



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
August 8, 2012 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

AUGUST 8, 2012 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

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

HDRB Members Not Present: Zena McClain, Esq.

MPC Staff Present: Tom Thomson, Executive Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Director
Leah G. Michalak, Historic Preservation Planner
Jack Butler, Comprehensive Planner
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

City of Savannah Staff Present: Tiras Petrea, Zoning Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. [Approve Minutes of July 11, 2012](#)

Attachment: [07-11-2012 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve July 11, 2012 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

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

III. SIGN POSTING

IV. CONTINUED AGENDA

- [2. Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc. for Screamin Mimis | H-12-4669-2 | 10 Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

Board Action:

Continue item to September 12, 2012 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

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

- [3. Petition of Twin Rivers Capital, LLC | H-12-4672-2 | 702 West Oglethorpe Avenue | New Construction](#)

Board Action:

Continue to September 12, 2012 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Reed Engle | - Aye |
| Ned Gay | - Aye |
| Nicholas Henry | - Aye |
| Keith Howington | - Aye |
| Sidney J. Johnson | - Aye |
| Brian Judson | - Aye |
| Zena McClain, Esq. | - Not Present |
| Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. | - Aye |
| Linda Ramsay | - Abstain |
| Ebony Simpson | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |

4. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc. for Screwie Louie's | H-12-4678-2 | 10 Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

Board Action:

Continue to September 12, 2012 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Reed Engle | - Aye |
| Ned Gay | - Aye |
| Nicholas Henry | - Aye |
| Keith Howington | - Aye |
| Sidney J. Johnson | - Aye |
| Brian Judson | - Aye |
| Zena McClain, Esq. | - Not Present |
| Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. | - Aye |
| Linda Ramsay | - Abstain |
| Ebony Simpson | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |

5. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | H-12-4727-2 | 600 East Bay Street | New Construction, Part I, Phase A](#)

Attachment: [Aerial - Looking South.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial - Looking North.pdf](#)

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

- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photos of surrounding buildings.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Elevations of Adjacent Buildings.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Context Images.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Site Plans.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Hotel 1 Drawings.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Parking Garage Drawings.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Hotel 2 Drawings.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Retail Buildings Drawings.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Streetscape and Riverfront 3D Images.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Narrative and Design Logic.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Continue to a future meeting at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Reed Engle | - Aye |
| Ned Gay | - Aye |
| Nicholas Henry | - Aye |
| Keith Howington | - Aye |
| Sidney J. Johnson | - Aye |
| Brian Judson | - Aye |
| Zena McClain, Esq. | - Not Present |
| Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. | - Aye |
| Linda Ramsay | - Abstain |
| Ebony Simpson | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |

V. CONSENT AGENDA

6. [Petition of Mike Schultz | H-12-4722-2 | 548 East Taylor Street | Addition of a Balcony](#)

- Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Site Plan.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Door Specification.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Paint Colors.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the balcony addition and door as requested because it meets the standards and is compatible. The exposed top portion of this balcony and door are minimal and only seen at some distance away from a public right-of-way. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Ebony Simpson

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Reed Engle | - Aye |
| Ned Gay | - Aye |
| Nicholas Henry | - Aye |
| Keith Howington | - Aye |
| Sidney J. Johnson | - Aye |
| Brian Judson | - Aye |
| Zena McClain, Esq. | - Not Present |
| Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. | - Aye |
| Linda Ramsay | - Abstain |
| Ebony Simpson | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |

7. [Petition of Doug Beans Signs for Cora Bett Thomas Realty | H-12-4725-2 | 15 East York Street | Sign](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use sign as requested because it meets the standards and is compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Ebony Simpson

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Reed Engle | - Aye |
| Ned Gay | - Aye |
| Nicholas Henry | - Aye |
| Keith Howington | - Aye |
| Sidney J. Johnson | - Aye |
| Brian Judson | - Aye |
| Zena McClain, Esq. | - Not Present |
| Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. | - Aye |
| Linda Ramsay | - Abstain |
| Ebony Simpson | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |

8. [Petition of Julia Hall | H-12-4728-2 | 501 Tattnell Street | Fence](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval of the fence with the condition that the finish for all of the gates be submitted to staff for review prior to construction. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Ebony Simpson
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye
Brian Judson - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

9. [Petition of Melissa P. Swanson | H-12-4731-2 | 407 West Congress Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the brick and iron fencing at 405 W. Congress Street as requested because it is visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Ebony Simpson
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye
Brian Judson - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

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

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

Agenda A (Items 12-15 will be heard at 2:00pm in sequential order)

10. [Petition of Tim Kinsey | H-12-4699-2 | 544 East Harris Street | New Construction Part II](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Part II Design Details, of a two-story carriage house at 544 East Harris Street. The accessory structure is proposed at the rear of the property and will provide two garage openings off of the lane. The existing wood fence on the east and west property lines will remain.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for Part II Design Details of the proposed carriage house because it meets the applicable standards and visual compatibility factors with the following conditions submitted to Staff for final approval:

1. Exterior walls to be smooth finish hardi-plank siding instead of the specified Select Cedar Mill finish and match the main residence's plank siding exposure dimension.
2. Revise drawings and specifications to include trim materials, sizes, and profiles. Also include French door design, garage door design (number and size of panels and windows), and metal roof detail.
3. Windows must maintain 7/8 inch or less simulated putty muntins. Submit a window section detail to staff.
4. Revise drawings and specifications to remove all shutters and the false window.
5. Confirm location of the intended storage area for refuse.

Ms. Simpson asked if the two references shown for the visual compatibility are a part of the storage area.

Ms. Michalak answered no; they are the other new construction adjacent carriage houses on the lane.

Ms. Simpson asked if there was an issue with shutters being added to the other carriage houses.

Ms. Ward answered that she was not aware of any issues regarding the shutters to the other carriage houses. She does not believe they were proposed. A part of staff's concern with the shutter here is that shutters are being proposed for one side of the building and not on the other side. Staff wants it to be consistent.

Mr. Gay asked if the window that is going to be removed when the shutters are no longer there, will the expansion between the two windows remain the same or will they be brought closer together.

Ms. Michalak said they are recommending that they be removed.

Mr. Engle asked if this is visible from the street.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it is minimally visible from East Broad Street. There is nothing on the corner block.

Ms. Michalak said there is a vacant lot; therefore, the top half of this can be seen over the fence.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Takats stated that he was present representing Mr. Tim Kinsey. Mr. Takats said there has been correspondence between Ms. Ward and Mr. Kinsey. They will comply with the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Takats to inform the Board where the trash will be designated. They are looking at four residential units.

Mr. Takats said that Mr. Kinsey is out of town. But he was sure that he will work with staff and make the necessary changes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Michalak reported that the **Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** representatives were unable to attend the meeting, but sent their written public comment which states that they agree with staff's recommendation.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Johnson asked if the petitioner is agreeable and will comply with all of the staff's recommendations. The staff has made several recommendations. Does the Board need to list the recommendations?

Ms. Ramsay said the maker of the motion can either list the staff's recommendations or incorporate them into the motion.

Board Action:

Approval for Part II Design Details of the proposed carriage house because it meets the applicable

standards and visual compatibility factors with the following conditions submitted to Staff for final approval:

1. Exterior walls to be smooth finish hardi-plank siding instead of the specified Select Cedar Mill finish and match the main residence's plank siding exposure dimension.
2. Revise drawings and specifications to include trim materials, sizes, and profiles. Also include French door design, garage door design (number and size of panels and windows), and metal roof detail. - PASS
3. Windows must maintain 7/8 inch or less simulated putty muntins. Submit a window section detail to Staff.
4. Revise drawings and specifications to remove all shutters and the false window.
5. Provide location of the intended storage area for refuse on the drawings.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Reed Engle | - Aye |
| Ned Gay | - Aye |
| Nicholas Henry | - Aye |
| Keith Howington | - Aye |
| Sidney J. Johnson | - Aye |
| Brian Judson | - Aye |
| Zena McClain, Esq. | - Not Present |
| Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. | - Aye |
| Linda Ramsay | - Abstain |
| Ebony Simpson | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |

11. [Continued Petition of Gonzalez Architects | H-12-4704-2 | 13 East Perry Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Mr. Sean Dillon was present on behalf of the petition representing Gonzalez Architects.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting to construct a second story addition on the concrete block addition at the rear of the building at 13 East Perry Street. It is located on top of the existing rear addition and is

setback 60 feet from Perry Street. The exterior is surfaced in stucco and will be painted Benjamin Moore Brilliant White to match the existing rear face. This item was continued from the July 11, 2012 meeting to address the following Board comments:

1. Provide more photos and illustrations showing visibility from Chippewa Square, Bull Street and McDonough Street.
2. Eliminate the parapet on the north facade;
3. Use a darker color on the north wall of the addition.

Ms. Ward stated that the petitioner submitted revisions to address the comments from the July 11, 2012 meeting.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval of the second story addition on the non-historic lane structure at 13 East Perry Street as amended in the submittal packet that was received today.

Mr. Judson believed it was two meetings ago when this item was continued. At that time, some of the issues were screening and condenser units on the roof. Mr. Judson said the plans are not clear to him. He asked if they are going to be encompassed within the space of the new second-story addition or will they somehow be screened. He remembers that the Board had a lengthy discussion about the paint, reflectivity and so forth.

Ms. Ward explained that the current units will be removed and placed on a shelf on the back wall. They have been approved for the mechanical screening of this equipment which is a louvered screen that creates an "L" shape. This will in essence end up screening not just that equipment, but any visibility of the HVAC equipment.

Mr. Judson stated he just wanted to be sure that if they approved this that later on they would not have a situation where some items still needed to be approved.

Ms. Ward explained that this has been addressed. However, one thing that was brought up at the Review Board meeting in July, 2012 was that the petitioner consider using a darker paint color on the north wall to possibly reduce the visibility. But, the petitioner still wishes to paint this white as the rest of the building is painted white. They feel the white will be a more compatible treatment.

Dr. Williams asked which area is the petitioner wanting to paint white.

Ms. Ward answered that the entire building is being proposed to be painted white as the existing building is white. She explained at the Board's last meeting it was brought up that the petitioner consider using a darker color for the north wall. However, as she has stated, the petitioner wants to use the white color that they are proposing.

Dr. Henry asked if staff is okay with painting it white.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Dr. Williams said he was looking at the sections that show the projected visibility lines. Is it fair to say that the one that goes to the far right would be

least visible?

Ms. Ward said the addition will be visible from Perry Street. But, she believes it is minimally visible. It is sixty feet (60') back from the front facade. The staff's justification for its compatibility and preservation of the historic structure, is that it actually appears as a separate building in the background. However, as she has said, you will be able to see it, but it is minimally visible.

Dr. Williams asked if image #1 is showing how much of it would be seen from a distance of 257 feet.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Dr. Williams asked if the white gable on Perry Street superimposes against a white background; he believes this is what the petitioner is proposing.

Ms. Ward replied yes.

Mr. Engle stated that he does not understand if they can see that much of the addition, how are they not going to see the three units. If they look at the section that shows the units, they are only two feet below the eve line and will show.

Ms. Ward said there is a grease trap and other equipment is on the roof. A louvered screen has also been approved on the roof. These are not shown on these sections either. But, she believes it will minimize the visibility of these units from the street.

Mr. Merriman asked if the louvered screen the Board approved months ago is also going to be in place.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Dr. Williams asked what color is it.

Ms. Ward answered that she would have to check the file to see what color was approved. However, she believes it was white. The petitioner is present and he perhaps may remember the color. However, she can check the file.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dillon explained that the screen will be painted white. They prefer the north wall to be white. He has informed staff that they will be willing to do sample paints in a light and darker colors for their review in the field to see whether or not there will be an issue with it.

Dr. Williams stated that his concern is the white gable superimposes a white background and he is afraid that they will lose the clarity of what is profound.

Mr. Dillon replied that it some what fades, but the existing surrounding buildings are all white as well. This is really an existing condition that will continue. But, as he has said, they are willing to make the paint samples.

Dr. Williams agreed with this idea.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Ward reported that the Historic Savannah Foundation representative could not be present today, but they submitted a written comment stating that "they agree with the staff's recommendations. The addition will be visible from the square, but it has been lowered and improved from last month's submission. This lessens the impact."

Ms. Eunice Spell wanted to know if the turquoise awning and signage were approved. Ms. Spell said it looks very incongruous with the rest of the street.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said his opinion is that using the photo as evidence with the small gable on the front silhouette against a darker background, but in an ideal world it would be to have the adjacent side gable building darker. Dr. Williams said he continually worries about the north and south being white. He was glad to hear the petitioner willingness to do the in-field sample.

Dr. Williams asked if the Board should leave this at the staff's discretion or should they just say they want it dark.

Ms. Ramsay asked if it would be possible to invite the Board to go see the test panels when completed.

Mr. Dillon said yes.

Mr. Engle agreed that white would not be good. He believes it should be darker. The entire character of the building is the temple forum front elevation and they will lose it with the white addition.

Dr. Williams asked if the screen and gable will be white.

Ms. Simpson asked if the screen will have vegetation.

Ms. Ward pointed out that if the Board looks at the picture, they will see that there is a big grease trap behind the tree. This is what the petitioner is required to screen. The louvered section will be placed basically in an "L" shape.

Mr. Engle said this is a grease trap and will not be white in six (6) weeks. He believes this should not be white.

Dr. Williams asked if the Board still has purview about the screen.

Ms. Ward explained that the screen has already been approved. They have not installed it and if this is something that the Board feels strongly about, they can state it and the staff will work with the petitioner to see if the color can be adjusted. She said it would be helpful if the Board pertaining to the north wall, give some guidance in their motion as staff is supportive of the white color that the petitioner has proposed.

Dr. Williams said the Board's question was not answered whether it would be possible for them to view this onsite.

Ms. Ward answered that the Board may go and review this onsite. The staff will

have to advertise this and once the petitioner lets her know, she will need two days in advance before the Board can go and review this onsite. As long as the petitioner is willing to do this, it can be done.

Board Action:

Approval of the petition of the second story addition on the non-historic lane structure at 13 East Perry Street as amended in the drawings received on July 19, 2012 with the condition that the final color of the north wall be subject to field samples applied to the wall following construction to be reviewed and approved by the Board and staff in the field. The color of the mechanical screen should complement the color of the north wall addition. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams
Second: Brian Judson
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye
Brian Judson - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

12. Amended Petition of Robert Portman for Barnard Architects | H-12-4707-2 | 133 Montgomery Street | Rehabilitation to ground floor parking

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Original 1977 Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Application and Description.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Sheriff Letter re PD Parking Variance.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawing.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photos.pdf](#)

The petitioner was not present.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to vary the design standard for Parking Areas in Section 8-3030 (n)(14)b., provided below,

to allow parking on the ground floor of the parking garage at 133 Montgomery Street.

(14) *Parking Areas. Parking areas shall comply with the standards set forth in Section 8-3081 through Section 8-3083 and the following:*

b. Structured parking within the first story of a building shall be setback a minimum of 30 feet from property lines along all public rights-of-way (not including lanes).

Ms. Ward stated that as the Board may recall, they spent a lot of time on this project last month. This parking structure is on the corner of MLK Jr. Blvd, Broughton and Montgomery Streets. This is the county's parking garage. They have moved the office space to their new Oglethorpe building. Consequently, the request is to put the parking back here. She explained that because the request is to allow a variance from the design standards, they are required to come to the Review Board first. Then the Review Board makes a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). The original design of the building which was included in the packet showed that parking was originally on the ground floor of the structure. It was built in 1979 for a parking deck.

Ms. Ward explained that during the staff's review of the Historic Review Board Proceedings, they did not find an application or approval of this building which would have been built in 1979. The Review Board was established in 1973. This does not mean that an application was not submitted, but they could not find a record of an application nor a record of the alterations to put the services on the ground floor. However, because the county is a local municipality they can opt out of the design review process and this may have been what happened during this time. But, at this stage, they are making it a practice to come to the Review Board. Variance criteria is in the ordinance which the Review Board is to consider and based on this criteria, the Board would make a recommendation to the ZBA. Ms. Ward reviewed the criteria with the Board and informed them that Chatham County can be exempt from the review providing they give the Review Board the opportunity to comment on the proposal.

Ms. Ward reported staff recommends that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review recommend the ZBA deny the request to vary the parking area standard in section 8-3030(n)(14)b, because the request is a special privilege that would not be permitted for other buildings in the same district and because it is not consistent with the intent of the ordinance.

Mr. Engle stated that Ms. Ward in her presentation said that the space was converted to offices. He asked if the office windows will be left in place.

Ms. Ward answered yes. The petitioner has not requested any alterations to the exterior. Pointing to an area, Ms. Ward said the petitioner has been approved for vented spaces along here and along the east and west rooms, but no changes have

been proposed for the Broughton Street corridor.

Mr. Engle asked staff if this will be enclosed with glass windows and parking.

Ms. Ward asked Mr. Engle to clarify his question.

Mr. Gay stated he believes that an individual can stand on the outside and look into the window and see the parked cars. Is this the way it will be?

Mr. Engle asked if the petitioner made an option of putting in a trellis for screening or something else.

Ms. Ward explained that when they originally reviewed the plans (before last month's meeting) the petitioner proposed to remove all the storefront glass and put in louvers. But, the petitioner has not brought this back for consideration for today's review. If this was required or needed, for ventilation of the parking, it would need to be approved by the Board. However, she has concerns about replacing storefront glass on Broughton Street with louvers. Ms. Ward stated that she believes this is why it is not shown on the plan, but the applicant can answer whether it is required.

Mr. Gay asked staff if they felt it would be better to look into a window and see the back of cars.

Mr. Judson said he was trying to understand the process. He asked if the Board is being asked to rule on a recommendation for a variance.

Ms. Ward explained that the Board is being asked to make a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance request on a design standard because it is a design standard in the Historic District ordinance.

Mr. Judson said, therefore, regardless of how the Board votes, this will be forwarded to the ZBA.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Mr. Judson said consequently as the Board knows, they may be overturned at the next level regardless of what is the Board's opinion.

Ms. Ward explained that the Board is not making a decision, but making a recommendation to ZBA.

Mr. Judson asked if the variance request is not approved by the ZBA, since the petition is on behalf of the county and they never had to enter into this process to begin with, they can opt out of the process.

Ms. Ward said yes.

Mr. Judson asked the fact that the county entered in the process has no bearing as they can do what they want to do.

Dr. Williams stated but they will have to go to the ZBA.

Ms. Ward said she believes the county can opt out of going to the ZBA as well. However, two persons from Zoning are present.

Mr. Gay said he was on the Architectural Review Board of the Historic Savannah Foundation at that time and it came before the Board.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

The petitioner was not present. **Ms. Ramsay** asked staff if they anticipated that the petitioner would be coming to the meeting.

Ms. Ward said she did not know, but would call the petitioner.

Ms. Ramsay said they could put this petition at the end of the agenda to allow the staff the opportunity to call the petitioner.

Board Action:

Approved to move the petition of Robert Portman
for Barnard Architects , H-12-4704-2, 133 - PASS
Montgomery Street, to the end of the agenda.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

13. Petition of Tomas A. Paxton | H-12-4726-2 | 106 West Gwinett Street | Addition of Balconies

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs and Renderings.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Specifications and Colors.pdf](#)

Mr. Tomas A. Paxton was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for the addition of a balcony with an awning to the third floor of the east facade, facing Whitaker Street. The balcony and awning are both designed to match the four (4) existing balconies and awnings on the sixth (top) floor of both the east and west facades.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval of the balcony addition, awning, and door as requested because they meet the standards and are visually compatible with the four (4) existing awnings located on the west and east façades of the building.

Dr. Henry said he wanted to fully understand what the petitioner is proposing. He asked staff to show the photo of the facade showing where the balcony will be placed.

Ms. Michalak, pointing to an area on the photo, said it is being requested to go here.

Dr. Henry asked if the balcony would be the same dimensions as the other balconies.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the balcony is nine (9) feet wide, but the depth is the same.

Ms. Michalak explained that it is because this one does not exist. She showed the existing balconies. They are going between the brick on center, which is nine feet and between the brick here is eight (8) feet. Therefore, the width is a little bigger.

Ms. Michalak said staff received two letters from the public who could not be in attendance at today's meeting.

The Historic Savannah Foundation's written comment stated "we do not agree with staff's recommendations. Continuing to allow balcony additions, we think, perpetuates a mistake made in 1998. We think the balconies do, in fact, change the character of the building irrespective of whether or not other similar vintages buildings in the area have balconies. This particular building was designed and executed without balconies and it overlooks Forsyth Park. If the architect wanted to put balconies on this building overlooking Savannah's premiere park, we think he would have. We think it is important to distinguish this building, which did not have balconies, with others that were built rather than allowing them to morph into sameness.

Also, we do not draw the same conclusion as staff does in interpreting Standards 2 and 9: 2) alteration of features shall be avoided; and 9) new additions shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property (openings and loss of

brick). While the proposed balcony may be visually compatible with the existing balconies that were allowed in recent past, we think that is not the perspective that should be considered. This should work with the majority of the building that does not have balconies, not the minority additions we think were mistakes that occurred under a different ordinance and a different Historic District Board of Review (HDBR).

Further, this proposed lower level balcony is even more obvious than the higher floor balconies and would bring more unwanted attention to errors of the past and confuse the public as to the real and historic nature of this building. Passersby will wonder why does this building have just a few random balconies when other "like" buildings either have may more or none? We should not perpetuate mistakes that confuse the public and compromise the original architectural integrity of the building."

Ms. Michalak said Mr. & Mrs. Thomas Chubb, the owners of Unit 2B at Forsyth Parkside, 106 W. Gwinnett Street, wrote that "yesterday we learned of the proposed balcony addition for Unit 3B in the same building. We object to that balcony addition on numerous grounds including, but not limited to:

Lack of actual notice until August 7, 2012; lack of informal notice from the owner of Unit 3B, Mr. Paxton, at any time; concerns about safety in the unit below as the result of the balcony; concerns about the aesthetics of the proposed balcony; concerns about water and leakage issues that could result from the balcony as they have from other balconies added to the building; concerns about safety of pedestrians passing below; concerns about damage to the structural integrity of the building as the result of adding the proposed balcony; concerns about insurability of the building as the result of the addition of the proposed balcony.

We feel very strongly that this is an extreme exterior addition. It compromises the integrity of the building-- both from an aesthetic and structural point of view. The addition of a single balcony on the east side would also be incongruous. We urge the Board to deny the request for approval of the proposed balcony at this time."

Ms. Ramsay explained that the Board hears the applications based on the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Visual Compatibility Factors. Consequently many factors in Mr. & Mrs. Chubb's letter are not something that is this Board's purview.

Dr. Henry said he was reading the Secretary of Interior's guidelines 2 and 9 and he agrees with the Historic Savannah Foundation. He does not see where these are compatible.

Mr. Merriman agreed with Dr. Henry as he, to, does not see where they are compatible.

Mr. Engle said if staff's recommendation is relevant, he does not see a reason why they could not put balconies on Drayton Towers. This building was

designed without them. The fact that the Board, in their wisdom fourteen (14) years ago, approved something that would never be approved today does not make it a compatibility factor. Compatibility factor is the integrity of the design and there are no balconies that have integrity.

Dr. Henry asked staff to explain how standards 2 and 9 are compatible.

Ms. Michalak explained that as she put in her report the addition is compatible and does not alter the character of the building and that many early twentieth (20th) century apartment buildings in Savannah such as the Graham Apartment at 210 East State Street, DeRenne Apartments at 24 East Liberty Street and the new apartments at 810 Whitaker Street all feature balconies compatible with this era of architecture. She stated further more, balconies are already present on the secondary facade of this building. The balconies can be removed in the future without damaging the existing structure and the building will retain its essential form and integrity.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Michalak if this is true with the existing balconies. Will they be removed?

Ms. Michalak answered that she did not know.

Mr. Engle stated that the Secretary of Interior's Standards are based on the integrity of this building. It has nothing to with the comparison of other buildings in Savannah. This is their design standards. The Secretary's standards talk about the integrity of that structure, itself.

Ms. Michalak stated that Mr. Engle was absolutely correct. However, she should have started this at the furthermore comment point in her presentation.

Dr. Henry asked staff if they were saying that it is compatible.

Ms. Michalak answered no.

Ms. Ramsay said staff is only making a recommendation; the Board does not have to agree with the recommendation.

Ms. Michalak explained that what she was saying is that she read something in her reply that did not have anything to do with the Secretary of Interior's standard. She stated basically what staff is saying is that the balcony can be removed and retain a central form and integrity of that structure which is the overall shape and mass. Staff believes that the amount of brick removal is minimal; it is three feet wide (3 ft.) by twelve inches (12 in.) high which equals three square feet. To increase the opening from a window to a door will not disturb the central form and integrity.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Paxton stated that he is not a native of Savannah. He came to Savannah in 1969. This building was economized in 1978; he believes two years after Mr.

Mercer died. They have done a lot of background check on this building. Apparently, this building was built by Johnny Mercer's father. It was intended to be a hotel or an apartment complex. He believes that Mr. Mercer intended to put balconies on this building which were common at the time. There was no air conditioning. There was a very ornate canopy on the front of the building. They have tried to find pictures of this to duplicate this. Some people who were friends of Mr. Mercer's grandfather (he has not heard this personally) but was told that they described elaborate plans for the exterior, but it seems that Mr. Mercer ran out of money. Mr. Paxton said they have discovered, in restoring the exterior of the building, that they were so short on money that they actually did not have proper lintels on the top windows; they are a little short. A few savings were made with during this. Therefore, the question of whether or not putting balconies on this building is inappropriate if they meant to have balconies, they would have put them here. There are a number of structural parts of this building that make them think they can see where the balconies were going to be attached. The balcony that he is planning to put here can be attached via the steel reinforced columns inside the building. The rest of the building will not support balconies because it is clay tile covered with brick. The columns are spaced appropriately for putting elaborate, large balconies on this building.

Mr. Paxton explained that the two full balconies that are already on the building cannot be removed without damaging the building. Their design for the balcony is to remove them in the case that someone wanted to change the balcony that what they think might be a good conception of what was originally thought to be here.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Paxton if he could give an idea of where he thought the original balconies were supposed to be.

Mr. Paxton explained that balconies were going to be on the third and fifth floors on Congress Street [SIC] side and possibly (not where this balcony was going to be) on either side. However, there is no way of knowing this; this is hear say.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Paxton if he found something structural to support this case.

Mr. Paxton answered no. They tried to find something, but they cannot even find a picture of the original canopy over the front door. This would give them an idea of how the other pieces would look. The style in those days were to be elaborate and expensive.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Paxton if he said the existing balconies cannot be removed without damaging them.

Mr. Paxton explained that the four balconies that are here (he does not know why they were put in this way) but there are some leaks around the balconies. He believes that the developer on the top floor put beams in the building and anchored them to the floor which has caused some leakage problems. The

manner of the attachment for the new balcony will be different than this. They will not be destroying bricks underneath the balcony.

Mr. Paxton, pointing to drawings on each side of the window, said that as he has already stated, the building is steel reinforced concrete with clay tile partitions and the facade is yellow bricks. The balcony will be mounted using steel anchor iron on either side of the columns and there will be wires protruding through holes in the building. Holes will be drilled through the bricks so only one brick or two bricks at each hole will be involved and easily replaced if the balcony is removed as opposed to the other balconies as they had beams coming in and the bricks were removed. Mr. Paxton said this is the comment that the Chubbs made that they are afraid that the balcony will be like the others. It is surprising that the Chubbs said they did not know this because they discussed this almost two years ago when the first idea of putting balconies on the building came up. At that time, the Chubbs seemed to think that this would be nice. However, the problems that they have had with the existing balconies may cause them to be concerned about this. Mr. Chubb is a lawyer and he supposes that his questions about the liability are well-founded, but this exists anyway from just having windows as anybody could drop something from up above and it does not necessarily have to be from a balcony; it can be from an open window. All the windows can be opened.

Dr. Henry stated that Mr. Paxton mentioned problems with the existing balconies.

Mr. Paxton injected yes; but they are repointing the building and they will address this problem when they get up there.

Dr. Henry asked what are the problems.

Ms. Ramsay explained that there are some leakages here.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

NOTE: Please see the written comments read into this meeting minutes by Ms. Michalak that were received from the Historic Savannah Foundation (HAS) and Mr. & Mrs. Thomas Chubb who were unable to attend today's meeting.

Ms. Laura Dixon came forward and stated that she resides at the Forsyth Parkside complex. Her floor is the fifth floor and it runs the full east width of the building facing Forsyth Park. Ms. Dixon said she is under two of the existing balconies and they do have leaks here. She said, however, they do understand that this will be a different type of construction and she is in favor of this.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle stated as he said earlier, he does not believe that this meets the Secretary of Interior's Standards. He believes they are taking the Forsyth elevation at the moment as still being pristine and they are altering it. If they set a precedent here, is any building elevation sacred anymore? They would be

adding a significant visible intrusion. He does not care if 20 years from now you can take it off and put walls back in. But for the next 20 years they would have altered a significant historical elevation and this does not meet the standards nor does it meet the design standards as far as he is concerned. If they are going by the design standards, he believes they are suppose to have brackets; having an eye beam holding up a balcony does not meet the standards. If brackets were put on here, it would make it more intrusive. Mr. Engle said he does not think the balcony belongs here and he believes they would be taking a very dangerous step. They are not talking about a back elevation.

Ms. Ramsay explained that there are two balconies on the sixth floor.

Mr. Engle said he was aware of this, but it was a mistake. He has always considered Whitaker Street as the front entrance to the building as it has a center door. However, it is news to him that this is not the front entrance. However, it is the front to anybody that uses the Forsyth Park. Mr. Engle said he cannot support the approval of this.

Ms. Ramsay said just to clarify, she does not believe that there is a center door on the Forsyth Park elevation, but there is a center door on the Gwinnett Street elevation.

Mr. Gay said the main entrance into this building is on Gwinnett Street.

Mr. Paxton explained that the door on Whitaker Street is a fire door and has been the entrance to a back stairway that has been in the building for years. This cannot be used as a stairway by code any longer because the steps are thirteen inches (13") or fourteen inches (14"). They are very narrow; so they have been asked to close the stairway and they have done so. The doorway is tacky and they would like to change the doorway. However, this is not what is being discussed today.

Dr. Williams said he believes a factor to consider in this photo actually reinforces the Forsyth Park side. On the Whitaker Street side, he never noticed the upper balconies as the tree canopy does an effective job. But, as the photo indicates, the new addition would be prominent. Therefore, the earlier ones that are here now, he believes if they were before this Board today, they would not approve them. But, as they are high up, they are less noticeable, at least on the Whitaker Street side. He realizes the requested balcony is not a real facade and he knows that one of the Secretary's standards that staff read talked about principle and rear facades. However, this is definitely not a rear facade; it is a public facade. Therefore, he shares his colleagues concerns about this proposal.

Mr. Merriman agreed with Dr. Williams statement regarding that if the others were presented to this Board today, they would not approve them based on the Secretary's standards.

Dr. Henry said his interpretation is that the Secretary's standards refer to this building, not the other buildings.

Mr. Merriman said the DeRenne building and the other buildings were made with balconies. But, this building was not made with balconies.

Mr. Engle said if the Board approves this petition this week what happens three months from now when they come back and want four more balconies. They could not say no.

Mr. Johnson questioned staff's justification for recommending approval.

Ms. Michalak said staff feels that it meets the Secretary of Interior's standards and would keep intact the essential form and integrity of that structure. This is not altering the entire shape and form of that building and it is reversible. It matches the compatibility of the existing balconies.

Ms. Ramsay explained this is staff's recommendation, but the Board ultimately has to come up with its decision.

Mr. Judson stated that he was remiss and should have done so at the onset of this discussion (although he has not participated in the discussion) his firm has a fiduciary contract with a tenant in this building. He will recuse himself from voting on this item.

Dr. Williams stated that in response to Mr. Johnson's question, for him, one of his concerns is about the compatibility. He would challenge the first half of staff's interpretation (not the part that the balcony can be removed) but the aesthetic appearance of this building is from an era that had, even though there were apartment buildings designed such as DeRenne which has a much more three-dimensional form and has a recessed entrance, courtyard and balconies incorporated into the fabric of the structure. However, this one is a very smooth facade; almost streamlined and dates from this era, but it is of the commercial block where the smoothness of the elevation, the play of light and shadow with the moldings in his opinion the character of the building is altered. The ease of which it can be reversed is not in his opinion a way of justifying that it is compatible. This is a case where the building, as the applicant has acknowledged the "hear say" that there were intended balconies, he is skeptical that unless they dramatically alter their plans as there is no evidence of doors on any of these elevations, and having spandrel panels which are the brick panels between the windows on a facade such as this is a typical form for both residential and commercial blocks from the late nineteenth (19th) century onward.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, the smooth panel does not mean that there must have been something intended to go here where they are planning to put their balcony. There are a number of different reasons, but for him the principle reason is that if they think of the volume of the building like a sculpture and then imagine that cubits are attached and projects outward, could have a dramatic impact on how to read the overall form of the building.

Dr. Henry added regarding Mr. Johnson's question that he had a different opinion between the way the staff interpreted the Secretary's

guidelines. Staff appears to be saying that the character of the property referring to all properties throughout the district. But as he reads the guidelines (he hopes he is not misinterpreting) they are talking about this property only. He believes this may explain why they came up with their recommendation, but he disagrees with staff's recommendation.

Board Action:

Denial of the petition of the balcony addition, awning, and door as requested because they do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards #2 and #9, the design standards, and are not visually compatible because it changes the inherent character of the structure and does not maintain its essential form and integrity. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Reed Engle | - Aye |
| Ned Gay | - Nay |
| Nicholas Henry | - Aye |
| Keith Howington | - Aye |
| Sidney J. Johnson | - Nay |
| Brian Judson | - Abstain |
| Zena McClain, Esq. | - Not Present |
| Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. | - Aye |
| Linda Ramsay | - Abstain |
| Ebony Simpson | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |

14. [Petition of Jeff Cramer for Diversified Designs | H-12-4730-2 | 601, 603, and 605 Tattall Street | New Construction Part I](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial - Looking West.pdf](#)

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

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

Mr. Jeff Cramer 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 and Mass, of four attached two-story townhomes at 601-605 Tattall Street. The vacant property is at the southwest corner of Tattall and Huntingdon Streets. Ms. Ward explained that the

petitioner has provided a model. The townhomes are oriented to front onto Tattnell Street as do the other existing structures within the block face. As part of this development, the parcel will be subdivided into four parcels. Currently, it is subdivided into three properties. A survey was attached to the submittal packet; but yesterday, staff received a revised copy.

Ms. Ward said that following staff review of the project and release of the packet, they noticed that there was a discrepancy. She believes that the petitioner has been going back and forth about how they are going to divide the parcels, on the elevation of the front and rear facades. She said the end unit, which will abut Huntingdon Street, seems out of proportion with the rest of the units. This unit is wider, but the plans show that the units all are the same. The petitioner has submitted a revised elevation. The revised elevation is included in the packet given to the Board today along with the revised survey.

Ms. Ward reported that staff, based on the revised elevation, recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass with the condition that the heights of the windows in the upper bay and rear be increased to be more proportional with historic windows.

Ms. Ward reported that for Part II submittal, staff recommends that the fence along Huntingdon Street use a material to match the main building or iron fencing with a masonry coping may be used for masonry buildings and a fence or gates along Tattnell Street be considered. She stated that more comments may be included during the Part II review.

Mr. Judson stated that thinking back to Berrien and Taylor Streets, he wanted to know if the City Engineers were aware of the problems that have come down where the grade suddenly change by three or four feet. He was not reflecting his comments in any way on this project; but procedurally, he just wanted to ensure that all the loops of communication were closed. Once Berrien and Taylor Streets were completed, they all could not understand how it happened. He wanted to know if this was being addressed at the site planning stage; and as he has said just to be cautious. He was not suggesting that something with this project would go awry.

Ms. Ward answered that this really starts at the development stage when you get to the final construction drawings and you know the specific changes in grade. However, the engineers are at the table at the site plan review (SPR) meetings.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward if the engineers are aware of what happened with the two developments on Berrien and Taylor Street.

Ms. Ward answered that the engineers were aware. She explained that at this phase, they are looking at a general development plan so that when they get to the more specific plan, they have this kind of information.

Dr. Henry said he was thinking about the same matter that Mr. Judson asked about. Because of past history, they need to keep on top of this. He assumes

that this will be built with hardi-board.

Ms. Ward explained that the Board is reviewing Part I, Height and Mass today. They are not reviewing the materials. As she has indicated in the staff report and in her conversations with the petitioner, she believes this will be a masonry building.

Mr. Engle said he wanted to ask a general question. He assumed the things on the roof are screens. They are not handrails. There is a note that says "roof access."

Ms. Ward explained that this is the roof plan.

Mr. Engle said he was not sure what is holding the handrails up. He guessed, however, they will get to this when they get to the details.

Dr. Williams asked if it is a flat roof.

Ms. Ward said it is a hip roof with a deck on the top.

Dr. Williams explained that he was talking about the central area where the air conditions are is a flat roof. He asked what is being indicated by the dotted line.

Ms. Ward stated that when the petitioner initially came to the office and in order to meet the standards for screening the condenser units, they had a handrail around the entire perimeter. Staff asked the petitioner to reduce the massing. Staff asked him to just do the condenser units and not add to the height and the petitioner has done so, but they may not have changed some of the earlier lines. But the applicant needs to address this.

Mr. Merriman asked if the units will sit on is a flat surface.

Mr. Gay said the entire roof will be flat.

Ms. Ward stated that based on the models and drawings, she was assuming that the roof would be flat on the top, but hip up to this point.

Ms. Simpson asked if the trash receptacle area will be brick.

Ms. Ward said she believes this is what the petitioner is proposing.

Ms. Simpson asked if this is purposefully for parking.

Ms. Ward, reviewing the site plan, stated that the petitioner is required to have parking for each of the spaces. The City has recommended that the petitioner use a pervious paver to park on back here. This is what the petitioner is showing.

Ms. Simpson asked if there is an opportunity on the plan for green vegetation.

Ms. Ward said they have no control over this. The petitioner can show a yard

on the plan, but we cannot make them grow grass. Their jurisdiction is limited to the structural elements of the proposal.

Mr. Gay stated that if the Board approves the size of building now, this sort of tells the Park and Tree Commission that they believe that one side of the tree should be cut off.

Ms. Ward explained that the standards say there should be no setbacks in the Historic District. The building should be pulled upward. But, in similar cases when they worked with the Family Dollar on MLK Jr. Blvd, the Park and Tree Department will not let you kill a tree on the City's property. In fact, after the petitioner meets with Park and Tree, they may have to make some modifications to this unit. They have not been on-site. Therefore, the Park and Tree Department does not know if they will or will not have any comments. However, if the petitioner has to change the footprint or design of the building, this will come back to this Board for approval.

Mr. Engle asked that on the rear elevation, the Jefferson Street side, he knows they are not dealing actually with windows at this time, but they are dealing with openings. He assumes a powder window will be here with a gigantic lintel. He does not know what the little opening over it is, but looks like a transom over nothing. Is this an air conditioning unit?

Ms. Ward explained that each of the properties features a door and a small window. Also, there is a recessed porch within the footprint. This is the opening that Mr. Engle was seeing. It is a little odd shaped because it is at a 45 degree angle. The windows on the ground floor are recessed within the building back here on this wall. A railing is here.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Ward to clarify her statement about the double windows. At this point if the Board goes along with this, they are approving the openings and he finds the back elevation ponderous.

Ms. Ward explained that the ordinance allows paired windows, provided that the individual sashes meet the 5 to 3 ratio. The petitioner is proposing 2.5 feet wide by 5 feet tall, but staff is asking that they be wider. However, because of the square shape that is created, they need to be taller to be more proportionate with the historic windows in the district. Therefore, staff is asking that the height of the window be increased on the rear facade and on the front second story.

Mr. Engle asked if the little powder rooms meet the standard.

Ms. Ward said accent windows are allowed and she considers this an accent window. She does not disagree with Mr. Engle's comment that the lintels look a little bit wide based on the size of the opening. Maybe these could be shortened to be more proportional.

Mr. Engle said if this is a masonry building, they should read as actual lintels and this is not relevant now, but he believes it will be on the details. However, he brought it up at this point so it will not be surprising. If you have a masonry

building, lintels should be lintels, but these are not.

Dr. Henry asked staff if they said they are recommending a fence in the back.

Ms. Ward explained that it may be a little difficult to do based on their parking requirement.

Dr. Henry said the fence would obliterate much of the view.

Ms. Ward said it would depend on what the fence is made out of. It could be an iron fence. But, in order to provide at least one space back here, they would have to have some sort of gate. She is not the designer of the project, but she does believe that a wall of enclosure along Jefferson Street would help to fill this in and define the street edge.

Dr. Williams said the staff has recommended making taller windows. However, he wanted to know if staff said they are recommending that the second floor be raised.

Ms. Ward answered no, not the floor, just the window.

Ms. Ward reported that Mr. Daniel Carey of HSF submitted their written comments about this petition. The HSF wrote "we agree with staff's recommendations of increased height of second-story windows; do more study and make sure they are the right proportion and properly placed. The vertical and horizontal spacing on the building and include a fence along Jefferson Street.

We offer this additional observation that the Tattnell Street elevation appears to show an enlarged unit on the far right end of the building, one that is separated by a greater distance from its three neighbors. This is either a drawing error or there is an imbalance in symmetry that needs to be corrected."

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cramer thanked the Board for considering the petition. He reported that he was at the SPR meeting. They talked a lot about the curb cut on Jefferson Street and how it is to be transitional. Since this meeting, he has talked with the former owner and he said all the drainage in this area has been redone. The owner told him that the work was either done in 2003 or 2004. The area did not flood before and now since the work has been done, it still does not flood.

Mr. Cramer said they plan to make the building stucco. He does not believe that they will deviate from this. Mr. Gordon Denny was at the meeting as far as the tree goes. He knows they will look at the tree as closely as needed. In accordance with lintels and exterior of the building, they got a little tied up with the mass and had a little trouble with the lot. As far the bigger unit towards Huntingdon Street, the three lots, they could have divided it up and had two lots that would have been one or two feet of each other. But, they decided it was more congruous to the neighborhood to make all of them the same size. Now, they have to do a major subdivision in order to make them blend in with the

neighborhood. Therefore, they plan to do this.

Mr. Cramer said he apologizes for some of the lintel drawings that are shown on the buildings. They were doing all the things at the same time. They will study this further. He said they agree with all of the staff's recommendations.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Cramer to clarify the roof structure. Is it flat or will it be hip all the way to the peak?

Mr. Cramer said the buildings are deep; therefore, they do not want to have a hip roof all the way to the peak as it will be too large. Therefore, they ended up doing what is called an essentially flat roof which will be like a minor hip at the top to ensure that it drains, but it will not be seen from the street. It will look somewhat like a conventional roof from the street, but it will drain as he has said. It will be an half inch to a foot or less at the top. Roof hatches will go up to the units only and each unit will have two units. They barely have enough space to put two units and a roof hatch up there. There will be no balconies up there.

Dr. Williams said if the area is going to be flat, could that central flat area be lowered relatively to the slope of the hip roof to the point instead of having the screen stick up, why not depress the central area?

Mr. Cramer said he has done this before, but had problems with it. He has done one where the roof comes up and then drop to a roof terrace. Actually, it was supposed to be a roof terrace, but had a kitchen on top and no one could see it, but they had so many leaks. Therefore, he would be afraid to do this again as it caused many leaks.

Mr. Howington said in speaking of the roof structure, could the units be put on the ground because to him, the railings seem to be out of place with the character of the building. It appears that there is enough room near the trash enclosure to get the units off the roof. This will enable the petitioner to get rid of what is essential a widow's walk up there, which to him seems to be out of style for this type of building.

Mr. Cramer said he definitely will consider what Mr. Howington has suggested. If they can do it this way, it may be a lot easier. However, he was only trying to save some green space at the bottom. They may be able to do one big unit instead of two smaller units. If they are able to put them on the ground, they will not have so many units. This may be a good way to do it.

Mr. Howington said in talking about the proportions of the windows, when you pull the upper four windows down, the spacing between the top of the door and the top of the porch seems awfully large, too. Usually, you see a larger space like this with an arched window. It looks like it is about four (4) feet from the top of the door to the underside of the porch. If an arched window was here it would make more sense, but since it is wide, it could be brought down. The windows need to be taller in completeness, but lower the sills.

Mr. Cramer said he agrees.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Cramer if he was open to putting a fence in the back.

Mr. Cramer asked Dr. Henry if he was saying put a fence along Jefferson Street.

Dr. Henry answered that he was saying where the cars would go.

Mr. Cramer asked Dr. Henry if he was saying by the gate where the cars come in.

Dr. Henry said yes, this would define the area a little more.

Mr. Cramer said he believes the staff has recommended this. They can definitely comply with this.

Dr. Henry realized that the Board had no purview with what he was about to ask, but he asked Mr. Cramer if it would be possible to get some vegetation such as crepe myrtles between the lots.

Mr. Cramer said they are planning on having green bands on each side of the driveways. The driveway is at least sixteen (16) feet and the little area to park is twenty-three feet. Therefore, there will be at least three or four feet on each side.

Dr. Henry stated that he was pleased to hear this.

Mr. Engle said they have an issue that if they approve this as is with the widow walks in place, then the petitioner does not have to move them to the ground. He asked Mr. Cramer if he was willing to remove the units from the top of the roof and put them on the ground. This is critical to height and mass.

Mr. Cramer stated he does not like putting things on the roof either.

Mr. Gay asked Mr. Cramer, therefore in this case, would he still have the flat portion of the roof.

Mr. Cramer answered yes. It would still be flat with the direct portion of the building because he does not want the roof to be two-thirds of the proportion.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Robert Abell resides at 521 Tattnall Street stated that firewalls should be between the structures. This needs to be looked at in Part II.

Ms. Judy Jones said this building will affect her. Huntingdon Street is narrow. When she opens her front door, she will be looking at stucco. They will be looking at a blank wall every day. The side elevation is not proportionate.

Mr. Walt Harper resides at 216 West Huntingdon Street. He said as Ms. Jones indicated, she will walk out her front door and see a thirty (30) feet wall. Mr. Harper said he is in favor of development, but some redesign of the building is necessary. He is a member of the Park and Tree Commission and does not see where it is possible to put a massive building such as this with the tree there.

Ms. Jones suggested that the petitioner walk though the neighborhood and see how the windows are designed.

Dr. Williams asked staff to pull up the side elevation on the monitor. He said the roof line will not be seen from Huntingdon Street. The air conditioning will not be on the roof.

Mr. Harper said he was not sure what is the height of Ms. Jones building, but still when she walks out of her door she only has thirty-two feet before there is a wall.

Mr. Engle said the problem is with the Huntingdon Street elevation. Jefferson Street is the rear elevation. He believes if this was detailed better with a few more windows or some other detail it would satisfy Ms. Jones. It looks like a suburban house with no windows on the side, but all are on the front and back. This is the only one that faces a primary road, he believes the Board should insist that it have more fenestration or perhaps a door or something else to enrich this corner. It is a prime elevation.

Mr. Engle said he willing that the Board not accept the mass of this side elevation; that it be restudied and presented in Part II. Mr. Engle asked the petitioner if he understood what is being said.

Mr. Cramer answered yes.

Mr. Ron Malander came forward and stated that he lives at 517 Tattnall Street. He was present a few weeks ago when this was presented to the Board and the petitioner did not have anything to present. Therefore, he realizes today that the petitioner needs more time to develop the side elevation. Mr. Malander said he believes it would have been better suited to have three houses instead of four. The addresses are 601, 603, and 605 and 605B; 607 is the next house. He would personally like to see the HVAC units not on the ground. He sympathizes with the effort to put the units on the roof, not that he agrees that he would like to see them, but on the other hand there is such a little amount of green space. He said five years ago they actually put trellis on top of their two car garage. If this project was not just being driven by investment, perhaps it might be interesting to come up with a lot more ideas of how to incorporate more green space and still have parking.

Ms. Ward explained that in the early scheme of this even before staff saw the plans, just going through the ordinance and standards it says that "structured parking on the first story of the building must be set back thirty (30) feet from all street fronts." No lane is here; so they would have an issue to resolve.

Mr. Malander said they are a pretty strong neighborhood and are glad to see the building going up; however, another issue that has not been discussed is the lack of street parking. There are a lot of people who park in that lot. Some times you will go over there on the weekend and you will see about fifteen (15) cars parked in this lot. These people will not be on the street, but they do not belong in the lot anyway.

Ms. Ramsay advised Mr. Malander that he is discussing an issue now that this Board does not have in its purview.

Mr. Abell said Mr. Malander made a comment about moving the air condition unit. This reminded him about a friend of his who had a back deck and his air conditioning unit was right underneath the deck. He could not use the deck because the air conditioning unit was too noisy all the time. He believes leaving the units on the roof would be a better solution. However, this will come up in Part II.

The Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) written comments are stated under the staff's report.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said if the petitioner asks for a continuance on Part I, the Board could hear Part I and II together at the next meeting.

Ms. Ramsay informed Mr. Cramer that he has listened to the Board's discussion and heard the public's comments. This Board cannot continue the Part I Height and Mass unless he asks for a continuance.

Mr. Cramer asked if Part I and II could be heard at the next meeting if he asked for a continuance today.

Ms. Ramsay answered yes. The Board can spell out in their motion their concerns.

Mr. Cramer asked for a continuance of Part I Height and Mass.

Board Action:

At the request of the petitioner, continue the petition to September 12, 2012 to consider the following items:

1. The heights of the windows in the upper bay and the rear be increased to be more proportional with historic windows.

2. Provide fencing along Jefferson Street to establish a wall of continuity.
3. Provide more windows on the Huntingdon Street elevation that are in proportion with historic openings and align vertically and horizontally. The Huntingdon Street facade should be treated as a formal elevation and the floor plan should correspond to the elevation. - PASS
4. Reconsider screening on the roof which appears architecturally as a "widow's walk." HVAC units could be placed toward the rear (far west) part of the flat roof or on the western slope facing Jefferson Street.

Parts I and II may be submitted concurrently at the next meeting. For the Part II submittal, the fence along Huntingdon Street should use a material to match the main building or iron fencing with a masonry coping may be used for masonry buildings and a fence or gates along Jefferson Street be considered. More comments may be included during the Part II review.

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson
Second: Ned Gay

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Reed Engle | - Aye |
| Ned Gay | - Aye |
| Nicholas Henry | - Aye |
| Keith Howington | - Aye |
| Sidney J. Johnson | - Aye |
| Brian Judson | - Aye |
| Zena McClain, Esq. | - Not Present |
| Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. | - Aye |
| Linda Ramsay | - Abstain |
| Ebony Simpson | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |

15. Continued Discussion of Amended Petition of Robert Portman for Barnard Architects | H-12-4707-2 | 133 Montgomery St. | Rehabilitation to ground floor parking

Ms. Ward reported that Mr. Portman will not attend the meeting today.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) was not present at today's meeting.

but provided a written comment which stated that "they agree with staff's recommendations. The requested variance does not meet the intention of the ordinance."

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review recommend that the Zoning Board of Appeals deny the request to vary the parking area standard in section 8-3030(n)(14)b, because the request is a special privilege that would not be permitted for other buildings in the same district and because it is not consistent with the intent of the ordinance. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Reed Engle | - Aye |
| Ned Gay | - Aye |
| Nicholas Henry | - Aye |
| Keith Howington | - Aye |
| Sidney J. Johnson | - Aye |
| Brian Judson | - Aye |
| Zena McClain, Esq. | - Not Present |
| Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. | - Aye |
| Linda Ramsay | - Abstain |
| Ebony Simpson | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

16. [Amended Petition of Neil Dawson | H-12-4579-2 | 209 W. Congress St. | Replace Existing Front Windows](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4579-2 Amended 7-11-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4579-2 Amended 7-11-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

17. [Petition of Amy L. Howell | H-12-4713\(S\)-2 | 411 Abercorn St. | Awning Frame](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4713\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4713\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

18. [Petition of Alexis AuBuchon | H-12-4716-2 | 650 W. Jones St./315 MLK Jr. Blvd. | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4716-2 650 W. Jones St. 315 MLK Jr. Blvd.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4716-2 650 W. Jones St. 315 MLK Jr. Blvd..pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

19. [Petition of John and Veronica Buckovich | H-12-4718\(S\)-2 | 408 E. Hall St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4718\(S\)-2 408 East Hall Street.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4718\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

20. [Petition of Guy Weidenback, VP for Collins Construction Services, Inc. | H-12-4720\(S\)-2 | 2 East Bay St. \(Upper Factor's Walk Bridge | Repoint Bridge Masonry Walls |](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4720\(S\)-2 COA 2 East Bay Street.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4720\(S\)-2 East Bay Street \(Upper Factor's Walk Bridge\).pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

21. [Petition of Bill Norton for Sign Mart | H-12-4721\(S\)-2 | 15 Bull St. | Sign Face Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4721\(S\)-2 COA - 15 Bull St..pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4721\(S\) 15 Bull Street.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of Mike Schulz | H-12-4723\(S\)-2 | 210 W. Huntingdon St. | Install New Stucco](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4723\(S\)-2 210 W. Huntingdon St..pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4723\(S\)-2 COA - 210 W. Huntingdon St..pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Dorothy Rich Miles | H-12-4724\(S\)-2 | 111 W. Perry St. | Color Changes](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4724\(S\)-2 111 West Perry Street.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4724\(S\)-2 111 West PerryStreet.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Amy L. Howell | H-12-4729\(S\)-2 | 209 W. Congress St. | Awnings](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4729\(S\)-2 209 West Congress Street.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4729\(S\)-2 209 West Congress Street.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of James Newkirk | H-12-4732\(S\)-2 | 111 West Congress St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4732\(S\)-2 111 West Congress Street.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4732\(S\)-2 111 West Congress Street.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

26. [Report on work performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness \(COA\)](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Ward Work Without COA 080812.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward reported on the properties where work was performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA).

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

27. [Next Meeting - Wednesday September 12, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

28. [August 31, 2012 - HDBR Annual Retreat - Clarence Thomas Center for Historic Preservation](#)

Attachment: [Preliminary HDBR Retreat Agenda 2012.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward reported that plans are being finalized for the Board's 2012 Retreat to be held at the Clarence Thomas Center (CTC) for Historic Preservation, 439 East Broad Street from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

The purpose of the 2012 Historic District Board of Review Retreat is to provide a forum for the Board to discuss items that relate to Certificates of Appropriateness, design review procedures, and best preservation practices.

29. [REVISED Historic District Height Map and Ordinance](#)

Attachment: [HD Ordinance 8-3030 FINAL, July 12, 2012.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Historic Height District Map_Final July 12, 2012.pdf](#)

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

30. [Adjourned.](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, Ms. Ramsay adjourned the meeting at 5:00 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.