



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
October 12, 2011 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

OCTOBER 12, 2011 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

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

HDRB Members Not Present: Ebony Simpson

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: Mike Rose, Building Inspector
Tiras Petrea, Zoning Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. [Approve Minutes of September 14, 2011](#)

Attachment: [09-14-2011 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve September 14, 2011 Meeting Minutes. - 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 |
| Brian Judson | - Abstain |
| Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. | - Aye |
| W James Overton | - Aye |
| Linda Ramsay | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |

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

2. [Petition of Urgent Care of Historic Savannah | H-11-4519-2 | 144 Lincoln Street | Awning](#)

No action required. Item reviewed by staff as directed at an Administrative Hearing on October 3, 2011.

3. [Amended Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architect | H-11-4478-2 | 502 East Broughton Street | Rehabilitation & Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

No action required. Application withdrawn by petitioner.

IV. SIGN POSTING

4. [313 Berrien Street](#)

Mr. Howington said he went by 313 Berrien Street yesterday, but did not see that the posting sign was posted.

Mr. Engle stated that he went by earlier in the week and the sign was not posted. It is a requirement that the signs are posted so that the public will be aware of what's going on in their neighborhood.

Board Action:

Rescheduled to meeting of November 9, 2011 due to failure to comply with posting of sign - PASS

requirement.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Sidney J. Johnson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

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

Board Action:

Continued to the November 9, 2011 Historic District Board of Review meeting at the request of - PASS the petitioner.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

6. [Petition of Pete Callejas for Greenline Architecture | H-11-4516-2 | 124 Bull Street | Screen wall](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Project Description.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the proposed copper louvered screen wall surrounding the chiller at 124 Bull Street. - PASS

Vote Results

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

7. [Petition of Daniel E. Snyder, AIA | H-11-4523-2 | 216 East Gaston Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the alteration to the number of openings, from three to two with an eight foot opening, on the carriage house at 216 East Gaston Street. - PASS

Vote Results

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

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

8. [Amended Petition of Jose Gonzalez for Gonzalez Architects | H-11-4438-2 | 13 East Perry Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Jose Gonzalez was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for an illuminated principal use projecting sign at 13 East Perry Street for the new business Fire Bistro. Ms. Bryant reported that the staff recommends approval for the illuminated projecting principal use sign at 13 East Perry Street with the elimination of the Perry Lane facia sign because signage is not permissible on lanes because they do not meet a definition of a street as determined by the Zoning Administrator.

Dr. Williams asked if there are other instances of signs on lanes.

Ms. Bryant answered yes there are other instances of signs on the lanes, but the Zoning Administrator made the determination.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Gonzalez stated the proposed sign is four feet by four feet for a total of 16 square feet and will be located above the central bay, align with the pediment and will not project over the pediment. The projecting sign will be illuminated with LED lights. The illuminated principal use facia sign on Perry Lane would be two feet by two feet for a total of four square feet. It will be located on the east side of the Perry Lane facade between the storefront windows and the top will align with the top of the windows.

Mr. Judson stated that the street projects, but the lane is flat.

Dr. Williams asked if it was not in the Board's purview to look at the sign for the Perry Lane.

Mr. Judson stated the sign for the Perry Lane is a part of the Board's purview.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry stated the illuminated sign for the Perry Lane was passed to the Zoning Administrator. Does it meet the standards? What is the staff's decision?

Dr. Williams questioned the illumination.

Ms. Ward stated the proposed sign will be mounted on a steel bracket and features an aluminum face plate. The projection sign will be illuminated by LED uplifting concealed in the bottom portion of the sign bracket.

Mr. Engle stated he believes that a sign is on the Lane for the proposed McDonald's that will be on Broughton Street at Jefferson Street. He asked staff if this is correct.

Ms. Ward answered that she does not remember if a sign was approved on the lane for McDonald's, but remembers that there is a sign on the lane for Avia.

Board Action:

Approve the illuminated principal use projecting sign on Perry Street and support a finding of fact for a variance for the Perry Lane illuminated fascia sign. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Howington reported that he went by this site on yesterday, October 11, 2011 and did not see that the public notification sign was posted.

Mr. Engle stated also that he went by the site earlier last week and the sign was not posted.

Mr. Coggins was not present, but a representative was present who knew nothing about the posting of the sign.

The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Savannah, Section 8:3030 Historic District, subsection (h)(1) requires the posting of property. Therefore, the Board did not hear this petition at its meeting today. Notification will be sent to the petitioner again regarding the posting of the property at 313 Berrien.

Board Action:

Continuance to the meeting of November 9, 2011. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Sidney J. Johnson

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

10. [Petiton of Paul Miller | H-11-4514-2 | 224 Houston Street | Rehabilitation, Alterations, and Demolition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Paul Miller and Ms. Shea Slemmer were present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. She reported that staff recommends approval for the rehabilitation, alterations, and demoliton of the rear shed structure on 224 Houston Street with the following conditions:

1. The glazing in the door, sidelights, and transom is restudied to be compatible with the 1850s character of the structure;
2. The finalized design of the front entry stoop is submitted to the Historic District Board of Review for approval.

Dr. Williams stated that page 16 of the report shows that the half-moon windows will be replaced.

Mr. Engle questioned the date of the photo on page five (5).

Ms. Bryant stated that she was not sure of date. The petitioner will have to get an encroachment agreement for the front entry stair.

Mr. Howington stated only windows with sashes are shown and no sills.

PETITIONERS COMMENTS

Mr. Miller stated that he did not have anything to add to the report as Ms. Bryant covered everything.

Mr. Engle said the request is to reconstruct the stairway, but it does not match the Secretary's Standards requirements. The photo shows that some of the windows and doors do not match. The petitioner cannot just pick and choose. Everything has to match.

Mr. Miller said the intent is to match the doors as closely as possible.

Ms. Slemmer said the skylights are boarded.

Mr. Engle stated that they should be rectangular and this should be the guidance that is used.

Mr. Miller stated that the doors will have to be rebuilt. The transoms are rotten.

Mr. Merriman said one could be made.

Mr. Miller stated that the exterior of the house is in poor condition. The integrity is to save as much of it as possible.

Mr. Howington said the submittal packet showed that all the windows would be replaced.

Mr. Miller said all the windows on the north side would be replaced.

Mr. Howington questioned the sashes.

Mr. Miller answered that they could possibly have some made, but they would not match.

Mr. Engle stated that the photo is used as a basis, but the windows are smaller. As he has said, the petitioners cannot just pick and choose.

Mr. Gay said historically most houses have shutters.

Mr. Miller said they want to restore the structure as accurately as they can.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Miller if they will maintain the 1950 portion.

Mr. Miller answered yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation said they agree with the staff's

report. They believe the transom should be eliminated.

Mr. Matthew Allan stated he has been inside this building many times. He is supportive of this building being rehabilitated.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Gay believes it would look better if the 1950 building was removed.

Ms. Slemmer said the addition is important. They will be living here and renovating the other part.

Mr. Miller said their intention is to use the second story as a gallery later on.

Mr. Engle said there are no pictures included for the shutters. His concern is that there is no specificity at all. The elevation drawings are needed. He is not comfortable with this as is. He realizes that a lot of work is needed to be done on the structure, but there is a lot of information that the Board still needs.

Mr. Judson said the Board needs more justification. What about the stairs and shutters?

Mr. Merriman, too, questioned the shutters.

Board Action:

Continuance to the meeting of November 9, 2011
upon the petitioners' request. - PASS

.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a new oriel window on 231 Houston Street. The new oriel window will be located on the Perry Street facade, above the garden floor door. It will be nine feet wide, with nine feet-seven inch wide roof, and project two feet-two inches from the building facade. It maintains a vertical clearance of eight feet above the sidewalk. It will feature three window bays, to align with the existing window height and proportions. New wood double-hung one-over-one windows, to match the existing windows, manufactured by Lincoln will be used. The oriel will be supported on wood brackets and feature a shed roof and Hardi-plank siding.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the oriel window at 231 Houston Street with the condition the windows are incorporated into the oriel design.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Deacon said he wants to simplify the petition from last month.

Mr. Howington asked if there is a reason for the small window being there. Most are boxed-bay windows.

Mr. Deacon said he is not opposed to excluding the small window. He kept the shed roof tall, but is open to suggestions on the corner windows.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Deacon if he gave thought to possibly doing palladian bay windows instead of boxed-bay windows.

Mr. Deacon stated that he looked at the palladian, but believes what they came up with is better.

Mr. Engle questioned the gutter. Will they need an encroachment agreement?

Mr. Deacon said a small planting bed will be here. There is an existing canopy here also. If an encroachment is needed, he will seek it.

Dr. Williams said more transparency would be allowed with east and west windows.

Mr. Deacon said the corner windows gave more depth.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation stated that they agree with staff to include the windows within the space. However, the windows could be lower.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said on page 12 of the report shows a cross-section of bay windows from inside which is null and void. There is no benefit.

Mr. Matthew Hallett said the windows are low and proportionate in the wall. The functionality needs to be softened to lineup with the ceiling.

Mr. Engle said the windows could be lowered from inside and put in a flat roof.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Engle if he was saying reduce the pitch on the roof.

Mr. Engle said bring the oriel down.

Mr. Deacon said they could lower the pitch of the roof. However, he believes the owners want the roof to continue to read as is. They do not want a slope roof on the inside.

Mr. Engle said bring it down on the side.

Board Action:

Approval for the oriel window at 231 Houston Street with the following conditions:

1. Simple panels are incorporated into the design - PASS below the window;
2. The pitch of the roof and roof height is reduced and submitted to staff for final approval.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Linda Ramsay

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

12. [Petition of Bill Norton for Sign Mart, Inc. | H-11-4520-2 | 217 1/2 West Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Bill Norton was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a principal use projecting sign at 217 1/2 West Broughton Street for the business Taco a ba jo. A revised report was given today to the Board. The proposed sign is 36.5 inches tall and 45.1 inches wide with a thickness of five (5) inches for a total of 12 square feet. The proposed sign will be located to the left of the principal entry. It maintains a vertical clearance of ten (10) feet and projects 4.8 feet from the building facade. The business is located in the basement and maintain two non-contiguous storefront entries on Broughton Street providing 12 feet of linear front. Ms. Bryant said the Zoning Administrator conducted a site visit on October 11, 2011 and determined that both storefronts can be used to calculate the overall linear frontage of the business Taco a ba jo.

Ms. Bryant report that staff recommends approval for the principal use projecting sign because the Zoning Administrator has determined that the business maintains 12 feet of linear frontage and therefore the proposed sign meets the standards set forth in the Broughton Street Sign Ordinance (Sec. 8-3119).

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Norton said the sign is a sand-blased HDU sign featuring a predominately orange backbround with lettering "TACO a ba jo" in white. A small portion in the lower right corner of the sign will be white. The sign will be mounted to the building with steel supports finished in bronze.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for the principal use projecting sign because the Zoning Administrator has determined that the business maintains 12 feet of linear frontage and therefore the proposed sign meets the standards set forth in the Broughton Street Sign Ordinance (Sec. 8-3119). - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle
Second: Linda Ramsay
Brian Judson - Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
W James Overton - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye
Reed Engle - Aye

| | |
|-------------------|-------|
| Ned Gay | - Aye |
| Nicholas Henry | - Aye |
| Keith Howington | - Aye |
| Sidney J. Johnson | - Aye |

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

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

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

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

Mr. John Deering of Greenline Architecture was present on behalf of the petition along with Attorney Brooks Stillwell.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction Part I, Height Mass, 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 garage. A variance from Section 8-3030(n)(16)e.1., Large-Scale Development, Height, Table 1., for Variation is requested to provide continuous height for 172 linear feet of frontage. The standard requires variation every 120 linear feet.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends the following:

1. The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals approve the request to vary the large-scale development height standard for Variation in Table 1 [Section 8-3030(n)(16)e.] to allow for continuous height of 172 feet on the south elevation because the building design meets all of the visual compatibility factors and is consistent with the intent of the ordinance;
2. Approval for Part I, Height and Mass of the two-story parking garage at 205 Street with the following conditions: a. Increase the visual expression on the second floor to 12 feet; and b. Consider projecting canopies above the ground floor storefront glazing;
3. For Part II, Design Details staff recommends providing a storefront base to the storefront flanking the entry doors and to reiterate that all standards for parking areas will apply.

Mr. Judson explained that the second hearing for Design Details will be held at the Board's meeting in November. He acknowledged the fine work of the staff.

Dr. Williams wanted clarification on what's involved with the movement on Turner

Boulevard.

Ms. Ward said it will be protected, but the petitioner would be able to elaborate better on this.

Mr. Overton asked if the retail component as been reviewed by Zoning.

Ms. Ward said they will work with Zoning on this issue. There is a possibility that retail may not be here.

Mr. Overton asked if Zoning requires that retail be here.

Mr. Petrea, Zoning Inspector, answered no.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Attorney Stillwell thanked the staff for their thoroughness. In 2007 they received a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). But due to an economic collapse, the work was halted. They figured out their unusual situation and the developer and architect knew of the changes and attempted to incorporate them in the 2007 submittal. The construction plans are ready.

Mr. Deering said they have made arrangements for the remote parking with the County and Chatham Area Transit to get the parking rights. The site will be sold to the City. They have workd out a temporary package. He said they considered the roof line variation and tried to make the service building lot. They designed a simple building. The second story height will be submitted for approval next month. They will also work on the canopies and bring back to that meeting also. **Mr. Deering** said they will consider the storefront bay windows also.

Mr. Engle stated he was excited. This could have five (5) stories. He congratulated Greenline.

Mr. Overton asked if they included additional parking because of marketing.

Mr. Deering said they will only have the required parking spaces. No considerations were given to SCAD.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation said they support the staff's recommendation. The HSF's Architectural Review Committee looked at this carefully. The industrial feel is good to sustain. Allowing a variance versus importance to context should be forthcoming with a recommendation. This should maintain a strong horizontal. **Mr. Carey** said five (5) stories were previously approved. Could this be added on at a later time?

Mr. Judson stated he did not know if the question could be addressed. It is slightly different at the corners of the building. The height is recommended to be reduced. They are looking for more solid. Corners look like towers; advise against the brick. The building

should read as is - A parking deck. This area can accommodate bigger buildings. SCAD's light tower is here; the model is the hotel itself and the parking garage.

Board Action:

1. Approval to recommend that the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals approve the request to vary the large-scale development height standard for Roofline Variation in Table 1 Sec. 8-3030 (n)(16)e.] to allow for the continuous height of 172 feet on the south elevation because the design meets all of the visual compatibility factors and is consistent with the intent of the ordinance; and - PASS
2. Approve Part I, Height and Mass of the two-story parking garage at 205 Papy Street.

Vote Results

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

14. [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: [Submittal Packet - Application and Project Description.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Variance Request.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Site Plan.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

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

Mr. Engle and Mr. Johnson left at 4:15 p.m.

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 I, Height Mass, of a five-story hotel bounded by Oglethorpe Avenue, Papy Street, and Turner Boulevard. This project received a Certificate of Appropriateness on November 14, 2007 which has expired. The design has been altered to meet the design standards for Large-Scale Development adopted in 2009 and the footprint and massing have been reduced along Oglethorpe Avenue providing more space adjacent to the historic Thunderbird Inn. A variance from the window design standard [Section 8-3030)(n)(7)a.i.] is requested to allow a single-hung sash window. The proposed window is aluminum with a two inch wide horizontal center mullion simulating a bottom rail of a top sash; one inch muntins divided the upper and lower sections into the appearance of a six-over-six window. The ordinance requires windows facing a street to be double or triple hung, awning, casement or Palladian.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends the following:

1. Finding-of-fact that the proposed window specifications do not meet the design standards or the intent of the ordinance and is 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 and submit a sample with the Part II, Design Details. Under subsection (n) *Design Standards, the Board may approve alternative materials that are not listed as prohibited upon a showing by the applicant that a material or product is visually compatible with historic building materials and has performed satisfactorily in the local climate.*
2. Recommend that the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals deny the request to vary the design standard for windows, shutters, and commercial storefronts [Section 8-3030(n)(7) a.i.] which states *windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, awning, casement, or Palladian* because the building design is heavily influenced by classical architecture and adjacent historic railroad structures which feature punched openings and double hung sashes and should be held to the same standard as these contributing buildings to which it visually relates.
3. Approval of Part I, Height and Mass, with the following conditions:
 - a. On the western end of the northern elevation, facing Oglethorpe Avenue, align ground floor openings and pilasters with bays above and restudy the projecting verandah to reinforce the bay rhythm present on the facade to which it is attached.
 - b. Increase the amount of glazing within the two forward facing brick bays on Papy Street and the eastern must brick bay on Oglethorpe Avenue.
 - c. Provide an additional primary entrance on Papy street and Turner Boulevard.
 - d. Fencing, wall design and any associated appurtenances must be submitted with Part II and were not considered in the Part I review although they were indicated in plan.

Mr. Overton asked if the brick is precast.

Ms. Ward answered she believes the bricks are precast, but this question could be asked of the petitioner.

Dr. Henry asked if the windows would be three inch setback.

Ms. Ward stated that she did not look at this, but should be as this is Part I.

Dr. Henry asked how close is this to the Thunderbird Hotel?

Ms. Ward answered 69 feet.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Deering said the building has been reduced considerably. They tried to preserve some of the previous work. They have changed the setbacks to where they feel they meet the ordinance. The building is setback 69 feet from the adjacent hotel on the north and 65 feet from the garage on the south. The building comprises the entire block face along Papy Street with the recesses and setbacks. Ms. Ward looked at the elevations and bays, but he saw it as the overall design. The entrances on Oglethorpe Avenue and Papy Street will have 283 feet. The ordinance regulates four doors. However, he believes another door would be confusing. The restaurant will be busy most of time. Turner Street elevation will be the same as before. At times, this area it will be busy. SCAD museum is 800 feet long and has one fire exit. This is an east/west through street. They considered one entrance here and three entrances on Papy Street.

Mr. Overton asked if the exterior materials would be stucco.

Mr. Deering answered that the center will be brick. The light color areas and cornices will be stucco. The west elevation will have the same treatment that wraps the building.

Mr. Overton asked about the mechanicals.

Mr. Deering said pool equipment will be here.

Mr. Overton asked if there will be muntins on the windows.

Mr. Deering answered no. The horizontal muntin is heavier and the windows look like they are double hung, setback 3.34.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Deering what he wants the Board to do.

Ms. Ward said if the Board found this not visually compatible they could ask that they increase the amount of voids within the forward facing brick bays on Papy Street and the eastern most bay on Oglethorpe Avenue to meet the standard.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Deering what kind of windows does he want.

Mr. Deering answered aluminum; they can do 7/8 inch windows and sashes.

Dr. Williams said he was puzzled by the configuration of the facade. They are suggesting leasing space to a restaurant. What is going on with the elevation? Why is the entrance located where it is?

Mr. Deering stated the entrance is great. When entering in, you come in through a small foyer.

Dr. Williams asked why is it not symmetric. The facade facing the bus station is unresolved.

Mr. Deering said they have resolved it as best as they can.

Mr. Overton said he objects to staff's suggestion of a, b, and c. He disagrees with b and c.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation said essentially this meets the standards. But, there is an opportunity to do more. He was not talking about starting over as this is a successful design. He wanted to point out the aeriels that are in context today. To the west is the Thunderbird Motel, the west elevation is the proposed building and on the north side is the Greyhound Bus Station. There are two gable parapets on the third and fourth bays on the east. Therefore, what is the point for the pediments. The SCAD museum across the street. The plot of land lends itself to be more designable. Mr. Carey said he challenges the Historic Review Board and the architect to start over and say why not do this better. His job is to advocate the best design for the city.

Mr. Alexandro Santana said this is interesting. He understands the comments about what is across the street on MLK.

Mr. Judson said the Board is considering the proposal that is before them today which is the Height and Mass.

Ms. Ramsay said there is no where to go on either side.

Mr. Overton asked if the design needs to be looked at more in detail.

Mr. Deering stated they are seeking height and mass today. They are not prepared to change the design a great deal, but they will look at some of the details.

Dr. Henry asked staff to explain the rhythm and solids.

Ms. Ward explained that the staff is concerned with the portico. It does not relate to the north facade.

Dr. Williams said the stucco bays are dropping down.

Mr. Overton said the windows are important. They need to be restudied.

Mr. Deering said they are restudying other windows and will address them at the next

month's meeting.

Mr. Judson said the wall designs and any associated appurtenances must be submitted with Part II - Design Details.

Board Action:

1. Approval for Part I, Height and Mass, with the following conditions:

- a. On the western end of the north elevation, facing Oglethorpe Avenue, align ground floor openings and pilasters with bays above and restudy the projecting verandah to reinforce the bay rhythm present on the façade to which it is attached.
- b. Provide an additional primary entrance on Turner Boulevard.
- c. Fencing, wall designs and any associated appurtenances must be submitted with Part II and were not considered in the Part I review although they were indicated in plan.
- d. Windows must be resubmitted and considered with Part II, Design Details.

2. Finding-of-fact that three primary entrances on the Papy Street elevation are visually compatible and meet the intent of the ordinance.

- PASS

3. Recommend that the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals approve the request to vary the design standard for Entrances on Large-Scale Development [Sec. 8-3030(n)(16)b.i.] which requires one primary entrance for every 60 feet of street frontage to allow three primary entrances on Papy Street. Papy Street maintains 282.92 linear feet of frontage which would

require four primary entrances (primary entrances are defined in Section 8-3030(a) as *an entrance to a use that has or could have an individual street address. Service doors and emergency exits are not primary entrances).*

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: W James Overton

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

15. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | H-11-4524-2 | 230-232 Bull Street | Rehabilitation, partial demolition, and addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial View.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Andrew Lynch was present on behalf of the petition

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for stabilization, exterior alterations, rehabilitation, and an elevator addition to the four-story masonry double-house at 230-232 Bull Street. The building is a load bearing brick structure surfaced in stucco. The south and east facades have evidence of masonry failure showing significant bowing in the south elevation between the first and second floors and separation of the east façade/addition from the principal structure. It is estimated that this is caused by interior water infiltration, foundation settlement, and mortar deterioration within the walls. A structural analysis has been performed by a Georgia license structural engineer and his recommendation is that the structure can be repaired with significant stabilization and masonry repair.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval for the stabilization, rehabilitation, and addition at 230-232 Bull Street with the following conditions: 1. Provide an outer stair foundation ledge, that is visible on the north and south elevations, and recess the side stucco walls beneath to be compatible with historic masonry stairs in the district; and 2. Provide specifications for the exterior stucco and confer with staff if the scope of the

work on the south wall changes.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lynch stated that they will comply with the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Judson asked what materials will be used on the eight inch skirt between the two buildings.

Mr. Lynch said it will be a wire-mesh material and an aluminum frame that will be a vegetated wall.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Lynch if there is any way he could take precautions and save the historic brick and tie this portion back in. Mr. Howington believes the back side of the building is much worse than the other side.

Mr. Lynch said the back is worse, but they will prepare a method for both sides to be the same. They plan on salvaging all the bricks and try to reuse them in some capacity. He was not sure rather they could be used as a structural element, but they will look into it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation stated that the petitioner has already contacted the HSF and they are conferring with them on this project. They are satisfied with the project. He made note of this because the HSF holds an easement on this project. Therefore, they, too, will be involved in the review of this as well. HSF believes this will be a good design.

Board Action:

Approval for the stabilization, rehabilitation, and addition at 230-232 Bull Street with the following conditions:

1. Provide an outer stair foundation ledge, that is visible on the north and south elevations, and recess the side stucco walls beneath to- PASS be compatible with historic masonry stairs in the district; and
2. Provide specifications for the exterior stucco and confer with staff if the scope of work on the south wall changes.

Vote Results

Motion: W James Overton

Second: Linda Ramsay

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

16. [Petition of Alexandro Santana | H-11-4525-2 | 102 East Gaston Street | Alteration & Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Alexandro Santana was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting alterations to the existing iron fence and carriage house doors of 102 East Gaston Street. The proposed changes to the fence will occur on the Drayton Street elevation, towards the rear. The petitioner is proposing to remove the existing iron fencing and to construct a new screening wall, 11 feet in height. The proposed wall will be concrete block, stuccoed to match the main house. It will be 26 feet-eight inches long and tie into the existing masonry pier and base with a scalloped edge. The petitioner is also proposing to remove all existing wood trim from the carriage house openings and replace with a knife edge stucco opening, to match the existing carriage house stucco.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for the alteration to the existing iron fence and to the carriage house doors with the following conditions:

1. The iron fencing be retained on-site for future repairs or restorations; and
2. The garage doors are submitted to staff for final approval.

Ms. Ward reported Mr. Engle left the meeting early today, but left his written comments about this item. A copy of Mr. Engle's comments has been given to Board.

Mr. Judson stated that he will read Mr. Engle's comment into the record under Board Discussion.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Santana said the comments are extremely insightful. He tends to agree and has tried to convince his client that they do a green fence with plants. However, his clients are committed to this privacy issue in their garden. But, of course, the comments also provide a wonderful suggestion of solid privacy by heavily planting vegetation. The vines will be on the fence and then put a complete privacy wall behind the vines. Mr. Santana said, however, if they look at Drayton Street which is directly across the street at 26 East Gaston, which is an old project of his that was done approximately eight years ago, is a solid wall, a garden

wall directly across from this new portion of solid garden wall that is being proposed today. If they continue down Drayton Street north, they will notice that Drayton Street is pretty much a walled corridor. There are lots of wall gardens along Drayton Street and a lot of bases houses are here, the side elevations of houses that front north and south. He said, therefore, regarding Drayton Street in terms of the softening characteristic of garden walls in Savannah he finds it, but Drayton Street is rather urban and solid.

Mr. Santana said indifference to his client, he asked the Board to approve the solid wall with the condition that the 14 inch coping remain and that they build a wall on top of coping. They can get a little more articulation to the bottom of the new wall. It was always their intention to keep this. Showing that it would be removed was a mistake. Mr. Santana said he welcomes the green wall suggestion, but just wanted to point out that Drayton is a solid wall corridor.

Mr. Judson explained that Mr. Santana was responding to Mr. Engle's comments which he has not read into the records yet.

Dr. Williams asked if the fence belongs to the original construction of the house.

Ms. Ward answered that she believes the fencing belongs to the original construction. She said that on page eight (8) they will see a masonry base with an iron fence that goes around the property. But, the segment that the petitioner is talking about replacing is the metal portion.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Judson stated that he appreciates that Mr. Engle put his comments in writing. The Board and Mr. Santana have been given a copy of Mr. Engle's comments. Mr. Judson read the following comments written by Mr. Engle into the record:

"The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation have three standards that I believe are in conflict with this proposal:

Standard 2: The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 4: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Comments: I suggest that the iron fence on the stucco-based-with-coping is a historic feature that defines the spatial relationship of the carriage house to the main house as viewed from the corner of Gaston and Drayton Street as well as from Drayton Street. Being a very prominent corner, the break in solid building massing provided by the masonry and iron wall, backed up by the screening vegetation, provides a softening spatial feature characteristic of the original design. Removal of the 27 feet of base, iron fencing, and vegetation and its replacement with solid masonry will eliminate this characteristic "green wall" so typical of Savannah gardens.

The proposal removes 27 feet of historic characteristic material and replace it with "hard" versus "soft" ones (iron fence with greenery). In spite of the fact that the 27 feet suggested for removal is not the entire fence, it is the only section of the enclosure that is not backed up by a solid building, that is providing a sense that a garden space exists in the courtyard.

The base with the coping is characteristic of Savannah garden walls. The proposed wall has no differentiation of base and wall and is 27 feet of flat masonry with no relief. This is not characteristic of the construction techniques or draftsmanship historically used in the district, nor is it compatible with the wall sections to be retained.

The obvious desire for more privacy or sound-proofing could be met, but the characteristic features of the wall could be stimulated by:

1. Replacing the existing iron fence with a metal "green wall" screen, planted heavily with vines, while still retaining the stucco wall base; or
2. Retaining the existing base and iron fence and erecting a "green wall" screen inside of the existing wall; or
3. Plant a heavier vegetative screening behind the existing wall/fence"

Reed L. Engle
October 11, 2011

Mr. Judson said the base comments regarding the wall have been resolved in the discussion.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Ward to explain exactly what the petitioner is proposing to remove and what will be retained.

Ms. Ward explained that the petitioner is proposing to keep the low knee wall which is continuous and remove only the iron fence section and construct the wall on top of the knee wall.

Dr. Williams asked if the base will still be legible as separate from the new construction.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Dr. Henry asked if this will be a straight base.

Ms. Ward said it has a curved top. The owners are trying to get more privacy in the back yard; therefore, they want a solid wall.

Mr. Merriman asked if the stucco on the new wall will match the house. If so, as Mr. Engle pointed out it really would not differentiate the new wall. It would exactly as like it was here all along. If the wall is constructed, it will need something to make stand out.

Mr. Gay said there is a little lip on the stucco part of the wall below the iron work. The little lip will continue to be here. The petitioner will build on top of this.

Mr. Howington asked, therefore, this will differentiate it.

Mr. Gay said yes. The lip will be seen going across this.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Gay to explain again what he said about the lip.

Mr. Gay explained that the stucco part of the wall currently has a lip on top of it. This will still be there. Now, it does not show on the petitioner's drawing, but it will be there and continually stick out. The petitioner will build above this lip. Therefore, a line will be going across with a projection of about an inch or two that will continue to be here. This will show that something is different.

Mr. Overton said therefore, this is not drawn on the drawings.

Mr. Gay replied that this is not shown on the drawings.

Mr. Merriman asked, therefore, the lip that is already here will be a part of what will correct this, but what goes on top will it match the house that is here now.

Mr. Gay answered yes.

Mr. Merriman stated the lip is already existing. Therefore, it does not provide any distinction that it is different.

Mr. Gay explained that the lip sticks out passed the rest of the wall. It is a cap on top of the little wall now. What the petitioner is proposing to do is build behind this.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Santana if the face of the new wall will be in the fence plane or in the center.

Mr. Santana answered that the face of the new wall would be on the plane of the recessed which lines up with the fencing. The recess in the coping wall, the lip that Mr. Gay is talking about projects about an inch and three-quarters, almost two inches. It then returns to the flat portion of the knee wall. The new wall sits aligned with the flat recess of the knee wall which is where the fence is located now. It sits back two inches from the lip. The string course extends around the entire property and will remain. This existing base line differentiates the wall that is sitting on top of it.

Dr. Williams said that if stucco is used to match the existing building, the distinction will be hard to differentiate.

Mr. Gay said this is just as one does not see the piers on the top of a house. You don't see

this any longer because it is stucco.

Dr. Williams replied he was not saying you would not see it, but was saying that it would not be seen distinctly as new construction. He believes the desire to use the same stucco is for it to blend in. But, the Secretary of Interior's Standards recommend that distinctive materials are use and doesn't blend in.

Mr. Santana said he believes the house has stucco in it or the sidewalk on the front has tabby. If the new wall is stuccoed with the tabby and the sidewalk is tabby, may be the new wall could be tabby. It would be close enough.

Dr. Williams said Mr. Engle also made a comment about 27 feet of flat masonry with no relief. He asked if this will have ivy or any greenery growing on it. Will this be capped as well?

Mr. Santana said he could propose to his client that he leaves a two inch or four inch strip of earth between the foundation wall of the new from the sidewall and plant ivy such as was done at 26 East Gaston Street with their solid brick wall. They made holes in the sidewalk and planted creeping fig and it is working. They can do this if the Board finds it necessary to soften the wall with greenery.

Dr. Williams stated that he was not necessarily advocating this, but was just wondering how Mr. Santana would respond to Mr. Engle's comment about the 27 feet of flat masonry with no relief.

Mr. Santana said he believes Mr. Engle was commenting on the fact that the drawings to not show the 14 inch coping wall which gives the wall a certain baseline. Mr. Engle's 27 feet of no relief, he believes that the Georgian scroll at the top which matches the style of the house diminishes the 27 foot length.

Ms. Ramsay said leaving a part of the wall iron, you could see through this part into the back yard.

Mr. Santana said a small swimming pool will be here and this is where the privacy of a solid wall is needed. He said at the juncture where the solid wall is being proposed, meets an open of transparent portion of railings which is the gate. From one side of it to complete on the interior of the courtyard to complete the privacy, the owners are planting greenery perpendicular to Drayton Street about six feet. Therefore, the railings will be heavily planted.

Ms. Ramsay asked why could this not be done behind the 27 feet of iron railings.

Mr. Santana explained that his client really is concerned about the swimming pool privacy. They want complete invisibility from this portion. They talked about planting more heavily greenery here; but they are against this. If the Board says that it has to be greenery, that is fine. However his clients do not believe that no matter how much greenery is here it will not be private enough. They are concerned about people putting their hands through the railings, pulling back the greenery and peeping. They believe a solid wall would resolve it as a private courtyard, better than the greenery.

Dr. Williams said he shares Mr. Engle's concern about the lost historic fabric, particularly, when there are other potential solutions that could be found. It is one thing if the rear wall is falling away (that's historic fabric), but it would be crumbling and jeopardizing the stability of the building. Mr. Howington makes a good point about preserving the wall as best as they can. But, here they have no better reason to remove the historic fabric than a concern of privacy. The petitioner has made a point that the property across the street has a similar situation with the high wall. In fact it has a low iron fence in front. But one distinguishing characteristic is that the fence across the street turns about 20 feet and then returns to the house. There is a little piece at the base of the house, but there is a big gap almost as an exterior courtyard before you come to the real wall that Mr. Santana is using for justification for this wall being reviewed today. Therefore, the situations are not exactly parallel. This fence basically faces the entire property. So from his point of view, taking away pieces of the historic fabric he was troubled particularly about when there is not a compelling motive a part from I don't think some other solution would work, let's get rid of the historic fabric and put up a wall. Dr. Williams said he respects the petitioner's observation that Drayton Street is a hard scape corridor. But he does not know if making it harder is the best idea. He agrees with the garage door. Although he loves the design, but in this case, it changes the character of the building.

Mr. Judson stated that procedurally the Board can split the item and approve the garage door modification and then rule on the fence as a separate issue. However, he asked staff that if the Board denies this proposal for the fence, would the petitioner have to come back regarding a green fence, screening or something inside here?

Ms. Ward answered that it depends on how it is constructed. If the petitioner did heavy wall cypress, no. But if they actually built a trellis or something to grow the green through, they would look at this as it would be in essence a structure.

Mr. Judson asked if the petitioner would need to wait a year to reapply.

Ms. Ward answered no. If the Board denied this, it would mean that only this was denied. They could come back with a new petition for a different type of privacy wall in the back.

Mr. Judson stated that he does not know who owns the property, but knew that it recently changed hands. If the person is new to Savannah, he is satisfied that they sought professional guidance to go through the steps.

Dr. Henry agreed that it is a pretty wall; but they would be doing away with historic fabric because of a belief that someone would be putting their hands through the railing, pulling back the greenery and peeping through the shrubby.

Mr. Thomson said if the Board puts this address in the computer there is really a good street view of what is here today. He said he understood the issue as he could stand there and look over the hedge into where the pool would be. He was only saying that the google map provided a good view of this.

Mr. Overton stated that he believes it does not make a difference with what the Board is discussing now.

Mr. Santana said his concern is not only the visual, but also the noise with the suggestion of the green wall. They are not quite concern about them hearing the street, but the street hearing them.

Mr. Judson said the feedback that Mr. Santana might want to give his clients is that the Board is here to make a decision based on the standards that apply to the architecture.

Board Action:

1. Approve the alteration to the carriage house doors
with the condition that the garage door design be submitted to staff for final approval.
2. Deny the alteration to the existing iron fence because it does not meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation as required in Section 8-3030(I) - PASS
(1) *Preservation of historic structures within the historic district.*

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.
Second: W James Overton

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

17. [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 - Streetscape and Photos.pdf](#)

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

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

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Part I and Mass, of four detached residential structures at 409 East Perry Street. The petitioner has submitted a general development plan for site plan review and for the proposed subdivision. There were no comments that would affect the design for this development. A model of the proposed structures was on display.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass with the following conditions:

1. Eliminate the front yard setback to align with neighboring structures and historic structures at the end of the block and on the adjacent block;
2. Provide a three foot sideyard setback on the western most structure to provide windows and fenestration on the west facade;
3. Provide a wall of continuity at Perry Street between structures; and
4. Increase the width of the upper story windows to three feet to match those on the first floor and to reduce the amount of solid within n the facade.

Ms. Ramsay said the model shows the two hip roof in the center and the flat roof on the outside. The shows an alternate pattern. Which is correct?

Ms. Ward said this is a good question to ask the petitioner.

Dr. Henry asked staff if there is a regulation about the height of the wall and continuity.

Ms. Ward answered that it cannot be more than 11 feet. The other regulation would be that the material of the wall would need to match the material of the building which the Board would like at in Part II.

Mr. Merriman asked regarding the stoop, if it was being said to move the building forward and then change it from coming out to the side.

Ms. Ward answered no. They were saying move the entire building forward. She believes the side hall plan is appropriate.

Mr. Gay asked if the Board stipulates the rhythm of the buildings at this point as to whether they are going to be building a pyramid, etc.

Ms. Ward said yes.

Dr. Williams asked if the facing in the elevation correct.

Ms. Ward answered that it is consistent with the site plan showing the two middle buildings closer together and the outer buildings further a part touching the outside property lines. She said that staff is recommending that the petitioner actually move the building over slightly so that they can have windows or some type of fenestration on the side wall.

Mr. Merriman guessed that the buildings are built on the property lines, windows could not be on that side.

Ms. Ward said this is correct; it has to be three feet off the property line.

Ms. Ramsay said windows could be there, but they must be fire rated.

Ms. Ward said there is not a fire rated window that meets the design standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Judson asked the petitioner to explain the sequence of the roof types.

Mr. Allan said they have been putting together multiple plans at once. This may have escaped their notice that there is a differentiation in the roofs. However, as always, they are open for suggestions. He does not have anything to add to the staff's report.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Allan just to be clear on what he has said, if the design shows a flat roof, then shows a hip, and goes back to a hip roof, if the Board says reverse the right hand to a flat so that it is flat, hip, hip, flat he would be okay with it. Dr. Williams asked Mr. Allan in other words if he was inviting the Board's input.

Mr. Allan answered absolutely. He said it would be okay if the Board said flat, flat, flat, flat.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Allan if the model or the drawing was correct.

Mr. Allan said if he had to picture it, he would put the two hip roofs on the end.

Mr. Judson said since the point has come up, he believes it is important that the Board stipulates the roofs.

Mr. Howington asked if any consideration was given to may be putting the two flat roofs together as mostly everything in this area is sort of a townhome. This would make a stronger element.

Dr. Williams asked for clarification on Mr. Howington's suggestion.

Ms. Ramsay explained Mr. Howington was saying put the two flat roofs together to make one townhome. She guessed the two ends would be hip.

Mr. Howington said again that most things in this area are townhomes oriented. He did not know if the petitioner had explored putting the two flat roofs together or was just stuck on separate units.

Mr. Allan said they explored it. Next door is attached. They found some examples within the area that were detached. There is not a lot of consistency in this area, but this does not mean that they shouldn't strive for it. They thought, however, that with the way subdivision lots are and the space of the buildings it would be more effective to have them separated.

Staff's wall of continuity comes into play to connect them, is a good suggestion.

Mr. Howington asked if materials would be brick and masonry.

Mr. Allan answered that it will be brick.

Dr. Williams stated that staff has recommended that the second floor windows be widened to match first floor windows. He asked Mr. Allan if this was a problem.

Mr. Allan answered no.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Lawrence Lee said he owns the property to the right, the existing gray structure. Mr. Lee said he is extremely interested in this project. He said it appears that Ms. Ward has said indicated that a wooden cottage was scheduled for demolition, was delayed and then it was demolished. Mr. Lee said as the former chairman of the Historic Savannah Foundation, he could assure Ms. Ward that it was not demolished. The cottage was relocated on East Broad Street where it still exists a cross the street from the East Broad Elementary School and it is known as the Perry Lane Cottage.

Mr. Lee said they are excited that single-family dwellings are being built. In their area there is a huge facility that backs up to Perry Street; garbage is on the street every day. Therefore, it is very refreshing to see that these dwellings are proposed to be built here and they applaud it. He had some questions but after seeing the model, he believes they have been answered. Mr. Lee said he has a courtyard at the back of his house that goes about 20 feet; then a garage and the carriage house. He recently invested in putting palm trees back here and is concerned about how the sunlight will come here. It appears to him that the dwelling immediately adjacent to him will drop off and have a single story in the back. If this is true, it will allow for the sunlight to come into the courtyard. Mr. Lee said, however, he wants confirmation either from Mr. Allan or staff that what he sees on the model is what is proposed. Mr. Lee believed he was hearing that this is what will be built. He agree with moving the structure away so that windows and fenestration can be on the west side of the house. Mr. Lee also wondered about how the buildings would relate to each other with regard to the space. He would like to get clarification on this aspect. He wants the house to pulled away from his house as much as possible.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation said they agree with staff that the front yard setback should be eliminated to align with the neighboring structures; the windows on the upper floor match those on the lower floors and that the wall continuity be provided at the Perry Street elevation between the structures. Ms. Meunier said they also suggest just as Mr. Howington has said to create a continuity with the dwellings that the two parapet flat roof structures be placed on the end of the corner and attach them to create the block at the corner and then have the two pitched roofs structures as detached dwellings within the interior of the lot.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Judson stated in order to help move the Board along, the design and massing of the four buildings regardless of their spacing on the lots should be addressed first. Then the

Board could talk about the staff's recommendation that they be moved forward to a zero lot line clearance. Lastly, the Board could discuss how they are going to move the different buildings around.

Dr. Williams stated that he fully supports moving the buildings to zero lot line so that the front stoops low as they are stand out as this is the norm in Savannah. He believes this is an amazing characteristic of Savannah that the front steps are public property. The zero lot line will be the historic norm and also make the rear of the property three or five feet bigger which makes them even more useful. He supports the window issue also.

Mr. Judson stated he knew the petitioner was in agreement about the width of the windows. He asked Mr. Allan if he made a statement regarding the suggestion regarding the buildings being moved forward to the zero lot line.

Mr. Allan said moving the buildings to the zero lot line is fine.

Mr. Judson informed the Board that in terms of discussion, they are at the general design of the buildings, the height, mass and also the placement of the buildings on the lots.

Mr. Howington said he had some issues with the proper order of the entablature with the porches. Before this comes back to the next meeting, he would like for the petitioner to explore this a little better. They are not proportionate.

Mr. Judson said the Board could communicate those concerns to staff who will have the comments available for Mr. Allan.

Dr. Williams said one issue that could be separated from the others is moving the western most building western edge eastward three feet. He believes that if they treat it separately also from the spacing. He does not know if there is any opposition to this.

Mr. Judson said as an amended part to this, he sees that if they are looking at some symmetry, which they may resolve by conjoining the two flat roof buildings, but as he looks at this if they move the right building over three feet, the left ought to be moved in three feet.

Dr. Williams said his comment was predicated on the assumption that if the right is moved, everything will be in play anyway. Therefore, move the right buildings contingent upon it being resolved within the groove.

Mr. Judson said whatever building ends up in the fourth position numbering from left to right be moved three feet away from the gray building. As it is now, it sits on the property line. Therefore without fire rated windows, it could not have windows. Therefore, the Board is suggesting that it be moved three feet and that windows be included. Technically, this would be a part of Height and Mass. But, the Board will stipulate that the spacing and fenestration of the windows be approved by staff.

Ms. Ward said the windows are shown in the plans.

Mr. Judson said the Board now will talk about the arrangement.

Dr. Williams said the Historic Savannah Foundation made a proposal to take eastern most buildings and join them into a double unit and allow the western pair to float separately. He said one observation about this is the far right end building which actually faces west on Habersham Street fronts a long facade on Perry. One way to look at this is that it provides a visual balance, but pending to this, is the pre-existing brick building at the other end of the block. He said in other words they have bigger ends and the green gets a little finer in the middle.

Mr. Gay said the lots are there; so they have to keep the houses on their own lots.

Ms. Ramsay said the lot lines go down the middle; therefore, they will have to move the building in from Price Street.

Dr. Williams said Ms. Ramsay made a good point. Is there a Price Street alignment that would be upset if they do this? Price Street is a great corridor with wonderful walls of continuity.

Ms. Ramsay said she is not opposed to letting the buildings remain as they are because if they start shifting buildings around, they might upset something.

Dr. Williams asked staff that in order to join the two eastern buildings would require the eastern most to move in off the lot line.

Ms. Ward recommended that the building wall needs to form the street edge at Price Street and at Perry Street. If it was setback it would not align with the buildings to the north or the south.

Dr. Williams said to conjoin the two eastern most buildings would mean that the second building would be crossing the lot line.

Ms. Ward said yes, they would have to redo the subdivision. There might not be 30 feet lots any longer as it would probably go to 20 something lots. Ms. Ward believes they need to be careful of what they are looking at. The Board has a proposal before them that is requested for approval. Therefore, if the Board is going to say that they have to do a double house, it really needs to be justified.

Mr. Judson stated that as he sees it at this point given that they are not going to come in off the street to the left, the two questions are what patterns to they want. Does the Board want flat, peak, peak, flat; and even though they all were in agreement about moving the fourth building three feet to the left, but recognizing that they are not going to re-position number one (1) building, does the symmetry become an issue.

Dr. Williams said he believes the question is does the Board want regular spacing between the four buildings or do they want the sync baited rhythm of wide, narrow, wide. He believes these are the two options. Or it could be narrow, wide, narrow. Basically, there are four buildings, does the Board want them evenly spaced regardless of roof.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board needs to study the property lines as there are windows on the side of these buildings.

Mr. Gay said the building on the right hand side could be moved three feet over, the two middle buildings could still remain on their lots, but just move them over a tad bit. This would allow a little wider spacing on the anchors of the lots.

Mr. Judson said that is a question to measure on the map that they are not moving either too close to the lot line.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Allan why is there irregular spacing of the buildings on his proposal.

Mr. Allan said there is a zero setback on Price Street and they discussed this with Ms. Ward. Therefore, in trying for some sort of symmetry, they tried to book end next to Mr. Lee and on Price Street; and may be also some separation from the street and a little more visual privacy in the back. The "L" shaped building reduces the courtyard to some degree and if they have the building over a little more, it brings some more space.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the "L" shaped building is the hip roof or flat roof.

Mr. Allan said in essence it is just the facade, they are interchangeable.

Dr. Williams asked in response to Mr. Lee's question, the "L" shaped building is one-story tall.

Mr. Allan answered yes.

Dr. Williams said the different roof is over the two-story part.

Mr. Allan answered yes.

Mr. Judson said, therefore, the Board needs to focus on which elevation they want to see and then revisit whether or not they want the building that is farthest left be moved three feet to the right, understanding that it will disrupt the symmetry which should not be interfered with because the building which is now to the far right needs to remain on the property line.

Dr. Williams said in observation, the buildings are not exactly centered on their lots and it appears that there is wiggle room even if they move the western most building three feet there is room to maintain symmetry within the lots. He asked, therefore, could they leave the precise spacing an exact location on the lot relative to lot line that could be an issue verified by staff.

Mr. Judson answered yes, but he is fearful that the Board could not stipulate an exact symmetry and then allow it to be reviewed by staff. There may be reasons that it cannot be moved. Mathematics tell him that the wiggle room will not allow them to establish a symmetry. In the worse case, they will either move one of the buildings too close to the property line. There has to be enough room for someone to roll their garbage can and walk down the side of the building. They either need to stick to symmetry and decide not to recommend moving that one building three feet or move it three feet with the recognition that they will be disrupting the symmetry.

Mr. Judson said regarding the lot line, do they like the mixture of two and two. If so, what order does the Board want to see them in.

Dr. Williams said based on the elevation where they have porches coming in on the end and then a type of "V" configuration, obviously there is an attempt to create symmetry across the four. One of the elevation drawings showed a flat, hip, flat, hip. He said either they are flat, hip, hip, flat or hip, flat, flat, hip.

Ms. Ramsay said she believes the two flats in the middle should be put together and make a townhouse whereas the hips on the outside are a little more prominent.

Mr. Merriman said he was a little confused. The western most buildings has got to move away from the gray building no matter what in order to get the windows.

Mr. Judson answered yes.

Mr. Merriman asked, therefore, they want to keep the building on Price Street at the zero lot line.

Mr. Judson said yes. Therefore, they will surrender a symmetry of these spaces between the buildings. There is no way that they can move the two enough to keep all the spaces exactly the same. They have one of two choices with this regard. They can either not recommend that the building be moved three feet or recommend that it be moved three feet and acknowledge that they are destroying the perfect symmetry.

Dr. Williams said another possibility is to cluster the flats on the left or right. If they cannot control symmetry and spacing, the other option is to treat them as two pairs rather than a group of four; two flat roofs and then two hip roofs. The hip roofs will have cornices projecting beyond the wall plain, whereas the flat roofs do not.

Mr. Judson said in this case, he removes is recommendation of having the hip roofs in the middle and go flat, flat, hip, hip; bringing the two hips closer to the center of the block and the flats closer to the street and then the existing building providing the flat on the other end of the block.

Mr. Overton asked if the house on the right has windows on the side.

Ms. Ramsay said the building does, but it cannot.

Mr. Overton said, therefore, it is in violation of the Building Code.

Dr. Williams said the windows will remain on the lot line or move three feet and keep the windows.

Mr. Merriman said the windows need to move three feet.

Mr. Overton said he believes the roof arrangement should be left to the discretion of the staff. He said if the Board thinks about the total development, these houses could have been built 30 years a part, but they all separate decisions about what it would look like. He

believes that it is a little silly trying to put symmetry to this.

Dr. Williams said that historically development pattern is that houses be developed in pairs. There is an effort to have staircases symmetrical to each other whereas individual houses they just put the staircases wherever. But here they have far left, far right, far left, far right on the staircases. If they are going to leave this up to the staff, he would advise that the recognition of these as pairs. Whatever are the roofs will be alright and the building be treated in pairs.

Ms. Ward asked for clarification regarding the pairs.

Dr. Williams said that the pairs, working east to west that two eastern houses be treated as a pair and have like roofs.

Ms. Ward asked if the houses need to touch.

Mr. Judson answered no. They are only talking about the pattern of the roof.

Dr. Williams said houses one and two could have the same roof and houses three and four could have the same roof. They all could have the same roof or they could have flat, flat, hip, hip.

Board Action:

Approval for Part I, Height and Mass with the following conditions:

1. Eliminate the front yard setback to align with neighboring structures and historic structures at the end of the block and on the adjacent block;
2. Provide a three foot sideyard setback on the western most structure to provide windows and fenestration on the west facade;
3. Provide a wall of continuity at Perry Street between structures; - PASS
4. Increase the width of the upper story widows to three feet to match those on the first floor and to reduce the amount of solid within the facade; and
5. The roof shape of the buildings be treated in pairs.

Vote Results

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

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

18. [Amended Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn, Meyerhoff, Shay Architects, PC | H-10-4222-2 | 701 MLK Jr. Blvd | Iron Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4222-2 Amended 10-3-11.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4222-2 Amended 10-3-11.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

19. [Petition of Joanne Duran | H-11-4511\(S\)-2 | 228 MLK Jr. Blvd | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4511\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4511\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

20. [Petition of Coastal Canvas | H-11-4513\(S\)-2 | 7 West York St. | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4513\(S\).pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4513\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

21. [Petition of Lulu's Chocolate Bar | H-11-4515\(S\)-2 | 411 W. Congress St. - Unit B | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4515\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4515\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of Urgent Care of Historic Savannah | H-11-4519-2 | 144 Lincoln St. | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4519-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4519-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of John McEachern | H-11-4527\(S\)-2 | 503 E. President St. | Replace Windows](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4527\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4527\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Arend Jan de Voest | H-11-4528\(S\)-2 | 16 Price St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4528\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4528\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4528\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Amended Petition of Arend Jan de Voest | H-11-4528\(S\)-2 | 16 Price St. | Siding Replacement](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4528\(S\)-2 Amended.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of The Fitts Company, Inc. | H-11-4529\(S\)-2 | 13 East York Street | New Sign Face](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4529\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4529\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

27. [720-722 Habersham Street](#)

Ms. Ward stated as she said at the Retreat the work that is being done on 720-722 Habersham Street is not in compliance with COA. The petitioner submitted yesterday for a text amendment/map amendment to remove the building from the Historic Building Map. This will be going before the MPC on November 1, 2011.

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

New Business

28. Nominating Committee for 2012 Officers

The following members were appointed to serve as the Nominating Committee: Mr. Engle, Ms. Ramsay and Dr. Henry. The Committee will recommend a new chair and vice-chair.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

29. Next Meeting - Wednesday November 9, 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 Board, Mr. Judson adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah P. Ward
Historic 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.