



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
November 9, 2011 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

NOVEMBER 9, 2011 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: W. James Overton, Vice Chair
Reed Engle
Ned Gay
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Keith Howington
Sidney J. Johnson
Stephen G. Merriman, Jr.
Linda Ramsay
Ebony Simpson
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Members Not Present: Brian Judson, Chair

MPC Staff Present: Tom Thomson, Executive Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Director
Brittany Paige Bryant, Preservation Planner
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

City of Savannah Staff Present: None

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. [Approve Minutes of October 12, 2011](#)

Attachment: [10-12-2011 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve October 12, 2011 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Linda Ramsay
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
W James Overton - Abstain
Linda Ramsay - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Not Present

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

IV. SIGN POSTING

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

[2. Continued Petition of James Thompson | H-11-4496-2 | 109 West Broughton Street | Alterations and sign](#)

Board Action:

Continuance to the December 14, 2011 Historic District Board of Review meeting to provide required public notice under Section 8-3030 of the city zoning ordinance for the historic district. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ebony Simpson
Second: Sidney J. Johnson
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
W James Overton - Abstain
Linda Ramsay - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Not Present

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

3. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects, PC | H-11-4539-2 | 318 East Liberty Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the alterations to the carriage house located at 318 East Liberty Street. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

W James Overton - Abstain

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

4. [Petition of Paul Miller | H-11-4546-2 | 224 Houston Street | Exploratory Demolition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Site Visit-October 26, 2011.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for exploratory demolition with the condition that any proposed change to the rear of the property visible from the public-right-of way be submitted to the Historic Review Board for approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

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

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

5. [Petition of William Coggins for Taylor Berrien, LLC | H-11-4512-2 | 313 Berrien Street | New Construction](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial 2007.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Johnathan Winter was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction Part I, Height and Mass and Part II, Design Details on a two and one-half (2 1/2) story single-family residence on the property at 313 Berrien Street. The proposed plan was submitted and approved by the Board on May 12, 2010 for Part I and on June 9, 2010 Part II was approved by the Board. However, the Certificate of Appropriateness has expired. No changes to the 2010 approved plans are proposed.

Ms. Bryant reported that the staff recommends approval for the new construction, Part I and Part II, of the two and one-half (2 1/2) story single family residence at 313 Berrien Street with the following conditions:

1. Smooth Hardi-Plank siding is used;
2. Verification of the HVAC screening and the east/west window relationship to the property line;
3. The specification for the standing seam porch roof and shutters be resubmitted to staff for final approval.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Winter said it appears that they need to submit some materials to staff for the shutters and standing seam for the roof. They will submit the materials to staff.

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Winter what materials will be used for the shutters.

Mr. Winter answered the shutters will be wood.

Mr. Howington said it appears that the gutter stops on the front. He asked if the gutter wraps around the side as well.

Mr. Winter answered no. The gutter will be on the front and back elevations only.

Mr. Howington asked the petitioner if he gave thought to getting rid of the pediment corners and do a gable on the side.

Mr. Winter stated that he did not have an opposition to doing this. It will actually save them in construction cost. Therefore, he is in agreement with this suggestion.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that they believe the structure is too heavily detailed for the size and style of the home. They feel that the cornices, window surrounds, porch details and columns should be more simply detailed. They suggested addressing the historic structure showing on the immediate left in the elevations as a reference for more appropriate detailing.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Gay said he agrees with the HSF. It looks a little cluttered in the front because of all the details.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she believes Mr. Howington's recommendation will remove some of the details.

Mr. Howington said an apron is shown under the window which is not typical. A sill would be better and remove the apron. He, too, agrees with HSF that some of the entablature should be reduced on the window. The crown needs to be deleted or make it much smaller.

Ms. Ramsay said she had a problem with the three top windows because all that would be seen are a band of wood and shutters. The house shown on the left is a relief.

Mr. Gay said what is shown is ten feet wider than the other house.

Mr. Engle said in the past with the unit around the corner, the Board wanted the shutters, but in this case it is too much.

Ms. Ramsay said there is not enough room for the shutters to be on these units.

Mr. Howington believes the dormer should be reduced a little, too.

Mr. Engle said there is no scale, but he does not believe that the shutters will work. He does not believe they will cover the entire sash if they were closed. They don't look wide enough to work.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Winter to please address the Board's comments.

Mr. Winter said they don't have a problem removing the shutters, but the last Board asked them to put the shutters here. He said not putting the shutters would save on the construction cost. Therefore, he believes the owners would not have a problem with not putting them here. As the shutters are laid out, they do cover the windows. They are the appropriate size. He agrees that the top band is heavy. If the Board wants them to remove the shutters, they will do so.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Winter if they will simplify the top band.

Mr. Winter answered absolutely. They are not opposed to simplifying the details around the windows.

Mr. Engle asked if the Board was saying keep the shutters on the first floor.

Dr. Williams said that shutters under porches are somewhat a hit and miss. It would seem doubly odd to keep the shutters under the porch if they are not going to be kept upstairs.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Winter if he recalls why the Board asked them to put shutters here.

Mr. Winter said he believes the Board felt that the elevation was too plain.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Winter how long ago was this.

Mr. Winter answered that he believes it was one year ago.

Mr. Engle said this was the other building and not this building.

Dr. Williams asked if the dormer window is the same size as the second floor windows.

Mr. Winter answered yes. It is the same exact size.

Dr. Williams stated that historically the dormer windows would be scaled down. Actually, because the dormer is by itself, it looks bigger than the second floor windows.

Mr. Gay said look at the dormer window next door.

Dr. Williams said the dormer next door is scaled down. He does not know what percentage, but he recommends scaling down the dormer ten percent (10%) so that it will not appear disproportionately heavy and large.

Mr. Howington stated he believes that by reducing the height between the window and the dormer will scale it down significantly so that it will not look so heavy.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Winter if he said the drawings that were submitted with the petition this time were the same drawings he submitted in 2010 and they were approved.

Mr. Winter answered yes. The drawings are identical. They only changed the submission date on the drawings.

Dr. Williams asked if shutters were on the drawings that were submitted in 2010.

Mr. Winter said the original times when they came before the Board, they did not have shutters.

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Winter who asked them to put shutters here.

Mr. Winter answered, the Board.

Board Action:

Approval for the new construction, Part I and Part II, of the two and one-half (2 ½) story single family residence at 313 Berrien Street with the following conditions:

1. Smooth Hardi-Plank siding is used;
2. Verification of the HVAC screening and the east/west window relationship to the property line;
3. The specification for the standing seam porch roof and shutters be submitted to staff for final approval. - PASS
4. The distance between the top of the window and roof peak in the dormer window be reduced in height;
5. The shutters be eliminated;
6. The window apron be removed and window entablature height be reduced;
7. The side gables are simplified with cornice returns instead of a continuous gable base.

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

6. [Petition of John L. Deering for Greenline Architecture | H-11-4521-2 | 205 Papy Street | New Construction](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial View.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Application and Project Description.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Site Plan.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Howington recused himself from participating in this petition hearing as he is an employee of Architecture.

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

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction Part II, Design Details, of a two-story, three level parking garage with ground floor retail on the vacant parcel at the southeast corner of Fahm Street and Turner Boulevard. The garage will provide parking spaces for the existing Hampton Inn and Suites and the proposed Embassy Suites to the east of the site, as well as the commercial establishments and restaurants within both hotels and the ground floor of the proposed parking garage.

Ms. Ward stated that a variance from Section 8-3030(n)(16)e.i., Large-Scale Development, Height, Table 1., for Roofline Variation is required prior to issuance of a building permit and was recommended for approval by the Historic District Board of Review (HDBR).

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval for the new construction of the parking garage with the following conditions:

1. Construct sample panel with all significant materials and architectural details on site for final approval by staff. See attached Sample Panel Guidelines.
2. Provide materials and colors for canopies to staff for final approval.
3. Provide design, materials, and colors for gate on west elevation to staff for final approval.
4. Verify that the curb cut is the minimum permitted by Traffic Engineering. The sidewalk must serve as a continuous uninterrupted path across the driveway in materials, configuration and where possible, height.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Deering said they will put up a sample panel on site. They will provide the storefront manufacturing details and colors for canopies to staff. They would like to keep the monument where it is. This needs to be worked out with the Monument Commission and the project's civil engineer. They are working with the site plan review on the ramps and handrails issue. Their civil engineer is involved in this also. They are doing their best to minimize the curb cuts.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation stated that as he said last month,

HSF is in favor of this building. However, he wanted to add a few comments and some details to what they said last month. Mr. Carey said this is an important building whether it's a parking garage or not. He believes, therefore, it needs to be seen and perceived as a distinctive stand-alone building. Although it is almost purely functional in the sense of parking and little retail, he believes it provokes an industrial feel which is appropriate for this area. Rather than think about this building necessarily as a pair to the hotel, he believes they would like to see this building considered unto itself. The HSF prefers to see the building be consistent precast concrete throughout and not have the brick corners. He understood this may be an aesthetic decision on the part of the owners and to try to tie this into the hotel, but the HSF Architecture Review Committee sort of serving two masters, would like to see this building respected unto itself. Consequently to have the entire building concrete is their preference.

Mr. Carey said with respect to the towers, they want to know what kind of glass is proposed. The HSF suggested using a clear transparent glass at the base as this is the retail portion; he believes this is what the Standards require. But as the glass goes up, be tinted a little so that it is darker. They will be able to see vehicles behind it, lighting, stairwells and other pertinent things. He believes there is a requirement that this cannot be opaque, but they propose a more tinted glass as it goes up. The HSF made an observation that the window configuration on the ground level of the north and south elevations varies to accommodate the change in grade; they recommend that this be restudied to have more consistent light pattern. The configuration on the left has a shorter light pattern. They are keeping the same number of lights. This is a challenge that they respect, but there could be another way to achieve this and have a better result. Mr. Carey stated that in summary the HSF is saying that the garage is a stand-alone and, therefore try to maintain an industrial or functional building as much as possible and keep the materials consistent throughout. Also, try to do something on the towers with the glass to hide somethings while lending a little verticality to the corners.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Carey if he did not think that brick is industrial.

Mr. Carey stated that he was not suggesting that as plenty industrial buildings are made of brick. There are some buildings in this area now that are made of brick. The center block of this building which is the majority of the building is very well conceived and would be well executed in the concrete form. The corners seem to offer too much contrast or bring too much attention to the corners. They talked about this the last time as he suggested that if possible, the corners be reduced in height. Mr. Carey stated that he believes the building would work well together as one material as opposed to the contrasting materials which he believes divert too much attention to the corners and diminish what he believes is the main functional aspect of the building which is the parking.

Mr. Christian Sottile stated that he was present today speaking on behalf of Savannah College of Art and Design and SCAD's Museum of Art. He thanked the Board for its partnership along the way as the museum building was reviewed by the Historic Review Board. However, he wanted to make some comments about the the proposal being reviewed presently by the Board and the one that will follow regarding the hotel. He will reserve his comments about the urban streetscape to share them as one collective group of ideas. To build on what Mr. Carey just said, he believes it is appropriate to differentiate architecture within the city, but the unity of the streetscape is something

that should be considered together.

Mr. Sottile said regarding the comment from the HSF regarding materiality and he would ask the Preservation Officer to help him with some of the exact wording with regards to large-scale development, some of the new standards enacted. He spoke in favor of the design as it is currently configured in the drawings that are being reviewed. The use of brick on the corner elements to this building is successful in helping to breakdown the scale of the structure and provide a more human scale to the street, knowing that it is, in fact, a large building. When they worked with the Historic District Revision Committee, the specific materials for large scale development actually references the importance of modular masonry even in the use of large cast stone concrete surfaces that they be formed or assembled as stone. Therefore, with this spirit in mind, the analysis did bear out that the use of a smaller scale materials help to manage the scale of larger structures. To the end that the building is configured to feel industrial, he believes is appropriate and is designed this way as it currently stands.

Mr. Sottile said to the extent of its permanent use as a parking deck, he asked the Board to consider that it may not always be this way when they think about creating long-lasting buildings in an urban environment it is likely that it might be used for something else in the future. Therefore, this needs to be considered, too.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he does not agree with the HSF comments. He believes this building, because of its position with the SCAD's museum, is entirely appropriate to the materials. By going to concrete in the center, they are diverging from the historic materials. But the corner towers bring it back to relationship with the rail yard. If they went with concrete, this could be a new parking garage anywhere. It would not have a context to where they are. Mr. Engle said he believes this is a perfect parallel to the museum cross the street and to some extent, the corner towers reflect the tower on the SCAD museum.

Dr. Williams said not only is the brick a part of the evolution of the historic shed, but the concrete in the middle with its scoring pattern of panels is in dialog with the concrete of the museum. On the SCAD museum brick is in the middle, flanked by concrete. But, here there is concrete flanked by brick. This actually generates and makes a streetscape more cohesive. He, too, therefore, prefers to see the corners remain brick.

Ms. Simpson stated that with the two different materials shown, they are showing that there are two different uses within the building. She realize that the Board needs to remain with the design of the building, but as a pedestrian with the car here, she knows that there is a difference with the tower and the stairs being here. Therefore, she believes it is important to have a visual difference within this use in this type building.

Dr. Williams said he shares the HSF's concern about the glass. Another strategy would be somewhat like the sky museum tower that has an opaque glass or something that would prevent the clear view of an automobile through the clear glass. It does not have to be tinted to deal with visibility issues through the under portion. According to the plans in two of the corners, there will be cars as a matter of fact only a few feet from the windows. May be this is something the petitioner can work out with staff.

Mr. Engle stated that a parking garage is a statement of what it is. The cars will only be seen on the corner tower as they are screened on the bulk of the building.

Dr. Williams said he was only saying frosted glass of some kind. The corner towers have a wonderful brick column and at night all that would be seen is the glass rather than silhouettes and aspect of cars and so forth. It is a parking garage, but do they necessarily want to see that.

Mr. Overton invited Mr. Deering to make additional comments to the Board if he so desired.

Mr. Deering thanked Mr. Sottile and Mr. Carey for their comments. He looked at the suggestion of removing the bricks from the towers. Their team believes the bricks help anchor the building and reflect the museum across the street and the railroad complex. There is a actually concrete in the railroad complex and the roundhouse. The clerestory ventilators are poured concrete which he believes is great. They would like to use clear glass as they like the light coming through it, they want to see the cars; it is a parking garage. It is a good idea to use some sort of squared glass on the second and third floor. However, he does not like the change in material. This has to be handled very carefully. People feel more secure in a parking garage when they can see out. So much of this is louvered that you cannot see out. He knows that most females feel safest in a parking garage where they can see out. Security cameras have helped this. They will present the muntin alignment and the windows back to staff.

Board Action:

Approval for New Construction of the parking garage with the following conditions:

1. Construct sample panel with all significant materials and architectural details on site for final approval by Staff. See attached Sample Panel Guidelines.
2. Provide materials and colors for canopies to staff for final approval.
3. Provide design, materials, and colors for gate on west elevation to staff for final approval. - PASS
4. Restudy the alignment of the window muntins to be consistent.
5. Verify that the curb cut is the minimum permitted by Traffic Engineering. The sidewalk must serve as a continuous uninterrupted path across the driveway in materials, configuration and where possible, height.

Vote Results

Motion: Ebony Simpson	
Second: Robin Williams	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

7. [Petition of John L. Deering for Greenline Architecture | H-11-4522-2 | 201 Papy Street | New Construction](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial View.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Sample Panel Guidelines 120309.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Written Description and Materials.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Site Plan and Landscape Plan.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Howington recused himself from participating in this petition hearing as he is an employee of Architecture

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

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction Part II, Design Details, of a five-story hotel bounded by Oglethorpe Avenue, Papy Street and Turner Boulevard. A variance from Section 8-3030(n)(16)b.i., Large-Scale Development, Entrances, is required prior to issuance of a building permit and was recommended for approval by the Board at its October meeting.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends 1. Finding-of-fact that the proposed window specifications do not meet the design standards or the intent of the ordinance and are not visually compatible. Staff recommends that the applicant study an alternative solution for a window that better meets the intent of the ordinance having the appearance of a double-hung sash; 2. Finding- of-fact that the proposed variation in parapet height and design is visually compatible and is sufficient to meet the requirements for roofline variation; 3. Approval for Part II, Design Details with the following conditions: a. Construct sample panel with all specifications and architectural details on site for final approval by staff. See attached Sample Panel Guidelines; b. Provide a 4:12 pitch on the one-story gable fronting Papy Street or projecting eave detail and brackets; c. Provide details for canopy and awning materials and colors; d. Verify that the curb cut is the minimum permitted by Traffic Engineering and DOT. The sidewalk must serve as a

continuous uninterrupted path across the driveway in materials, configuration and where possible, height; and e. Resubmit sign plan with required information on the application checklist to the Board for approval.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Attorney Brook Stillwell stated as they discussed at the last meeting, this hotel was approved by the Historic Review Board in 2007. The reason they are back now is because of the recession. The architects have redesigned some of the elements of the hotel basically to comply with the new regulations. They have not tried to redesign the entire building from what was approved in 2007. Therefore, the issues they feel important are the issues that address the changes in the Historic Review Board and not the things that were previously approved or previously considered in the design. They have applied for three variances to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).

Mr. Deering stated that they will be happy to build the sample panel on site during construction. The front parapet facing Papy Street can be a 4:12 pitch roof slope; they will provide the details for canopies and awnings to staff; the wall and fence around the pool enclosure may not be exactly six feet - three and seven inches, but this is what is shown on their drawings. The window sample has been brought in for review. The lower sash is set back an inch and one-half from the upper sash. The frame on this window that the staff spoke of is different than a residential wood double-hung window as the frame goes all around the window. It is more prominent than a residential double-hung window. A brick mold goes on top of this and makes it appear as if the sash is an individual and extends further out than a lower sash. The brick projects another three inches beyond the wall. Mr. Deering said they feel that they have met the spirit and the intent of the ordinance on commercial buildings although the window is not truly a double-hung window. They would like to get the Board's approval for this particular window with the understanding that they must still go before the ZBA.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Deering if he was saying that the manufacturer cannot recess the frame of the window so that it would appear as a true double-hung window.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Deering if this was a wood window what would be the setback.

Mr. Deering said it would be about two and one-eighth inches.

Mr. Engle stated that it is not the depth for the sash, but the depth for the frame. It is great that the sash is recessed, but the frame is not and this is the problem. He did not understand why this could not be pulled back one half inch and then the brick mold would cover it.

Mr. Deering said the frame does continue down.

Mr. Merriman stated the sash does not continue.

Mr. Engle asked if the frame could not be pulled back one-half inch.

Mr. Deering said he did not know if the manufacturer would be able to change the frame.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Deering if this is a custom-made unit he is proposing or a stock-made unit.

Mr. Deering said it is custom-made. He said with looking at big commercial building and trying to understand the spirit of the ordinance with the double-hung window, the shadow line at the meeting rail is important when looking at the whole building.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Deering if he had any objections in seeing whether the manufacturer could try this again.

Mr. Deering said they have talked with the manufacturer about the set back.

Mr. Engle said money is not an issue to the Board, but he asked Mr. Deering if they have talked with the manufacturer and compared just buying stock double-hung windows and screwing them shut as compared to getting the windows custom-made.

Mr. Deering stated that the issue with stock double-hung windows is that if you get something of quality that will last as a commercial window, they are very expensive. Cheap double-hung windows could be bought and put here, but they will not hold up and then the owners would be forced with maintenance issues for the life of the building.

Dr. Williams stated that great care has been accomplished to align the ground floor piers between the windows with the plaster stripes on the floors above. However, on the Papy Street elevation there is no alignment.

Mr. Deering asked Dr. Williams if he was talking about the cast stone piers.

Dr. Williams answered yes and the piers above them. He asked if this is an error in the drawings.

Mr. Deering answered that it could be an error in the drawings. He will look into this.

Dr. Williams said looking at the one bay, the windows are recessed and bases are on the piers. For roughly six feet up to the height of the window, it recesses a certain number of inches, but then the piers die at the top of the window and then turns into a wall; it is flush. There are certain details that are overtly used to try to make it feel as a Renaissance Revival style building while the upper stories are stripped. Dr. Williams suggested that the base be simplified, but articulate the piers all the way up through the base story.

Mr. Deering said he understood. The base detail was created as a result from meetings with the City and SDRA before the ordinance changed in 2009. In 2007, they wanted some detail at the street level and this was their solution to it. They did not find an issue putting this in with the same thing with column because often the entablature phase is in the same plain as the pilaster. They just omitted the capital.

Dr. Williams said it is not the entablature. The entablature is higher up.

Mr. Deering the said the entire thing is a play on the order and it is not exactly a true order. But, if the Board would like for them to remove the detailing on the lower portion

of the pilaster, they would be happy to do so.

Dr. Williams said his preference is to simplify the base, but it is the Board's decision.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Deering who recommended that they do a different base.

Mr. Deering said four years ago in meetings with MPC, Historic Preservation Staff, SDRA Staff, and the City of Savannah representatives. In looking at large-scale development in the Historic District and trying to bring buildings more into what the ordinance was to become is what they have now.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Sottile stated that they wanted to respectfully address the Board on behalf of the Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD) and the SCAD Museum of Art. He said as a key stakeholder in the revitalization of the west boundary, they are excited to see these development proposals moving ahead within the district which has every potential to expand Savannah's world class urban environment. Working with the MPC and the City, they have made a sincere effort to set a standard for quality and care in the development of the streetscape and sidewalk improvements along Turner Boulevard directly across the site from the proposed development that is under consideration today. Mr. Sottile said in addition, their firm has had a great deal of involvement in crafting the new historic district ordinance which places more emphasis than ever before on the preservation and enhancement of Savannah's historic streets; and in addition to establishing higher standards for the quality of large scale development with the Landmark District.

Mr. Sottile said he wanted to briefly express a number of concerns about the petition with regards to the proposed streets and sidewalks as they are currently shown. He asked the Board to consider authorizing the Preservation Officer to provide careful oversight as this important proposal works its way through the process of final site review. There is a proposed realignment of the centerline of Papy Street which results in an out-of-balance street design. Moreover, the main entrance of the SCAD Museum has been specifically designed and located to align with this historic street. The current drawings would also eliminate eight on street parking spaces on Papy Street to accommodate a suburban style passenger loading area which extends visually into the street through the use of stamped concrete paving in a radio pattern. This material is shown to wear poorly over time in other areas of the City where it has been used and the proposed radio pattern is foreign to the range of patterns found in Savannah's historic streets.

Mr. Sottile said in an urban environment it is important to note that passenger loading and on street parking have been accommodated in a balanced way in other hotels within the Landmark District such as the Marshall House on Broughton Street which has certain dedicated spaces, but accomplishes both of these functions without altering the traditional configuration and appearance of the public street. Papy Street as shown in these drawings would feel more like a private drive for the hotel rather than a first rate Savannah street. Its alignment, configuration and materials should be seriously reconsidered. In the development of the SCAD Museum, they worked very closely with the City to establish new higher standards of quality for pedestrian crosswalks, using real brick pavers instead of stamped concrete. This standard has also since been used successfully by the City in the new Savannah Garden development. The site drawings also do not show the existing

brick crosswalks that have now already been installed between the main entrance of the museum and the corner of Papy Street and Turner Boulevard; the southeast corner that is being discussed today. The additional crosswalks in the drawings are shown as stamped concrete and, therefore, would not be visually compatible with the new crosswalks already in place along Turner Boulevard. Finally, a number of building entrances with significant impacts on the sidewalk have not yet been coordinated with the site drawings and the architecture drawings. Two entrance stoops that encroach into the public sidewalk are shown on the south facade of the Embassy Suites building and the architectural drawings, but they are not shown on the site plans. These elements and their impact on the public ground need to be understood. The site plan related to the parking deck and the retail frontage as Ms. Ward noted earlier also indicates ADA ramps with handrails encroaching on the public sidewalk along the retail frontage of Turner Boulevard. These ramps and the entrance configuration that they would require do not match the doors shown in the architectural elevations nor do the elevations depict handrails in the public sidewalk. Similar recent attempts to meet ADA requirements within the public sidewalk using ramps and handrails have had visibly unfortunate results. Alternative strategies should be considered. On the southside of the same street, the SCAD Museum of Art has dealt with the same topographic site constraints and has been able to work with the City to integrate accessibility requirements without resorting to the unfortunate barrier affect resulting from handrails along the edge of a public sidewalk. Therefore, a well, thought-out urban environment is essential as they continue the successful rehabilitation of the west boundary. Mr. Sottile said given the concerns expressed, they respectfully ask that the Board consider authorizing the Preservation Officer to continue to provide oversight in the site plan review process; work with the petitioner and stakeholders; and the City departments to ensure that the final details of these public improvements result in a design that is supportive of the standard of quality being established in the west boundary and in keeping with the best traditions of Savannah's greatest streets.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated she knew this has been pointed out already, but there are discrepancies between the proposed site plans, floor plans and elevations. The HSF question which plan takes precedence. Firstly, the site plan shows asphalt paving coming in from Oglethorpe Avenue that connects to the roundabout. Directly to the east of this, there is a wall that staff referenced fencing the pool. The floor plan shows the wall extending all the way into the existing Thunderbird Motel. She is not sure where the drive has gone. Also, in the north elevation in the portico, two doors are shown in the entrance and on the first floor plans, only one door is shown. On the north facade, two sets of double doors are shown with a window between them and the floor plan shows two sets of double doors and the windows are on the right. The south facade shows two doors and an additional door has been added on the Turner Street facade. However, on the floor plans there is no representation of the door. As it is now according to what has been added on the elevations, they will actually be opening up into meeting rooms or at least what is specified as meetings room. The HSF suggests that the space be a retail use because the doors will be locked if this is actually meeting space.

Ms. Meunier said the HSF also questions the location of the street lights that have been proposed. They do not see where these lights will actually be used anywhere on the site plan. They suggest that the street lights match the City's standards for the right-of-way. They suggest that staff review the lanterns that have been proposed on all of the elevations.

The HSF agrees with the staff that the windows that are currently being proposed do not meet the visual compatibility standards. They recommend that the petitioner continues to work with staff on this issue.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Deering said the site plan is further along developed and takes precedence over the floor plan which references the site materials. The wall and the site plan is correct. They will submit the lanterns to staff, the two doors on the north elevation, one is a fixed door that faces Oglethorpe Avenue, the other door to the restaurant is fixed and two are operable. The door on Turner Street that is not shown on the floor plan is because the architecture firm that they are working with did not have time between the last Historic Review Board meeting and the submittal deadline to update the floor plans to show the door on Turner Street. The door on Turner Street does lead directly to a meeting room, but this was discussed last month and it will remain locked. They will reanalyze the pilasters on the southernmost projecting wing on the Papy Street elevation and bring this all back to staff.

Mr. Engle said he believes that Mr. Sottile raises some interesting issues, but some of them do not come within the Board's purview. They are to deal with the building and not the site. He agrees with what Dr. Williams said about the pilasters. They need to be simplified. Whatever the Board did four (4) years ago has nothing to do with this present Board's decision. They have a new ordinance. Mr. Engle said his concern is the windows. He is pleased to see the sash recessed, but he agrees with staff that it does not quite get there. It is important as there are two other hotels with double-hung and they don't look good. Now, this is a little better, but it is still not good enough. The Board needs to deal with the question of the variance because he does not believe they should as it is too early in the ordinance to make a major variance such as is on a very prominent building. It may mean that casement windows or use double-hung secured which cannot be opened. Mr. Engle said he is pleased that the sashes are on different plains because it helps as Ms. Ward pointed out, the lower rail is not here. This has to be reflected in their motion.

Mr. Merriman said if it is going to be custom-made, then get it made correctly. It should be an inch and three-quarters and set in two and one-half inches like it normally would be.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the Board could ask Ms. Ward to comment on Mr. Sottile's recommendation that she work with the site plan review process.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Ward what is the proper eminent for adjudication of Mr. Sottile's comments if it is not this Board's purview.

Ms. Ward answered to work with the site plan review and the infrastructure departments or even work with Mr. Tom McDonald who oversees the entire process. Mr. McDonald would be a good point of contact. A lot of the issues are Street Maintenance, Traffic Engineering and so forth. A lot of different departments are looking at different things. May be the Historic Review Board's Preservation Staff will have comments as well. Some times things take precedence and it is not always them. But, there is a system and they all provide their comments and the applicant takes the general development plan and tries to address the comments as best as they can through a series of revisions and resubmittals of the general development plan and then the specific development plan. They

have open meetings twice a week where the applicant can come to meet with all the infrastructure departments at one time. Ms. Ward said she believes this is the best forum where they all can sit down and discuss the plans.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Ward if this is a regular scheduled meeting with the various projects on the agenda.

Ms. Ward answered yes. Ultimately, some of the comments that she has seen for any of the issues for encroachment, street paving, planters, and lighting within the right-of-way, they have indicated that this actually has to go before City Council in a public hearing.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Ward to restate what her role would be relative to the drawings being different from each other.

Ms. Ward said staff is working closely with Mr. Deering and he has been before the Board trying to address their comments as quickly as possible. However, there is a separate engineer who is not local and on this project there is a separate architect doing the interior floor plans for the hotel who is also not local. Therefore, they are not able to quickly respond to our comments as Mr. Deering has. The elevations are correct to try to address some of the concerns; the floor plans and the site plan have not caught up in some respects. As Mr. Deering has stated, in some respects the site plan takes precedence with regards to any of the landscaping features which include the privacy wall.

Dr. Williams stated that Mr. Sottile also made comments about the south elevation of the building facing the Museum's railings. He believes this is in the Board's purview as it is a part of the building. Dr. Williams asked that this issue be clarified.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Ward if she understood the comment about the railing, please comment to the Board on this issue. If not, then he would ask Mr. Sottile to clarify this point.

Ms. Ward explained that there are two entrances on Turner Boulevard. In order to meet the ADA requirements, they have a landing pad with a stair and a railing into each of the entries on the public sidewalk. She believes that it is being suggested that there be an alternative to meet the ADA compliance as opposed to having the stair and railing on the sidewalk.

Dr. Williams asked if this is in their purview.

Ms. Ward said Mr. Sottile could address this also.

Mr. Sottile stated that Ms. Ward's summary was correct. The Board is being asked to approve some architectural elements of the buildings that are actually off-site. They are in the public right-of-way on a city sidewalk. Therefore, he suggests that this type of stoop and stair perpendicular to the building into a sidewalk is not a good precedent to set for a building of this type. The doors should be at the level of the sidewalk. Moving a part of the building's services out into the public ground to try to solve these issues, he suggests as an architectural review that these elements be solved internal to the building so that the sidewalk can remain open.

Dr. Williams asked if this is the only area that the railings appear or do they appear on one of the site plan and/or ground floor plan.

Ms. Ward answered that there are more railings located outside of the garage, but they are for the public sidewalk. They are not in any entryways or doors into the building. There is a formal portico on Oglethorpe Avenue.

Dr. Williams said he was referencing the south elevation. Can they see what they look like on the plan?

Ms. Ward said they are shown in the elevation as well.

Mr. Overton asked if the sidewalk in its entirety is in the public right-of-way.

Dr. Williams asked staff to show the Board the edge of the sidewalk.

Ms. Ward explained that the dash shows the property line. She believes that the entire area will be sidewalk. Planters will be on the sidewalk.

Dr. Williams asked where is the curb and what is the distance from the curb to where the 34.60 is seen.

Ms. Ward said she would have to review this on the plan and scale. They do have scaled plans but she would have to review them.

Dr. Williams asked if it is an eight (8) or nine (9) foot sidewalk.

Ms. Ward answered that they are very generous sidewalks all the way around.

Dr. Williams asked if the railings are architectural features and, therefore, falls within the Board's purview.

Ms. Ward replied that she believes they do. It is a gray area as other persons are looking at this too and it falls within their purview also. Therefore, they have to work together to try to achieve what will be best for the City street. However, they do regularly comment that the building try to handle the ADA's requirements internally to the site and not have them bleed out into the public right-of-way.

Dr. Williams said he is concerned about blocking more than half the sidewalk with railings being perpendicular from the facade. He agrees with Mr. Sottile.

Mr. Deering stated that they will do all they can to get rid of this and resubmit the drawings to the staff. This is such a minor thing; they can handle it internally.

Mr. Overton asked the petitioner to handle it internally and resubmit to staff.

Board Action:

The Savannah District Board of Review does hereby,

1. Make a finding-of-fact that the proposed window specifications do not meet the design standards or the intent of the ordinance and are not visually compatible. Recommend that the applicant study an alternative solution for a window that better meets the intent of the ordinance having the appearance of a double-hung sash.
2. Make a finding-of-fact that the proposed variation in parapet height and design is visually compatible and is sufficient to meet the requirements for roofline variation.
3. Approval for Part II, Design Details, with the following conditions:
 - a. Construct sample panel with all significant materials and architectural details on site for final approval by Staff. See attached Sample Panel Guidelines.
 - b. Provide a 4:12 pitch on the one-story gable fronting Papy Street or projecting eave detail and brackets. - PASS
 - c. Provide details for canopy and awning materials and colors.
 - d. Verify that the curb cut is the minimum permitted by Traffic Engineering and DOT. The sidewalk must serve as a continuous uninterrupted path across the driveway in materials, configuration and where possible, height.
 - e. Resubmit sign plan with required information on the application checklist to the Board for approval.
 - f. Simplify base of piers/columns.
 - g. Remove landing and rails at Turner Street entrances within the public sidewalk.
 - h. Restudy window to have the appearance of a double-hung sash and resubmit to staff for final approval.
 - i. Preservation Officer to engage the Site Plan Review process to look at paving, ramps, street alignment and other site issues.
 - j. Consider historically appropriate paving materials within the private drive aisles.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

8. [Petition of Matthew Allen | H-11-4526-2 | 409 East Perry Street | New Construction](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial View.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Materials and Windows.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Site Plan.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

Mr. Matthew Allan was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction, Part II Design Details, of four detached residential structures at 409 East Perry Street.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for New construction Part II, Design Details with the following conditions:

1. Door frames must be inset a minimum of three inches (3") from the exterior surface of the facade and restudy of the transom above 409/411 to match the shape of the arched opening;
2. The window muntin must be no wider than seven-eighths inch. Provide material for infill panel within arched opening at 409/411 or consider an arched window;
3. Provide materials for the foundation must be brick to match the main structure. Provide materials for treads. Incorporate railings that meet the standards to reinforce side entry orientation;
4. Verify materials for stair treads and incorporate railings that meet the standards to reinforce side entry orientation on the front porticoes;

5. Provide variation between the height of the piers and the wall sections between piers on the brick wall of continuity and resubmit a section to staff for final approval. The wooden fence must be painted or stained and the final color submitted to staff for approval.

Mr. Engle asked staff if they considered having gates on the brick privacy walls on the street elevations.

Ms. Ward said the petitioner could answer this question.

Mr. Engle said he believes it is a little unusual to have a brick wall between townhouses without gates.

Ms. Ward said she could not answer this question. She knew they talked about the gates at one time, but the petitioner could answer why they chose not to put gates here.

Ms. Ramsay said the column capitals do not extend beyond the architrave.

Ms. Ward agreed and said it is a requirement of the ordinance that the capital extend beyond the architrave. Therefore, the petitioner will have to correct this.

Dr. Williams said it appears that the capitals are missing a piece. The square piece above it is missing and this is what sticks out.

Dr. Henry asked staff to explain where the different roofs will be located.

Ms. Ward explained that the conditional approval that the Board made last time was that the roofs be treated in pairs.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Allan said Ms. Ward and he discussed the wall continuity and the gate. He believes they looked at some examples. The idea was that it is a wall of continuity; not that a gate would necessarily break it. However, he believes also from a practically standpoint that there is not much going on between the buildings as to why access is needed from the front. Therefore, he believes that ultimately it was decided to go with the unbroken wall.

Mr. Engle said he was wondering how the utility personnel would be able to get into the yards and read the meters. He does not see gates on the back. When you have a six feet wall and there is no line of sight, these persons cannot read the meters from the outside.

Dr. Williams said he does not know the technicality of the proximity, but there is certain radio control where these persons do not have to come onto the property any longer.

Mr. Allan said this was also his understanding. The walls are set back from the building as well. He is not sure where the gas meter is located that it cannot be close enough to the front.

Dr. Williams said he was curious about the two-over-one which is not typical of an Italianate. It is more of a craftsman early twentieth century where there are multiple panes

over single panes. The nineteenth century would look more like the windows on the left. If the petitioner is aiming for a nineteenth century look, he believes it should be the two-over-two.

Mr. Allan explained that the designer was quite attached to the two-over-one and if she was present she would have some strong opinions on it. The designer felt it was more of a later nineteenth century transitional feel as opposed to appear to be Italianate. In a classical sense, you can always say that people borrow and there are transitional periods and collective buildings.

Dr. Williams said the doors are Italianate with the arched panels. Being painted black will make them even more so. He respects the transitional quality, but it seems like parts of the design are leaning one way and other parts are leaning another way. It seems a bit odd to him.

Mr. Howington said he believes all the windows should be two-over-two over and possibly not an arched over the door.

Mr. Overton said what is being discussed now comes under the Board's decision which they will get to later. It is a good discussion, but it should be done in order.

Mr. Howington asked the petitioner which elevation the shadow box is on. Is it on the back? The drawings show it as a board-on-board. Is it on the lane?

Mr. Allan answered that it is not on the lane because a parking pad is off the lane. It separates the parking pad from the rear courtyard.

Ms. Ramsay said the two front elevations on the right appear to have a recessed panel, but it is not reflected in the section detail.

Mr. Allan said he believes this is one of the details that came in late and with trying to get the materials in for this meeting did not allow enough time. However, he believes it is a recessed panel.

Mr. Engle asked the petitioner if he considered getting arched top windows.

Mr. Allan answered yes. Custom windows are difficult as there are so few suppliers presently, but it is a consideration if they can be done in a timely fashion and economic fashion.

Mr. Engle said he believes it would really improve the design of two houses; not just the fan light over the door, but actually all five windows with arched top windows. He believes this would carry the feeling through.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation stated that they agree with staff recommendations; especially that railings be included on the porticoes and with the walls of continuity that there be a differentiation in height with the piers. Just as was pointed out by Mr. Engle, the HSF agrees that gates be incorporated on the walls of

continuity and as Dr. Williams pointed out that there be two-over-two windows on 409 and 411.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Howington said he agrees with the two-over-two windows. He would also like to see the entire portico restudied. To him the order is totally wrong. The details do not meet the standards with the extension of cornice; definitely railings are needed. The entire top part needs to be looked at to create the correct order. The columns do not have a cap nor base. Mr. Howington said he believes the entire entablature needs to be restudied to get the proper order. He agrees with the gates and walls.

Mr. Howington said on the other elevation, the columns have a sort of wrap-around base. He believes the double-tier column should be removed. All of the lintels need to extend past the windows.

Board Action:

Approval for new construction Part II, Design Details, with the following conditions:

1. Door frames must be inset a minimum of three inches (3") from the exterior surface of the façade and restudy of the transom above 409/411 to match the shape of the arched opening;
2. The window muntin must be no wider than seven-eighths inch. Provide material for infill panel within arched opening at 409/411 or consider an arched window;
3. Provide materials for the foundation must be brick to match the main structure. Provide materials for treads. Incorporate railings that meet the standards to reinforce side entry orientation;
4. Provide variation between the height of the piers and the wall sections between piers on the brick wall of continuity and resubmit a section to staff for final approval. The wooden fence must be painted or stained and the final color submitted to staff for approval.
5. Provide variation between the height of the piers and the wall sections between piers on the brick wall of continuity and resubmit a section to staff for final approval.

- PASS

6. Provide a gate within the walls of continuity adjoining properties fronting Perry Street;
7. Restudy the proportions of the front portico entablatures, columns, and capitals. The capitals must project forward of the architrave; and
8. Incorporate two-over-two arch shaped windows within the openings at 409 and 411 East Perry Street.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

9. [Petition of Paul LaBrosse for Craftsman by Design | H-11-4530-2 | 410 and 414 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Windows](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Preserving Historic Windows Brochure.pdf](#)

Mr. Paul LaBrosse was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new windows at 410 and 414 East Oglethorpe Avenue. The new windows will replace the non-historic six-over-six windows with a fixed light transom. The proposed windows are Marvin aluminum clad double-hung windows with double-pane, simulated divided lights and a space bar, and finished in "French Vanilla."

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends denial for the proposed replacement windows in 410 and 414 East Oglethorpe Avenue because the proposed windows do not meet the Preservation Standards or the Design Standards as set forth in the historic district ordinance [Sec. 8-3030 (1) or (n)(7)]. Staff recommends the replacement windows match the existing (as an in-kind repair or replacement) or historic windows in composition, design, and materials.

Mr. Merriman asked staff if they were recommending that whatever they replace the

windows with match what is here now or the original nine-over-nine.

Ms. Bryant explained that staff is recommending that the replacement windows either match wood windows with the six-over-six with the fixed transom above or the original wood nine-over-nine windows.

Dr. Williams asked if the problem is they are aluminum clad.

Ms. Bryant said the proposed windows are aluminum clad, but the current windows are wood.

Mr. Merriman asked if the windows are simulated and not a true divided light.

Ms. Bryant answered that the proposed windows are simulated, divided light windows.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. LaBrosse thanked the Board for hearing their proposal. This is a very specific situation with these windows. They were approved to be changed in 1998 and were done in 2000. However, the windows have been a continuous maintenance problem. The owners have lived here ten years and have had to re-glaze and repaint the windows four times. Nevertheless, they continue to rot. Mr. LaBrosse said he has done work on almost all of the units in this building and most of the owners have resulted in putting Plexi-glass on the inside of the windows to protect the windows from rotting. But, this has compounded the problem. He looked at a house on Bolton Street. The windows on this property had no paint left on them. They have been peeling for years and completely stripped of paint. Yet, there was no rot in any of the windows or corners. This is because the historical windows were made out of heart pine. But, this is not available today. All of the new wood windows that come out are made with finger jointed pine which is a sponge for water. The windows they are requesting are approved by the committee for use in commercial buildings as well as in new residential construction. Places all across the country are having to make these decisions. These windows were specifically designed by Marvin to match the historic aspects of the existing windows. It has seven-eighth inch muntins on it; a three and one-half inch bottom rail; and the meeting rails are the same size. Everything about the appearance of the window is the same.

Mr. LaBrosse said when it was decided to go with the six-over-six window with the transom above, he believes it was because they cannot fabricate a window out of pine that will hold up to the dimensions of the opening size in the window, plus going back to the nine-over-nine window would adversely affect the windows on either side. Mr. LaBrosse showed the Board a picture of the color of aluminum they want to use. They will be putting in a better window. It is made to look exactly the same. The only exception is the window will be painted and will remain painted. These are not cheap windows. He realizes they are asking the Board to do something against what the ordinance specifically lists, but cities all over the country have had to do what they are asking to with reference to the windows. The first floor windows have already been approved by the Board for insulated glass to be installed.

Ms. Lauren Tomhave stated that she is the owner of this building. She reiterated that replacement windows were allowed in 1998. It does not replicate the original. They have pictures showing what the original windows should have been. Therefore, the replacement

window approved by the Historic Review Board does not meet the standards. Their findings state that the replacement window should match the nine-over-nine windows. Ms. Tomhave said an exception was already allowed that changed the historic character and the significance of the original windows. Therefore, the windows are not historically correct. The replacement storefront window on the lower level is a double-pane insulated glass. It has already been approved. Therefore, she believes the double-pane window should be allowed on the upper level since they already have a precedence on the lower level. The windows will not be seen from the street and the lane is not a through street. Therefore, the windows will not be noticed by anyone. The windows are approximately 20 feet off the ground.

Dr. Williams said it has been stated that there is no way of acquiring a window made out of heart pine.

Mr. LaBrosse said he was not saying this.

Dr. Williams said if the windows could be done with traditional materials such as heart pine, which as Mr. LaBrosse noted is really durable in this climate.

Mr. LaBrosse said they used Spanish Cedar in the Rectory.

Dr. Williams said economics is not a part of the purview, but there are companies locally that can made these windows and replicate the nine-over-nine in heart pine.

Mr. LaBrosse said if they are not allowed to use the aluminum clad window, they want their next alternative to be able to put insulated glass in the windows so that the window would be efficient. They want a window that will not be cold, not condensate and not have water problems. The water problems are not just limited to the muntins, but also they soak through the sills and down into the wall and damages the entire unit.

Dr. Henry said he believes Mr. LaBrosse said the window was approved by a committee.

Mr. LaBrosse stated that the window has been installed in the Savannah Police Barracks, Savannah Smiles, Leopold Ice-Cream Shop, SCAD buildings and the Bohemian Hotel just to name a few of the places. Ms. Ward told him that when he applied for the windows that while it is approved for commercial or new construction, it is not approved for replacement windows.

Ms. Ward clarified that the distinction is when it is a historic building, they do not distinguish between the uses. The uses change over time in the district. They have approved this window on new construction and feel that it is compatible on new construction.

Mr. LaBrosse said Savannah Smiles is on River Street. The windows face River Street; they are on the second floor have been replaced.

Mr. Johnson said Mr. LaBrosse said he has repaired a lot of damages caused by these windows. He asked what kind of damages these were.

Mr. LaBrosse said the window sills are completely rotted. Depending on what his clients want to spend and wants to repair what is here, he replaces the bottom part of the window with either cypress or Spanish cedar. However, this only repairs a small portion and frequently he is asked to put the plexi-glass back on the inside of the window. But, he cannot guarantee his work when he does this.

Mr. Johnson asked him the damages are mostly because of water.

Mr. LaBrosse said the damages are from water and being manufactured out of pine. The new windows they want will be finger-jointed pine which will absorb water from the rain and other elements.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. LaBrosse if he was saying that if he could get windows made out of heart pine or cedar that it would work.

Mr. LaBrosse said they would need to buy an entire window that is fabricated with the balancing system. It is completely feasible that they can replace the windows with Spanish cedar. The only question they are asking is if they use Spanish cedar then they have to do wood. Their question is can they put in an insulated glass panel in it so that it is more efficient.

Mr. Engle asked the petitioner if he has considered interior storms which are recommended by the Secretary of Interior instead of putting plexi-glass on the inside which causes condensation.

Mr. LaBrosse answered that he has not, but it will not correct the rotten damage that is on the outside of the window. This is not a solution to the deteriorating problem that his client faces where they have to continuously re-glaze and repaint.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Merriman said the windows can be made. They can be Spanish cedar or cypress. They are rot resistant. Some weather stripping could be put on the sides and the bottom. They can be painted with a good primer and cocked correctly will last a long time. Finger-jointed white pine rots all the time, but if they were made out of Spanish cedar and so forth, they could be replaced as nine-over-nine just as they were originally. This will be a nice product and will look good. Mr. Merriman said he had nothing against the Marvin windows, but these windows do not meet the ordinance.

Mr. Engle said the windows do not look like historic windows. He said looking at the windows on an angle, they can see the muntin on the backside of the glass. The gap is huge.

Dr. Henry asked staff if the 1998 decision is relative to this Board.

Ms. Ward said in 1998, the Board was operating under a different set of circumstances. Ms. Bryant did the research. The files did not clearly say that a standard applied.

Ms. Bryant stated that the decision was made to replace the windows with the six-over-six with the fixed transom because they thought it visually conveyed the original historic appearance of the nine-over-nine. The Secretary Standards did not apply at this time.

Ms. Ramsay asked staff what is their opinion of the insulated glass.

Ms. Bryant said the insulated glass is not allowed because this is a historic building.

Mr. Engle said the ordinance does not allow it. This is asking for deviation from two of

the clear standards in the ordinance and the Secretary Standards. He does not know how the Board could approve this. This Board goes not have the authority to grant a variance. Therefore, the petitioner would have to make a request with the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Board Action:

Deny the Marvin aluminum clad double-hung windows with double-pane, simulated divided lights because the proposed windows do not meet the Preservation Standards or the Design Standards as set forth in the Historic District Ordinance [Sec. 83030 (l) or (n)(7)]. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

10. [Petition of Sam Carroll | H-11-4538-2 | 405 East Gordon Street | Rehabilitation and alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photos.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Sam Carroll was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations to the front stair at 405 East Gordon Street. The brick entry stair is proposed to be replaced with a wood frame stair with wood treads and risers. The new balustrade will feature four inch square newel posts (three foot-four inch tall) with a three foot tall railing to match the existing railing on the building. Ms. Ward explained that on December 8, 2010, the Board reviewed this request and approved the rehabilitation of the project provided that the brick stairs remain due to lack of historical documentation supporting its replacement (File No. H-10-4346-2). Further evidence documenting the physical characteristics of the existing materials and configuration, photographs showing neighboring properties with similar stairs and a new application requesting approval of the alteration have been submitted.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval to replace the front entry stair with the condition that the stair be widened so the railing ties into the existing columns.

Dr. Williams asked if the balustrades will match or nearly match the existing balustrades. The newel post does not seem to be compatible.

Ms. Ward said she agrees with Dr. Williams. She said she struggled with this because she could not say what the designs should or should not be. There was no other newel post on the property. It probably evoked some of the characteristics that are in the columns.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Carroll stated that he did not have anything to add to Ms. Ward's presentation. The presentation given is comprehensive to what they are requesting to do. Their drawings do show it inset a little and if the Board wants it to set out a little further so that it reaches the post that is currently on the porch, it will be fine with them.

Dr. Henry asked the petitioner if he would be willing to find a newel post that reflects the current gingerbread.

Mr. Carroll answered yes. Do they want them to bring this back to the Board or the staff?

Dr. Henry said bring it back to staff for approval.

Mr. Engle asked if the posts are six feet-six.

Mr. Carroll answered yes.

Mr. Engle said the newel should be six feet-six, too. There is nothing wrong with the six feet-six square base if it comes to the height that is reflected by the porch balustrade square. Then it would go to a ball or something on top. There is about thirty inches of straight six-by-six on the porch balustrade. It will not work with the handrail if it is't reflective. Mr. Engle said the handrails going up the risers will not work unless the newel posts are the same configuration. Mr. Engle asked the petitioner if he would consider not mimicking the post.

Mr. Carroll asked if Mr. Engle was saying not turn the base of the post, but leave it square and turn the top of the newel.

Mr. Merriman said if the petitioner is matching what is already here, he will not have to do that.

Mr. Engle said if the petitioner is matching the porch columns, he would not be turning the base.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation said they agree with the staff's recommendation. It sounds as if there is some consensus among the Review Board. However, they agree that it should be widen to match the railing ties with the existing columns. On the larger point of the Secretary's Standards (he knows this is a great debate and they need to be mindful of this) certain features on a property may gain significance

over time, but it does not make them historically correct or accurate. HSF supports the effort to restore the front entry stairs to some more in keeping with the original design of the building. Basically, they are trying to correct a wrong that was allowed. In this case they believe it should be approved as recommended by the staff.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams stated that he believes the picture they are looking at is the best guide that is on the block. Yes, they can have a six-by-six that was square all the way except at the top. But, he believes the spirit of the newel posts are to be a kind of squashed or scale-down version of the column rather than just the first thirty inches of it. The newel post is suggesting that its base is scaled-down relative to its height and has a turn element. Dr. Williams said he just wanted to be sure that they are on the same page in that he would not recommend that just taking at least thirty inches of the columns and replicating that, but rather just as the photo shows, a scaled –down version.

Mr. Engle said the drawing is showing a four-by-four.

Dr. Williams said it should be a six-by-six with some details that mimics the columns. Therefore, he would say that the petitioner work with staff to ensure that the newel post design be compatible with the existing columns in spirit.

Board Action:

Approval to replace the front entry stair with the condition that the stair be widened so the railing ties into the existing columns and that a six-by-six inch newel post be installed - PASS that reflects the shape and style of the historic porch columns.

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay
Second: Keith Howington
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
W James Overton - Abstain
Linda Ramsay - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

11. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-11-4540-2 | 19-21 East River Street | Rehabilitation and Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Neil Dawson and Mr. Bob Turner were present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for rehabilitation and alterations to 19-21 East River Street. Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the rehabilitation, including removal of the exhaust duct, repair of the existing conductor heads and downspouts, new awnings, and new balconies at 19-21 East River Street with the following conditions:

1. The proposed awning fabric be resubmitted to staff for final approval;
2. The ground floor window opening sizes remain unaltered until further historical documentation can be provided;
3. The replacement windows and doors should match the historical windows and doors and should be substantiated with historical documentation. They should be inset no less than three inches from the building façade.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson stated that he is the architect on behalf of Turner Food and Spirit who is his client. Mr. Dawson said Mr. Turner was just telling him that he built a ton of wood windows out of heart pine so if some are needed see Mr. Turner. With regard to staff's comments, they did some historical research and this is why they were late getting the amendment back. Despite their efforts they found nothing that helped a lot. However, he will say that during the course of his career he has renovated about five of the eight bays in this range. The vast majority of them have been four-over-four windows. It would be their preference to use a four-over-four, although some historic windows in this particular set of bays are two-over-two vertical. Obviously, some windows have been changed over time and achieved the historic significance. However, they will defer to the Board on this issue. They have one-over-one just for simplicity and when you have a hodge-podge of windows he does not know exactly what you would go back and say. As they can see, this is a two-over-one window. They can also note that the sills of the window heights do vary as well as the door height in this range. Their thought was lowering the first floor window sills so that they would be consistent with the new floor level. As you come in the door now the window sills are about four and one-half or five feet. Therefore, they thought it would be more consistent to lower it. There are buildings that have lower window sills such as the building next door.

Mr. Dawson said they have modified the petition to withdraw that, but they feel it would be worth considering. They prefer to have the window sill lower. He showed a photo he believes is from the 1950s. But, they can see a hodge-podge of windows, screened windows, one-over-one, and two-over-one vertical. He said he needs to be told what is the appropriate window based on the documentation. But, he can say that fairly consistent on the upper levels, his experience has been the four-over-four. He said he had another photo that showed a lot of variation in the first floor range with door heights, window sills, and light patterns. Most of these have shutters over the windows that are closed. Therefore, there is really not much that he can tell the Board that will clarify the issue. Mr. Dawson said they modified the main entry doors to be a single three-0 door to meet handicap accessibility requirements. The opening would only allow a two foot-eight inch pair of

doors. Even though the sidelights are a little smaller than they would like for them to be, this is a configuration that meets the ADA requirements. They did feel that a single sidelight with a large door would be an odd symmetrical configuration.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Dawson if he was doing anything with the round awning on the right.

Mr. Dawson said this is not theirs.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation said the petitioner is correct. This is a complex issue. HSF agrees with staff that the sizes of the ground floor window openings remain unaltered unless the original openings can be provided. He said regarding the light pattern, he believes it is their opinion that using a two-over-two window in these locations would bring a little more consistency and would not be inappropriate. Mr. Carey said he believes the petitioner is open to this.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams stated that he leans more towards divided lights more so than the one-over-one because in a building such as this, the windows give a finer grain detail. It does not have any ornament, so the interest is in the windows. If you look at the photos, there is precedence for divided light windows that are clearly historic windows. Therefore, given the choice, he would say rather than one-over-one, he believes that two-over-two is reasonable.

Mr. Engle said the upper two floors will be replicated. They are replacement in-kind.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Dawson if they were replacing the fifth floor windows.

Mr. Dawson answered that the fifth floor has aluminum storefront windows. Maybe at some point they will want to restore them, but it is not within the scope of this project.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Dawson to point out the relevant windows where the issue of lights is in it.

Mr. Dawson said the upper windows three through five will be replaced. The opening is frankly just open presently. Their thought is to approximate this ace symmetrical double-hung. Therefore, everything on the lower two floors are new because of the damage of the fire in 2004, except for the one that Ms. Bryant pointed out that is a nine-over-six. He would say that this is an anomaly.

Dr. Williams said it may be historic.

Mr. Dawson said based on his experience in this range, he has not seen a nine-over-six.

Dr. Williams asked what the condition is.

Mr. Dawson said it is in bad shape. It is salvageable, but their thought is if they are doing the work it is better to get a consistent light pattern. There is no documentation whether it has achieved significance or was original. They are fine with the two-over-two vertical.

Ms. Ramsay asked for clarification on the door.

Mr. Dawson answered that it will be a wood door. Probably, heart pine.

Dr. Williams asked if the staff's recommendation for the nine-over-six is to leave it alone.

Mr. Engle stated he believes the staff is recommending that the petitioner keep the nine-over-six.

Dr. Williams replied that he just wanted to be sure that this is clear.

Board Action:

Approval for the rehabilitation, including removal of the exhaust duct, new awnings, and new balconies at 19-21 East River with the following conditions:

1. The proposed awning fabric be resubmitted to staff for final approval; - PASS
2. The replacement windows should be two-over-two windows;
3. The existing nine-over-six window be repaired rather than replaced.

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

12. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-11-4541-2 | 126 West Bay Street | Addition and Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Neil Dawson was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new awnings and new pedestrian bridges at 126 West Bay Street. The proposed awnings will be located on the Bay Street level, spanning the storefront with the frames located between the larger pilasters. The proposed awnings project eight feet and maintain a vertical clearance of 10 feet-five inches (10'-5"). The awning fabric and color will be submitted to staff for final approval.

The applicant is also requesting approval for two new pedestrian bridges over Factors Walk. The proposed bridges will be located at the east and west ends of the pedestrian plaza and will be eight (8) feet wide and 21 feet long featuring a three feet-six inch (3'-6") tall railing with metal mesh and a wood top rail, to match existing.

Ms. Bryant reported that the staff recommends approval for the new canvas awnings and new pedestrian bridges at 126 West Bay Street with the condition that the awning fabric be submitted to staff for final approval.

Mr. Engle wanted to know if staff had any historic photos of this site.

Ms. Bryant answered no. They did not find any historic photos. They do have some photos, but it appears that this is what was demolished.

Mr. Engle asked whether at one point this was six separate warehouses.

Ms. Ward said there were multiple bays within an entire row. The Sanborn Maps go back to 1884. A series of platforms are shown. The historic photos that staff has shows a concrete slab with infill. The ones that were on the right-of-way were demolished. At that time they were approved to go back with multiple pedestrian bridges, but they ended up only building one. This is probably a little different than what was there as far as they know, but it is consistent with what was approved and is consistent with development on Factors Walk.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson said he has one historical photo (he does not have it with him) that shows a large permanent canopy structure that comes out over about half of what is currently the plaza. It has large kind of truck ramps that went up to the front of the building. It was probably heavy timber. The front was more of a warehouse type.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said what bothers him is that looking at all the other pictures of the Factors Walk and the warehouse district, it was chaos. Every single warehouse was different than its neighbor. They are getting six identical awnings in a row. It is almost getting precious. He wished there was a little variety. This looks like it was built as one big hotel.

Dr. Williams said it was built as one row. Obviously, the architectural character of the cast iron detail around each storefront. The Cotton Exchange has a very similar character to this. There are no awnings here, but he is sure that it was designed as a row. One way to look at it he guessed the chaos that Mr. Engle spoke of is more typical of the River Street side. Certainly, this is more dressed up.

Mr. Engle stated not at all. When they look at Factors Walk and even the photos of Factors Walk, every single shop had a different awning and a different gate. This is like City Market. Look at the variety of awnings, canopies and everything else that is here. They are not all the same; they all do not match. he wished this could be broken up somehow. Now, this does not say that there cannot be six awnings. If they were different colors it would not look like they were all matched. Each owner put up what they wanted themselves. They did not have an architect designing the overall plan.

Dr. Williams said he does not know how they would say incorporate variety.

Mr. Merriman said they will have to be specific about how they are going to do that.

Dr. Williams said the entire facade has identical details. Below grade level is there is some irregularity in the fenestration and no doubt in materiality. But from Bay Street level up, it is regular. They would almost have to design it for them if they say create variety.

Mr. Engle said they would not have to design it. They could just say don't have six identical awnings. They can be different colors. This is a staff issue and not the Board's issue. He was not saying that the form of the awnings is a problem. He is saying having them all identical is the problem. There are buildings in City Market with four storefronts, but the four awnings are different.

Dr. Williams said the building being discussed today is only one business.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Dawson to comment on what the Board is discussing about the awnings.

Mr. Dawson said he agrees. He believes that the richness of Broughton Street has been homogenized by the standards.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Dawson if he believes that he could come up with some scheme of variation with the staff.

Mr. Dawson said his client is actually considering that two of the bays may become a coffee shop. If this happens, there might be an opportunity to introduce either a different color or form to the awning or something that would be consistent with an overall building development that would express a little of the richness. Even the standard would prohibit what was done historically which were the structural canopies. There were some on Broughton Street, but now they are prohibited.

Mr. Overton asked that a motion be made that asks for some variety perhaps to be distinguished between Mr. Dawson and staff pertaining to color. He senses that the Board is in agreement with Mr. Engle's observation.

Ms. Simpson asked if this needed to be stated in a motion if the petitioner has to meet back with the staff anyway.

Mr. Overton said he believes a motion needs to be made to that effect as the Board is asking for a little bit of variation.

Mr. Dawson said his proposal is consistent with the standards of the district and ordinance. Therefore, if he has the opportunity with a different such as the coffee shop then he would do it. But, he believes for the Board to tell him that this is too perfect even though it meets the standards, they will become a design board. Therefore, let him know if this meets or does not meet the standards.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Ward if Mr. Dawson was correct in saying that his proposal meets the criteria.

Ms. Ward said the Board needs to be justified in their reason for making a condition. Is it preference or is it based on our preservation and design standards in the ordinance?

Mr. Engle said they are reconstructing not restoring. They are reconstructing a feature because they have no historic evidence that this ever existed. With this in mind, the Board has a right to say that they would like to see a variety.

Ms. Simpson said as has been said, there is only one order now. Therefore, things are different. In past time, the owners, themselves, would put their awnings. Also, at that time, the awnings served different purposes as there was not heating and air conditioning. Therefore, she is not sure she agrees with telling the petitioner that he has to have different awnings. There is only one owner.

Mr. Merriman said due to the lack of historical evidence, the Board is working off of conjecture, too.

Dr. Williams said when they run the risk of having variety for variety sake and it becomes arbitrary.

Mr. Engle said most of the awnings along here cover the entire deck. They are on post that came all the way out to the front rail at Factors Walk. They were huge, ten feet deep.

Dr. Henry stated that he does not disagree with any of the statements he has heard, but he believes they need to stay out of this color and just make a straight motion.

Board Action:

Approval for the new canvas awnings and new pedestrian bridges at 126 West Bay Street with the condition that the awning fabric be submitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle	- Nay
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Nay
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

13. [Petition of Alexandro Santana | H-11-4542-2 | 102 East Gaston Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Alexandro Santana was present on behalf of the petition

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a screening wall, located 18 inches behind an existing historic iron fence and knee wall on the Drayton Street elevation towards the rear, at 102 East Gaston Street. The proposed wall is 26 feet-eight inches long and nine (9) feet high. It features a scalloped edge on the south end. The proposed wall will be concrete block, stuccoed to match the main house.

Dr. Henry asked if this request has been before the Board at an earlier time.

Ms. Bryant explained that this is not the same request that was made at an earlier time. This is the same design, but the height is different.

Mr. Engle asked what height was being requested initially for the wall.

Ms. Bryant believes that the request was originally eleven feet and now the petitioner has lowered it to nine feet.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Santana stated a planting is between the original fence and the knee wall.

Dr. Williams asked the petitioner how does the wall connect to the pier.

Mr. Santana answered that the wall does not connect to the pier.

Dr. Williams asked how far is the east side from the wall.

Mr. Santana answered about twelve inches. There is a planting between the original fence and the knee wall and the new wall.

Dr. Williams said he could not tell from the elevations how the wall terminates behind the piers.

Mr. Santana said they terminate straight and then cuts the wall in three halves.

Dr. Williams stated there is the capstone and then wire.

Mr. Santana stated that the capstone wraps around and remains flush.

Dr. Williams asked what is at the bottom.

Mr. Santana answered the planter.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry said when the petitioner was here before he said he would do a green wall.

Mr. Santana stated that the last proposal was proposing to remove the original planting, the original iron fence and the knee wall and build a solid wall and configuration about 26 feet. This proposal maintains the original knee wall, maintains the original iron fence, maintains the one foot wide planter that will be built directly behind the original iron fence. The greenery will remain.

Board Action:

Approve the screening wall, located 18 inches behind the existing iron fence and knee wall at 102 - PASS East Gaston Street.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Not Present

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

14. [Petition of Rebecca Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | H-11-4544-2 | 327 Jefferson Street | Rehabilitation, alterations, and addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Rebecca Lynch was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations and a masonry wall and garage/carport at 327 Jefferson Street.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for the alterations, wall and garage/carport at 327 Jefferson Street with the following conditions:

1. Incorporate casement windows in the upper floor of the west facade to meet the design standard and still be in keeping with the contemporary nature of the design.
2. Address or correct the alignment of the curb cut with the garage door.
3. Staff recommends study of a vertical orientation to the corrugated metal and use of a sliding garage door to match those on the existing building and to meet the intent of the ordinance which requires it to resemble a "carriage house door" which would not be appropriate on this modern design.
4. Submit all stains, colors and specifications for light fixture to staff for final approval.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Lynch said they concur with most of the staff's recommendations. Ms. Lynch said regarding the window, the steel windows are existing and will be used on the south facade. The windows that they are proposing for Jefferson Street facade is actually a fixed window over an awning window. If the ordinance requires the upper sash to be operable, they will use a casement. Regarding the garage door, they were originally wanting to do a sliding door, but they found that it was cumbersome. They did not want to make the appearance of the garage any larger than it needed to be and the door would somewhat slide off of get in the way of the pedestrian gate. It is a little more difficult to have an automated door for car access. Ms. Lynch said regarding the ordinance on the carriage style doors are in fact over head doors that are made to look like carriage doors. The reason they wanted to do the corrugated vertical is because they thought it would be a little more seamless with the section on the door where the seams would not be seen. If the Board has an issue with the materials, they will work with staff to come up with another option on the corrugated metal.

Ms. Lynch said they show the curb cut as it actually is on the survey. They will address this with Traffic Engineer. They just want the Board to be assured that they will not try to construct anything without approval from the Traffic Engineering department.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Ward informed the Board that the **Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation** could not remain to hear this proposal, but left the HSF's written comments to be read into the records: HSF supports the reuse of the existing awning windows and we do not feel that it is necessary to incorporate casement windows in the upper sashes due to the contemporary design and the fact that it is a non-historic structure.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said he agrees with the staff's recommendation.

Ms. Ramsay said she believes that the petitioner has already stated that she agrees to work with the staff regarding the sliding glass door.

Mr. Engle said he does not believe that the sliding glass door will work. There is not enough room for it to be functional. He suggested that the staff and the petitioner work together on this.

Board Action:

Approve the alterations, privacy wall and garage/carport at 327 Jefferson Street with all stains, colors, and specifications for light fixture to be resubmitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay
Second: Ebony Simpson
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Not Present
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
W James Overton - Abstain
Linda Ramsay - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye

15. [Petition of Brannen Construction Company, Inc. | H-11-4545-2 | 408 East Liberty Street | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Steve Brannen and Ms. Leslie LaRue were present on behalf of the application.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to install a door within an in-filled arch opening on the second floor, rear facade of the building at 408 East Liberty Street. The opening will feature a new door, double French wood door with true-divided lights and a four light transom above, painted to match the existing trim on the structure. A black iron railing with one-half inch square pickets, four inches on center is proposed over the doors to project no more than four inches from the facade.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval for the alteration to the rear opening at 408 East Liberty Street with the following conditions:

1. Study of an arch shape in the transom or door to echo the shape of the opening and eliminate the wood infill panel; and
2. The door frame be inset a minimum of three inches from the exterior surface of the rear facade.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Brannen staying that they are trying to keep things as simple as possible.

Mr. Howington asked what are the dimension of the inside opening of the arch.

Mr. Brannen answered that it is approximately a nine inch space. They picked this up from the next street over.

Mr. Howington said the transom has a narrow opening.

Mr. Brannen stated that it is roughly sixth-eighth.

Mr. Merriman said the petitioner could go with a regular transom and increase the wall between the door and transom; a little bit will make it look better.

Ms. LaRue, owner, said she prefers to maintain the architectural work of the house from the front to the back.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Ward informed the Board that the **Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation** could not remain to hear this proposal, but left the HSF's written comments to be read into the records: HSF agrees with staff's recommendation for approval; specifically that the transom or door shape be restudied to fit the arched shape of the opening, and eliminate the proposed infill panel.

Board Action:

Approval for the alteration to the rear opening at 408 East Liberty Street with the following conditions:

1. The transom shape match the arch shape of the opening; and - PASS
2. The door frame be inset a minimum of three inches from the exterior surface of the rear façade.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

16. [Amended Petition of Rebecca Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | H-11-4405\(S\)-2 | 205 East Hall Street | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4405-2 Amended.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4405-2 Amended.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

17. [Petition of Caroline Nichol | H-11-4531\(S\)-2 | 554 East Jones Street | Color Change and Shutter Repair](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4531\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4531\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

18. [Petition of Rebecca Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | H-11-4532\(S\)-2 | 23 W. Perry St. |](#)

Stucco Repair

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4532\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4532\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

19. Petition of Nicole Curreri | H-11-4533(S)-2 | 322 Price St. | Color Change

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4533\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4533\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

20. Petition of Ted Carellas | H-11-4534(S)-2 | 519 E. York St. | Color Change

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4534\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4534\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

21. Petition of Stephen D. Barnhill, Jr. | H-11-4535(S)-2 | 301 Williamson St. | Color Change

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4535\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4535\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. Petition of Bill Wohlschlag | H-11-4536(S)-2 | 36 East Broad St. | Windows/Doors

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4536\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4536\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. Petition of Lott + Barber | H-11-4543(S)-2 | 142 Bull St. | Minor Rehabilitation Repair

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4543\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4543\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

24. Past Cases

NOTE: Ms. Simpson left the meeting at 6:50 p.m.

Ms. Ward reported that a report has been provided to the Board. They were tracking some of the past cases that have been brought to staff's attention. They will continue to monitor them as they come into compliance.

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Proclamations

25. [720-722 Habersham Street](#)

Dr. Henry said the property owned by the at 720-722 Street has been re-designated as non-historic although it had been designated historic. He believes that in the future if a petition comes such as this it should be made known to this Board. In this way, they could at least get their position known to the public. Dr. Henry said, therefore, he would like for the staff to inform the Board of this sort of situation so they can make their decision known.

Mr. Overton said his understanding is the Metropolitan Planning Commission reviewed the request of the historic nature and then made a recommendation to City Council.

Dr. Henry asked if the Historic District Board of Review should have voted on this.

Mr. Thomson said the Historic District Board of Review is not a part of the process for this. Individually, they can voice their opinion if they know about it, but this Board is not a part of the process adding or subtracting buildings from or to the Historic District Building Map. This is a part of the ordinance that the Metropolitan Planning Commission and City Council mandates.

Dr. Henry said if they are not a part of the decision-making is fine, but this Board had a right to make their position known.

Mr. Engle said this Board did not know about this.

Ms. Ward said she made the announcement at the October meeting.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Thomson if he was saying that the Metropolitan Planning Commission has the authority to either include or exclude properties from the Historic District Building Map.

Mr. Thomson explained that the Metropolitan Planning Commission is a recommending body to City Council.

Dr. Henry stated that he understood what was being said, but this Board has the responsibility of making historic decisions.

Mr. Overton asked how does one board's members get to understand another board's actions.

Mr. Thomson stated there have been about four or five updates to the Historic Building Map. The building was never identified by staff to be added to the Historic Building Map. The applicant in cooperation with the staff asked in 2007 that it be added. It was an individual action at that time just as it was to take it off. He believes the owner had some good intentions when he went into this, but as he got into the restoration his good intentions faded. The reasons he wanted to get it designated historic was to get the tax credits, but this was not necessary. The Metropolitan Planning Commission looked at the request and said that the petitioner asked for it to be put on the map and now he is asking that it to be removed from the map. The MPC accommodated the owner's request because in four or five surveys, they never brought the building forward to be added to the Historic Building Map. Mr. Thomson believes that there is some historic context, but believes that most of it is not in the building or the structure, but in the family context at the site. A lot of things went wrong with this. They are trying to get the owner to change his materials. He does not know what approval this requires, but instead of vinyl they are asking that Hardi-plank be put on the building as was requested from this Board.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Thomson if he could comment on whether the Metropolitan Planning Commission set a precedent for future extractions of the buildings within the Historic District something other than what the Historic District Board of Review is prescribing to do.

Mr. Thomson answered that he does not believe so as each building comes with its own set of circumstances in terms of being historical or not. The only remaining standard from his perspective is the context of the family business being here 50 or more years. The chimney and many others things have been changed.

Mr. Overton asked did the Metropolitan Planning Commission know what the Historic District Board of Review cares about.

Mr. Thomson said he does not recall if there was a staff report.

Ms. Ward said a verbal summary was given. The focus of the review at MPC was on historic designation. Therefore, to get into the details of whether or not they approved Hardi-plank, they would have to review the discussion. However, she does not believe that they got into this.

Mr. Thomson said some members of the Metropolitan Planning Commission were more aware of this than others.

Mr. Engle said the unfortunate fact is the wood was removed after he had an approved plan from the Historic District Board of Review. He said he wanted to put Hardi-Plank on it. Ten years ago an architect and an engineer

recommended that this be demolished. This property should not have been listed on the Historic Building Map.

Mr. Thomson stated that he just completed his observation of this Board's reasoning. This was looked at and do you want a dilapidated, boarded up place, a hole in the ground, or a restored building. This is the other factor that was considered. The City Manager echoed this in her comments during the meeting. Choices must be made sometimes and he sums it up as the building will still be standing for some future owner who might want to come back and do the right thing with this building. Otherwise, as was said, it would be a hole in the ground or a dilapidated building.

Board Action:

Recommend that staff advise the Historic District Board of Review when structures are re-designated as non-historic so that the Chair and Vice-Chair be invited to testify before the appropriate body. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion:

Second:

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

26. [Nominating Committee Report for 2012 Officers](#)

NOTE: Mr. Gay left the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

The Nominating Committee members are: **Mr. Reed Engle, Dr. Nicholas Henry, and Ms. Linda Ramsay.**

The Committee nominated Mr. W. James Overton as Chair and Ms. Linda Ramsay as Vice-Chair for 2012.

Board Action:

Accept the report of the Nominating Committee.
Officers to be voted on at the December 14, 2011 - PASS
meeting as per the by-laws.

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington	
Second: Sidney J. Johnson	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

27. [Unified Zoning Ordinance Update and Comments](#)

Mr. Thomson said that the Metropolitan Planning Commission as has asked him to consider how they are going to approach dealing with the public comments on the Unified Zoning Ordinance. Originally, the review period was December 30, 2011, this period will be extended. No date has been set as of yet as the Metropolitan Planning Commission said the date will be kept open until they get further along in doing the other things that Board wants the staff to do. Mr. Thomson believes, however, that it will probably be at least six months into the future at a minimum. Plenty time will be given for anyone who wants to make comments.

Ms. Ward said staff has received comments from Dr. Henry and Mr. Engle. She has taken the comments verbatim and put them on letterhead template. Ms. Ward said she believes that the Board members need to review the comments and if they have additional comments, to please send them to staff.

Mr. Overton asked staff if they are going to send the comments to the Board

members.

Ms. Ward answered that the Board members have the comments in their green folder. She will also send it as email.

Ms. Ward stated, additionally, comments were received at the end of this summer from a petitioner who requested that they work at doing HVAC screening at the staff level. She asked the Board if they would consider looking at the By-laws to amend this section if they approve of staff approving the HVAC screening.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Ward if she was talking about the HVAC tower at the old courthouse.

Ms. Ward answered that it could be.

Mr. Engle said this required more than just putting a fence around the unit.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

28. [Next Meeting - Wednesday December 14, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic Distric Board of Review, Vice-Chair Overton adjourned the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 14, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah P. Ward
Preservation Director

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.