of view on this. Therefore, she believes it is worth discussing.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Dawson** stated that with regards to the staff's recommendation, they agree that the canopy over the door is a good change. They don't believe, however, that there is any benefit in trying to enlarge the window, although, it would be beneficial for the owner to have a larger window. The ceiling framing is right at this level. Consequently, they could not take it up and it doesn't make sense to make it more detrimental. They are slightly enlarging it and they feel this is good enough. Removing the awning lets in more light and he believes this serves the purpose. With regards to the height of the awning, presently the door is only 6'-2" tall. Therefore, he set the awning at 6'-8" which is the minimum code for any kind of ADA clearance. While it does obstruct the belt course slightly, they believe if it was over the door it would be a minimal intrusion. The awning will be fabricated so that they don't cut into the brownstone. Mr. Dawson said they respectfully request that the height remain 6'-8" as indicated on their drawings.

Regarding the louvers in the back, they have done an architectural feature that is very common in the Historic District. They give a second layer of design detail to the porch and bring down the effective height of the porches. Otherwise, they would appear to be very tall and slender with a thin porch belt line. The second layer of louvers give some visual break to the overall elevation so that the second and third floors are the right proportions. This is why the louver panels were added.

Mr. Dawson stated regarding the 1st floor windows, he believes it is probably best to go back to the cover sheet. It is a fairly unusual example. Their initial submittal kept the 2-

over-2 windows, but he does agree with everybody's suggestions that they are Victorian and probably have achieved historic significance. He guessed the windows are from the 1880s or 1920s. The 1st parlor level windows are not, it is tough to judge a 1-over-1 window, but just looking at the woodwork, it is probably 1940 or 1950. But, he believes this would make it historic, too, as it is more than 50 years old. Normally, he would say that they would keep this, but they have a specific condition of a sister home, which is basically a double house. Therefore, they felt it was more important to try to be consistent and take more of a restoration approach on the facade rather than a rehabilitation approach. They feel it is more important to maintain the historic character that matches the sister structure. Their neighbor next door has also asked if they would replicate the existing Federal entry piece. Mr. Dawson said the owners have agreed to do so; he wants to get the HBR's feedback on this. If the HBR agrees, they will submit the details to staff.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Dawson to elaborate on what this would entail.

**Mr. Engle** asked if they would remove the fourth floor.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that he believes the fourth floor was a part of the original house. He stated that he did not have a reference on this, but if they look at the cornice brick work that is done with considerably poor quality than the work below. Whereas their brick work remains consistent all the way to the top and has a much more refined architectural style. Mr. Dawson guessed that this structure burnt and was torn down to this level. Certainly, this brick is not the original.

**Mr. Engle** said this could be verified by the tax assessors's office and find out when the value increased. This is how the documentation is done.

**Mr. Dawson** said this would have been during the Victorian era. He did not know if he would be successful in this research. However, their intent is and Mr. Braswell, their neighbor, asked that they take more of a true restoration approach to match the sister house. They will have a Victorian window and an entry element that would have the same look. This was only at the neighbor's suggestion and it is not something that he feels strongly about. He believes that the existing entrance is fine

**Ms. Simpson** asked when was the existing entrance.

**Mr. Dawson** said this was probably during the Victorian restoration. He guessed it would be the 1880s or 1890s. He does not have a problem keeping it.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the doors were recessed two feet.

**Mr. Dawson** answered yes; it is one of the traditional elements where they the second set of doors from the outside, although they appear to have been removed.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the outer pair of doors were evidence of hinges anchoring and now these door are gone and now they just have the enter pair of doors.

**Mr. Dawson** answered yes, in the Victorian style which they would expect to see.

**Dr. Williams** stated that without altering what is already here, put back a pair of doors that

gave it a little more compatibility.

**Mr. Dawson** asked Dr. Williams if he was saying maintain the existing Victorian character and just add the original outer doors.

**Dr. Williams** answered yes, as this might eliminate the shadowy recess.

**Mr. Dawson** said he would find it a shame to discard a beautiful Victorian door. Therefore, he prefers to keep what is here.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the rear elevation windows are all intact.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that the rear elevation is an addition. They really have no bearing on the facade.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that the wall section through the new canopy shows storefront.

**Mr. Dawson** explained that their original submittal had storefront and they met with staff and was quickly convinced to change this.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that the columns on the bottom level are not under the columns on the second floor; especially the far right column.

**Mr. Dawson** said certainly their intent is that they be square and centered underneath the columns above. He believes that this is a drawing migration error. In checking the drawings, Mr. Dawson stated that Ms. Ramsay was correct, it is not shown as such on their drawings, but they will correct the drawings.

**Mr. Engle** stated that Standard three is not only applicable to the windows, it is also applicable to the entrance doors. He read that "each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development such as adding congesture features or elements from other historical properties or periods will not be undertaken." He said this was Victorianized all over Savannah in the 1870s and 1880s. Ceilings were being raised on the inside of buildings and adding a fourth floor. Mr. Engle believes that what they are looking at is it is conjecture to say the building next door burned down and yet they match. They don't know this. What they have now is that the historic fabric is 100 years old and they should be preserving it. If the petitioner wants to do a historic structures report and do an indepth fabric analysis and then come back and say they want to restore this building. But, until the petitioner gets the documentation, it all is conjecture. Mr. Engle said he would change the 1-over-1 and make them 2-over-2 as he believes there is adequate evidence to indicate that they were 2-over-2.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Jessica Pedigo of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** stated that they agree with the staff and appreciate the 6-over-6 windows. Ms. Pedigo said she was told that someone might have a different opinion. Just as the neighbor, they are asking that the front door be

restored to the original flush with the facade of the building.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** wanted to know what is happening with the ground floor windows. Will they be 6-over-6?

**Mr. Dawson** said they are proposing that the windows be 6-over-6. The windows are smaller than the windows on the sister house on the garden level. This is the one that they are proposing to match. They can see the hatch marks over the existing window. This shows the size they want it to be and it is more consistent with the window in the sister house.

**Ms. Ramsay** believes it would have helped a lot in this case if they followed the submittal guidelines and had pictures of the adjacent structure. She believes the guides say they should have adjacent photos of adjacent structures. She asked Mr. Dawson if he is increasing the existing size of the window opening.

**Mr. Dawson** said they are only increasing the length of the window. Actually, it is not a big deal to them. They are only increasing the window one foot and it is not something that they really care about one way or the other.

**Dr. Williams** stated that the current building has shutters on all five of the facade windows. The different heights, the presence and absence of shutters already speak to two row houses that were presumably identical at one time, but have now have evolved in different manners. He said that Mr. Dawson's argument is that a fourth floor might have originally been here makes a good case. He agrees with Mr. Engle that they should do everything possible to preserve the record of evolution. He does not know whether the doors can be moved from the recessed situation to become flush. With all due respect to the HSF's advice of going with 6-over-6 and putting the doorway back, he believes would be more prudent and more with keeping the Secretary of Interior guidelines to preserve the two-over-two on the second floor and the doorway as such. As to how the 1st floor two windows should be replaced, should they be 6-over-6 or 2-over-2 in assuming that the 1-over-1 will be replaced.

**Ms. Ramsay** believes that if they went to 6-over-6 the lights would be small.

**Dr. Williams** stated that when he made reference to the 1st floor he was speaking of the floor to the main entrance, the elevated 1st floor. He said his recommendation would be preserve as much of the historical fabric as possible.

**Ms. Ramsay** was concerned about the ground floor window.

**Dr. Williams** believes the ground floor window could be left up to the architect's discretion. It could be 2-over-2; it is very small. He asked Ms. Ramsay if she was saying put in 6-over-6.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that the opening would be reduced.

**Ms. Simpson** believes the opening would be increased.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that it is shown increased, but she believes this would be taking away

from the historic fabric if they are allowed to do this.

**Ms. Simpson** stated she realizes this is a case-by-case basis, but an opening is here which is slightly different from the case they discussed earlier.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the proposal is to increase it to match the size of the window on the other house.

**Mr. Dawson** explained that the only reason they proposed the 6-over-6 for the window is for it to have a consistent 3 to 5 ratio with the mullions that would match the door. He believes if they did any thing other than this, then they would also want to change the door. Mr. Dawson said they do not have a problem with restoring the 1880 modifications abutting the 2-over-2 on the parlor and 2nd floor levels. This would make it consistent with the entry.

**Board Action:**

Approval for following to be resubmitted to staff for final approval: 1. Retain the historic 2-over-2 windows on the second floor; 2. Replace parlor level windows with 2-over-2 double hung sash, true divided light, wood frame windows to match the second floor; 3. Reduce the awning on the front elevation to be over the door; 4. Align the stucco columns on the rear ground floor with columns above; and 5. Garden level window to be approved by staff. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams  
Second: Sidney J. Johnson  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye  
Brian Judson - Abstain  
Richard Law, Sr - Aye  
W James Overton - Aye  
Linda Ramsay - Aye  
Ebony Simpson - Aye  
Robin Williams - Aye

13. [Petition of Daniel E. Snyder, AIA - H-10-4233-2 - 41 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. - New Construction, Part I Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)



Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Mr. Daniel E. Snyder** was present for the petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval for Part I, Height and Mass of a new garden wall and ancillary support/service structures on the north and west portions of the property at 41 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.

A finding-of-fact for visual compatibility of a 2'-2" variance for the height of the wall is requested.

The historic building at 41 MLK, Jr. Blvd., now occupied by the Ships of the Sea Museum, was constructed in 1819 for William Scarbrough and designed by William Jay. The property is designated as a National Historic Landmark and is a contributing structure within the Savannah Historic District. This is the only listed building within this block of Middle Oglethorpe Ward. Historic structures across MLK are of a later period in history and are more commercial in nature.

The site is currently comprised of three separate parcels all zoned B-C (community-business). A General Development Plan has been submitted to the City and the following comments that could have bearing on the design have been provided:

Traffic Engineering: Provide sidewalk the entire length of Orange and Ann Streets. The 12' drive entrance width will need to be 20' minimum width or signed as a one-way drive.

Streets Maintenance: Sidewalk will be required around the perimeter of the project including Anne and Orange streets. The brick crosswalks at the driveways on Bryan Street will have to be stamped or plain concrete 6" thick 5,000 PSI with fibermesh.

The applicant has revised the plan and resubmitted to the City on April 5, 2010.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the wall would project in front of the Scarbrough House. He stated that on page 15, the arch columns project to the wall and appears slightly behind. He asked where would the wall be located.

**Ms. Ward** answered that this would be better explained by the petitioner.

**Mr. Engle** asked where is the trellis and where is the wall. If it is not at the development stage, they cannot approve it.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Snyder** stated that he brought the team with him. He wanted to clarify Mr. Engle's question. The roof cannot be seen from the public right-of-way. He is not seeking approval of this today. They will give an elaborate presentation on this later. The wall going south is not historic. Only one segment between the main house is historic. The new wall steps are six feet in front of the wall and 8'- 2" from the wall back to the facade of the Scarbrough House. The wall facing MLK will be a brickface wall.

**Dr. Williams** asked would the steel framing be in line with the masonry walls.

**Mr. Snyder** answered that they would be slightly recessed. They will have an educational hall. They had to consider it as part of their design. Their drawing illustrates the alignment with the hotel. The Scarbrough House face does not align with the hotel. They feel the wall is more attractive to the Scarbrough House.

**Dr. Williams** asked if plantings would be in front of the wall.

**Mr. Snyder** said no. Sometimes it is good to see the wall. They are extending the wall down Bryan Street at the same height which makes it 13 feet. They are aligning with the historic William Jay wall.

**Mr. Engle** said this will be a massive wall. Why not step it down?

**Mr. Snyder** said they broke the mass substantially.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the middle elevation is recessed.

**Mr. Snyder** answered yes.

**Mr. Engle** said this will be a massive hard surface wall next to a historic building. It is a wall. They don't have windows or doors.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Snyder if the walls were lowered, would it throw off his educational building.

**Mr. Snyder** answered no. He believes it would be pleasant to have the hall by a tall wall. It does not necessarily need to be looked at that a wall is something bad. They did the project on West Harris Street across from the SCAD building. The Barcelona building is truly beautiful.

**Dr. Williams** said the gas station wall on Harris Street shows a lot of soft greenery.

**Mr. Snyder** stated that they will also have greenery. What they are looking for now is height and mass.

**Dr. Williams** stated that a 13 foot wall is not an insignificant wall.

**Dr. Henry** stated that a 15 foot is across from him and it is beautiful.

**Dr. Williams** stated that variances apply at 11 feet.

**Mr. Engle** said the visual compability applies also.

**Mr. Snyder** said they will submit this to the Zoning Board of Appeals. He stated that since there is a concern, should he ask for a continuance?

**Mr. Engle** stated that he was not sure if putting the iron gate next to the portico is

compatible. He has a problem with this.

**Ms. Ramsay** believes the opposite. She believes it distinguishes the old from the new.

**Dr. Williams** said the drawings show the wall 9'-10".

**Mr. Snyder** said MLK goes down hill 2'-4".

**Dr. Williams** asked about the iron balcony. Can you go upstairs from the garden?

**Mr. Snyder** stated that they are calling it belvedere.

**Mr. Overton** stated that the going back and forth from all the photos make it difficult for him to understand what is going on. The petitioner probably does need to ask for a continuance.

**Mr. Snyder** said he will submit the hard copies.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Mr. Daniel Carey of HSF** stated their review committee will be happy to meet with the petitioner. They are concerned about how the building is framed. They are talking about monumental buildings and they want to be certain that the principal facade is treated right. They want to understand the relevance to the hotel. Their focus will be along MLK.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the petitioner has made an application with the ZBA. He can also requested a continuance from them.

A copy of the model is in the Public Information Office.

### **Board Action:**

Continue to the meeting of May 12, 2010 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

### **Vote Results**

Motion: W James Overton

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

**VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS**

**IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS**

14. [Petition of Greg Jacobs H-10-4224\(S\)-2 - 124 Abercorn Street - Enlarge Louver HVAC Chiller](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

**Vote Results**

Motion:

Second:

15. [Petition of Bill Norton for Sign Mart - H-10-4225\(S\)-2- 25 Bull Street - Sign Replacement](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

**Vote Results**

Motion:

Second:

16. [Petition of Dora L. Beatty - H-10-4226\(S\)-2 - 333 Tattnell Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

No Action Required. Staff Approved -

**Vote Results**

Motion:

Second:

17. [Petition of Stuart C. Sherwood - H-10-4227\(S\)-2 - 445 Price Street - Repair Front Porch](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

**Vote Results**

Motion:  
Second:

18. [Petition of John R. Miller - H-10-4228\(S\)-2 - 510 East St. Julian Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

**Vote Results**

Motion:  
Second:

19. [Petition of Richard and Katherine Malish - H-10-4229\(S\)-2 - 335 Tattnell Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

**Vote Results**

Motion:  
Second:

20. [Petition of Sarah Dagen for Wild Fibre Savannah, Inc. - H- 10-4230\(S\)-2 - 6 East Liberty St. Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

**Vote Results**

Motion:  
Second:

21. [Petition of Glenn Wood of Coastal Canvas for Pinkie Masters H-10-4235\(S\)-2- 318 Drayton Street - Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

No action required. Staff approved. -

**Vote Results**

Motion:

Second:

**X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

**XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

**Acknowledgements**

22. [Resolution for Ms. Beth Reiter](#)

Mr. Judson presented a resolution to Ms. Beth Reiter for 24 years of dedicated services to the community. Ms. Reiter thanked the Board for the resolution and stated that the Historic District Board of Review has served the community for more than 37 years. She said it has been a pleasure for her to have served this Board.

Ms. Sarah Ward has served as the Preservation Planner. She is now assuming the position as the Preservation Officer.

**XII. OTHER BUSINESS**

**New Business**

23. [Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties](#)

Attachment: [Secretary of the Interior's Standards.pdf](#)

**Ms. Ward** stated that a hard copy of the "Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings" is on file in the office.

**XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

24. [Announcement](#)

Dr. Williams announced that he will be giving a report on Tuesday, May 11, 2010 at the Arnold Hall Building on Bull Street. He will send the information to Ms. Ward to be forwarded to the HBR members.

25. [Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, Mr. Judson adjourned the April 14, 2010 meeting at approximately 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah Ward  
Preservation Officer

SPW:mem

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