



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 14, 2012 2:00 P.M
Meeting Minutes

MARCH 14, 2012 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Linda Ramsay, Chair
Reed Engle
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Keith Howington
Sidney J. Johnson
Zena McClain, Esq.
Stephen G. Merriman, Jr.
Ebony Simpson

HDRB Members Not Present: Ned Gay, Vice Chair
Brian Judson
Robin Williams, Ph.D

MPC Staff Present: Tom Thomson, Executive Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Director
Brittany Bryant, Historic Preservation 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 February 8, 2012](#)

Attachment: [02-08-2012 Minutes.pdf](#)

Chair Ramsay called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance to the meeting.

Ms. Ramsay recognized Allison Buker, an intern, with the Historic Preservation staff. Ms. Buker has worked on the research and survey of Factor's Walk.

Ms. Sarah Ward, Preservation Director, stated that Ms. Buker was not present, but she just wanted to recognize her. Ms. Buker spent the last three months working untiringly on a project for the Preservation Department. As Ms. Ramsay has stated, Ms. Buker worked on a research and survey study of Factor's Walk concentrating on what is there historically and documenting the existing conditions through photographs and mapping. Ms. Ward said this will be a useful document and it is here if anybody needs to use it.

Board Action:

Approve February 8, 2012 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Sidney J. Johnson

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Not Present

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

IV. SIGN POSTING

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

2. [Petition of Jose Gonzalez for Gonzalez Architects | H-12-4596-2 | 14 Barnard Street | Signage & Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the new signage and alteration to the existing corner entry at 14 Barnard Street. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle - Aye

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

3. [Petition of Nathan Pollard for Kern-Coleman & Co. | H-12-4601-2 | 660 East Broughton Street | Stabilization and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the stabilization of the Kehoe Machine Shop building, with the condition that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Stabilization be met and the plans be reviewed by staff for final approval, the decorative metal cornice, on the south elevation, be retained and - PASS
reinstalled. As indicated on the submittal, windows must be retained in situ or stored on-site until repairs are made and reinstalled.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ebony Simpson

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

4. [Petition of Ryan Claus for Greenline Architecture | H-12-4604-2 | 405 Whitaker Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Howington recused from participating in this petition. He is an employee of Greenline Architecture

Board Action:

Approval for the alteration to the storefront of 405 Whitaker Street because it seeks to provide consistency to the building and meets the Visual Compatibility Factors. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Not Present

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

5. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | H-11-4569-2 | 412 Williamson Street | New Construction, Part I Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial Map.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Description, renderings and plans.pdf](#)

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

Mr. Patrick Shay 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, for a five-story hotel at 412 Williamson Street. The property is located within the Factor's Walk Character Area of the historic district and the building is large-scale development as defined in the ordinance. A finding-of-fact to vary the parking area design standard [Sec. 8-3030 (n)(14)b.] requiring a 30 foot setback for structured parking from property lines is requested. The petitioner is proposing a zero setback along Martin Luther King (MLK) Jr. Blvd and on the northeast corner fronting River Street. The Board approved the request to demolish the existing structure and continued the request for new construction, Part I, Height and Mass at the January 11, 2012 meeting for consideration of staff comments and Board discussion. The following changes have been made:

1. The stairs and landing within the Montgomery Street right-of-way have been redesigned to have a vehicular turn-around/drop-off area with a pedestrian and stair leading down to River Street. A sailing ship mast is proposed to provide a visual marker to this area from Franklin Square. This would require review and approval by the Historic Site and Monument Commission.

2. A valet parking area is proposed along Williamson Street.
3. Multiple entrances are proposed along Williamson Street with a wall of continuity and ornamental metal gates.
4. The overall height has been reduced three and one-half feet and the seventh floor has been setback in several areas to reduce the height 12 feet-10 inches at the northwest corner near the historic Georgia Power building and along River Street.
5. The parking garage entrance has two bays.
6. The corner pavilion is connected to the principal structure.
7. Increased the amount of storefront along MLK Jr. Blvd.
8. The arcade and facade recesses along River Street have been eliminated. Seven addressable entrances are provided and the parking area reduced.
9. An arched opening above the northwest corner entry at MLK Jr. Blvd is proposed.

Ms. Ward stated that the MPC Preservation staff, at the request of the applicant, forwarded staff recommendations and comments with regards to this project to the City in an effort to highlight those areas of the development that affect the right-of-way along Montgomery Street and the River Street sidewalk. City and MPC staff are in agreement that the Montgomery Street Ramp concept be supported and planning efforts be incorporated into any new design.

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

1. One of the criteria for an additional story is fully met.
2. Restudy the valet parking, retaining wall, plaza, and stair in the Montgomery Street right-of-way to provide a greater public connection between the Oglethorpe Plan Area and the riverfront. Staff recommends ending vehicular access at the north side of Williamson Street and creating a pedestrian thoroughfare within the right-of-way without obstruction. Tables and chairs for the hotel could be placed adjacent to the building with approval from the City.
3. Restudy of the parking setback along MLK to meet the standard.
4. Provide more voids within the south elevation adjacent to Williamson Street to be visually compatible with historic structures and to meet the specific design standards.
5. Balconies should project forward of the building facade, be supported by brackets, and be made of a complimentary material different from the principal material (such as metal) to reduce the mass.
6. Provide a parapet roof over the two-story extension on MLK Jr. Blvd. and restudy the gabled pediment to be in proportion to the bays to which it is attached.
7. The height of the privacy wall along Williamson Street should not exceed the maximum allowed by the ordinance (11 feet).

Finding-of-fact recommendation: Restudy the parking setback along MLK to meet the standard.

Dr. Henry stated that he was a little confused about the finding-of-fact recommendation. He asked if a 30 foot setback is required for the parking, but the petitioner is proposing zero setback. He asked staff as far as they can determine, no special conditions would apply.

Ms. Ward answered that there are special conditions that would apply. The property shape, itself, is trapezoidal in nature and is awkward. The change in grade is not typical of the historic district; therefore, there are unique conditions that apply to this property. There are a few other properties in this area that do have this, but it is a unique condition. It is also the minimum variance needed. The petitioner is not asking for it along all sides of the building nor levels. It is only a small portion. Therefore, staff believes a minimum variance is requested.

Mr. Engle asked if there is no pedestrian friendly activity on the elevation at all at street level along MLK.

Ms. Ward, pointing to an area, explained that a corner entry is here and a storefront. It is usable space until you get to the drive opening and this is where it becomes more vehicular oriented or not an active use.

Mr. Engle asked for clarification on criteria one as he thought the intent of this criteria was essentially to restore Factor's Walk to public usage. The question that was raised at the last meeting and still is today that this is not restoring Montgomery Street to public use, but is taking it out of public use.

Ms. Ward said this is City property; therefore, it is public use. Staff is saying that the petitioner needs to redesign it a little more. They have gone a long way, but staff believes a little more design is needed to make it more public.

Mr. Engle said he believes that the only vehicles that could use this are vehicles that are going to the hotel.

Ms. Ward stated that she recommends that there be no vehicular traffic here; that it all be pedestrian zone. The terminus of Montgomery Street be at Williamson Street . Once here you have to choose to turn left or right and don't go forward and turn around.

Mr. Engle said then it becomes a pedestrian plaza.

Ms. Ward answered yes that is City owned and public property. They are essentially restoring that connection.

Dr. Henry asked if the grand staircase would be affected.

Ms. Ward said the idea is to create the grand staircase. It is really just a concept that the City has developed. They don't have the design details for this, but the petitioner is proposing some of these design details as part of this development. Therefore, staff applauds this effort and encourages this. However, staff thinks it needs a little more before it is fully realized.

Mr. Merriman said what the petitioner has presented this time is a lot closer to the picture that the City had the last time. This is a big improvement and looks good. Mr. Merriman said, however at the last meeting, he believed it was said that the petitioner needed to meet two criteria.

Ms. Ward said the petitioner only has to meet one criteria; but, they are almost meeting two criteria. She believes that the petitioner will say they are almost meeting a third criteria because of materials. However, staff wants the petitioner to meet one criteria fully. She applauds the efforts to put all the active usages on the ground floor, especially on River Street side which is very important to creating an active streetscape on the river side and for restoring Montgomery Street; both of these are things that will make this development more successful and make this area more desirable.

Mr. Merriman asked staff if it is the petitioner's choice of which one they meet.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Ward to go to the elevation that shows the power plant. He asked if the smoke stacks that are shown in the white area are considered historic. Can these be removed?

Ms. Ward answered that there were some additional structures that were attached here that were not considered historic and they were removed and demolished. She believes the property had an environmental section 106 review and these were identified as being of age and contributing to the overall historic character of the building.

Mr. Engle corrected that he was not saying the smoke stacks, but is the white block historic.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Mr. Engle said, theoretically, this will always be in view.

Ms. Ward explained that it is presently owned by Georgia Power and they are utility.

Ms. Simpson stated this is a question they can ask the petitioner, but she asked Ms. Ward if it is her assumption that the petitioner is leaning towards the building that is next to them in terms of the height.

Ms. Ward replied yes.

Ms. Simpson said all the other buildings are somewhat two-story in nature.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay commended Ms. Ward and the staff who worked on this. This is a big complicated thing; it has a lot of moving parts. They had a real good meeting on Monday as he did not understand some of the comments that were in the staff report so he could go through and understand Ms. Ward's and staff's thinking with regard to a number of these issues. The more he understood, the more comfortable he became. Mr. Shay said he has had a chance to discuss this with his client. They are happy to go through and address any of the issues that the Board might have about what Ms. Ward has raised in the staff report. But, at the end of the day, if the motion is as recommended, then they are prepared to accept that for height and mass approval and move on. However, he would say because he suspects that it will come up, the criteria that they would prefer to meet for purely

technical reasons in regarding to getting height bonus would be the improvement in the Montgomery Street right-of-way. If this is conditioned on moving the curb line back so that the semi-circular turnaround area is eliminated, then this is something that they are happy to participate in and recommend to the City of Savannah.

Mr. Shay explained that the design that the Board sees is something that they basically volunteered to the City of Savannah in order to help them begin to understand their issues better. He said they will continue to support this. He could not commit at this point to the extent to which his client is willing to participate in it; however, his client is willing to participate in this particular development. He would like to ask that they get some clarification, he does not know how to do it yet; but he would like to study in this area a way to make sure that non-automobile vehicles, which is horse-drawn carriages, pedicabs, etc., do have a way to be able to sort of cue up here. Hotels in the area quite frequently have guests that like to take these. Making them cue up in the same cue as automobiles is a little clumsy. At the end of the day if they can't work this out, it is fine, but he would at least like to tell the Board that when they come back for the final design detail, they will study this further and may not at all encroach on the line that has been described. However, they would like to point out that they are not as concerned about these kinds of vehicles as they are apparently along with the Board about having automobiles that move, turn and have conflicts with pedestrian movements from time-to-time. Mr. Shay entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Merriman stated that the petitioner has come a long way with the design and the Montgomery stair. He stated personally if the petitioner is going to meet one of the criteria, he hopes it is this criteria. It is really shaping up.

Mr. Shay responded that he would give credit where it is due. He had a meeting with Mr. Christian Sottile who was one of the authors of having the idea of the descending staircase in this area. One of the suggestions that Mr. Sottile made was that they incorporate an object that could actually be seen from Franklin Square so that as the pedestrians were navigating this area might actually be able to see the object. Therefore, the idea of a ship's mast came to him. However, this is not to say that he is asking the Board to approve this. It is only a suggestion to the City of Savannah.

Mr. Merriman informed Mr. Shay that the mast was the only part that he did not understand.

Mr. Shay said he had an opportunity to give a proclamation at Fort Pulaski yesterday. It has been 150 years since siege of Fort Pulaski and they have something similar to this. It did not inspire him, but when he saw it here, he looked at it and said this really works good.

Mr. Howington agreed that this is a great improvement. He generally likes the mast as it helps overall. He said he believes Mr. Shay said he is more in favor of the Montgomery Street, and he is also, but he would like to possibly see some more retail on the MLK side in the seven spaces, although they will sort of be low to the ground. He believes this would be a nice addition to this project because there is a dead zone to the corner. Mr. Howington believes a valet entry is to the door to the garage. An entry is here in a box, he was not sure what this is and asked Mr. Shay to elaborate on this.

Mr. Shay said the valet needs to have a place to operate out of and in a hotel such as this, it is quite frequent that people with check-in, hand their keys to the valet, but they may choose to come down and actually unpark themselves. Therefore, this is a place where all the keys will be kept. It is also a place where baggages, etc. can be stored so that people that are taking a late checkout can put their bags in this area. This is just basically a way to have the interface that ends up being with automobiles whether they exchange the keys, bags or any other type such as if a person calls a taxi. This is a place to handle this that is out of the Montgomery Street right-of-way.

Mr. Howington asked if the person would go through the garage to get back to the other side.

Mr. Shay explained that the valet would take the car, go around, down and in and then take an elevator back up and go back to the valet stand. If an individual wanted to checkout their own car, they would come here and be able to get their key, go down the elevator and unpark the car themselves. He stated that he was not saying to the Board that he knew exactly what the parking strategy is going to be; but he does know that his client is deeply concerned that they are under-parked at this point and is trying to get him to figure out how to find ten (10) more parking spaces, which he is struggling with.

Mr. Howington stated the shape just looked an odd shape and he was not sure whether it could be expanded to retail. It is right in the center of the building.

Mr. Shay said in essence to the function similar to this, it would have a storefront and would be a place for somebody who was walking along here would be able to enter.

Mr. Howington stated that he has counted approximately fifteen (15) different window types just on the River Street side.

Mr. Shay stated "really."

Mr. Howington said as the petitioner goes into the next round, he would like to see, throughout the entire building, a more consistent window type leaning more towards the industrial side, in window shapes, sizes and detail.

Mr. Shay responded fair enough.

Mr. Howington stated that on the Montgomery Street side (Ms. Ward mentioned a part of this) there is a little post modern balcony. He said to him, this is out of character. Therefore, he would like to entertain the idea of getting rid of this. Mr. Howington stated that he could see a balcony similar to the wash room, especially to the left, but with balconies and brackets.

Mr. Shay explained that one of the dangers of using a tool like sketch up is that they are trying to present height and mass. If you put a person on a balcony and all of a sudden it looks like they are being literal about the materials in front. He said he agreed with Mr. Howington.

Mr. Howington said also on the balconies on the River Street side, he does not know if

the petitioner looked at the idea that instead of setting back the rails on the top, he may be in favor of seeing a masonry parapet here instead of the metal railing setback keeping the mass of the building instead of breaking it back; and this would give more balcony space as well if the parapet continues around the wall.

Mr. Shay said they will take a hard look at this.

Mr. Howington said the corners have been addressed very nicely with the arched window. It talks about the entry and breaks down the mass. But, he would almost like to see some of this on the other side, too, as this is a prominent corner or see something different on the River Street side. Just bump it out a little or something to define the corner. It is starting to look really nice.

Mr. Shay stated, "did my designer pay you to say that" as this is a discussion that they have had.

Mr. Howington said definitely keep it on the industrial side. He stated one arch is different than the arches on the other side. He wanted to see some consistency in the arches. He pointed out that the arches on Montgomery Street are different; either/or the keystone is a modern detail.

Mr. Shay stated that they look forward to getting into the details of this. They agree with Mr. Howington.

Mr. Howington said this should be scaled back to the industrial. He believes the mass on the meeting room is out of character. He would like to see a simplified gable.

Mr. Shay said they will work on this. He just wanted to be sure that they have an interesting silhouette and an interesting object that as you drive along Bay Street that you are able to look over there and say, "there it is." He likes the shape, but he is not wedded to it.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Shay to consider Mr. Engle's comment in terms of making sure that River Street is pedestrian friendly. Pedestrian access needs to be all the way around.

Mr. Shay stated that they are totally in agreement with this. It is somewhat a clumsy position to be here a couple of months ago and again today. They have not had the opportunity to have a meaningful dialog with the City of Savannah at that time. Frankly, they have not had it yet. But, they have taken the charge from this Board and illustrated this. He believes the City is receptive. Mr. Shay said, therefore, he believes that as long as they keep putting good ideas in front of them, there is probably a way to work this out. The grade elevation on this site is 17 feet difference from diagonal corner to diagonal corner. All four corners of the building are a different grade elevation. The areas of parking that are of concern with regards to the one corner on MLK actually start below grade and eventually come out of grade. However, he cannot change the elevation of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. But, they are very keenly aware that this is an issue that the Board has concerns about. They will do their best and his client at the end of the day may choose to look for other reliefs if they go with the right-of-way of vehicle for the height bonus. Then they may choose to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) and ask for relief from the setback in this area. He said he cannot make it an activated storefront

anyway because the ground level starts about four and one-half feet (4 1/2 feet) above the level of the inside of the deck. Eventually it evens out, but this is where the entrance is located. They have been strongly encouraged to use this as the entrance by the City's Park & Tree and other folks. They are trying to get it all in there.

Mr. Engle stated that he realizes this is Part I, but he finds this very hard and not pedestrian friendly. This may be because there is no detail here; there is no shadow; but this is a hard elevation and he does not believe that he would want to walk on this at all. He asked Mr. Shay if they intend to soften this as they get more details.

Mr. Shay answered absolutely. The staff has recommended that there be more openings. They will take a hard look at this. Mr. Shay, pointing to a section, stated that they think these openings along here need a lot more study. They are just trying to get to a point where they have an improved type of mass. He promised the Board that it will get better.

Mr. Engle stated that the problem is as a Board they have been burned in the past by approving Part I and then have the applicants come back and said, "but you approved the height and mass so the windows are set." Mr. Engle said he is a little gun shy about this.

Mr. Shay said he is not going anywhere. He is here to stay.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Hank Reed, President of the Downtown Neighborhood Association (DNA), on behalf of the association thanked the Board, Preservation Officer and Staff for the work they do because they truly have a critical role in protecting the historic integrity of what they think is Savannah's crown jewel, the Downtown Landmark Historic District. Mr. Reed said although the neighbors grumble when the Board subjects their plans to scrutiny and modification, but they overwhelmingly support the Historic District Ordinance and the work the Board does to ensure that it has meaning. However, in this regard, the neighbors want the Board to provide the same detailed scrutiny to these large complex projects as they do to their own renovations on their property. As Mr. Shay said, this is a big complicated thing. Mr. Reed said they believe the staff has done a good job in their report and their analysis is accurate, but they do not agree that it should be approved at this point. There are seven important conditions that the staff has identified that should be met. There is also the need for dialog with the City and they believe that the Board should have another opportunity to see the project developed further before they actually approve Part I, Height and Mass. Mr. Reed said they have done some more study of the specific issues and Bill Stuebe who is also a member of their board will address this as they don't want to duplicate anything today.

Mr. Bill Steube of the DNA said that in addition to the staff's comments concerning the proposed hotel, the DNA offers the following observations: 1) the DNA applauds the applicant for the redesign of the proposed hotel to include retail spaces along River Street facade. The DNA strongly believes, however, that retail space be incorporated along the MLK facade as well. Such space will serve to lead the pedestrian from Bay Street to the river and is crucial to the redevelopment of the western edge of the historic landmark district. Mr. Stuebe said the drawings submitted on sheet 16 depict and show windows on

the MLK facade. The full plan discussed earlier for this area clearly shows parking spaces behind the windows. The scale of the elevations in the plans that have been submitted are not consistent and as such is kind of difficult to really understand what is going on here. He believes all of this needs to be clarified. The SCAD River Club building on the western side of MLK across from the proposed site has been designed in such a manner as to allow pedestrians access to its upper and lower floors from MLK Blvd as the street descends to the river. It appears to him that a similar approach could be used on the proposed hotel to provide retail space on MLK. The SCAD building is presently for sale and could be developed into retail use by a new owner. If the hotel was designed to offer retail facilities along MLK Blvd, it would encourage a new owner of the SCAD building to develop retail facilities as well. The corridor would then offer retail on both sides of the street and would, thus become a vibrant, retail area leading down to River Street. It is difficult to just have retail on one side of the street; it needs to be on both sides. Therefore, for this reason, Mr. Steube believes it would be important to consider having retail on MLK. In consideration that the applicant's desire is for a variance for the proposed structure is no apparent reason why the desired retail space along MLK cannot be incorporated into the design in his opinion. Once the retail spaces are built, it would be encumbered upon the City of Savannah to ensure that these spaces are used in the manner which is fully accessible by the general public and are not used for hotel conference rooms, exercise rooms, and other facilities. This does not mean that it is solely for the use of hotel guests. He believes they have seen this in other hotels in town where the developer got an extra floor for retail space, but the retail space, exercise rooms are not opened to the public. It needs to be followed through that this is really retail space. The west and north elevations of the proposed hotel depict a one-story step down at the corner, although the elevations are not dimension, the northern balcony wall on the elevation does not extend as far north as it does on the plan. The detail needs to be shown in Part I and not slipped into Part II with saying that "you approved it didn't you?" He believes this is true throughout the project.

Mr. Steube said, pointing to a section, there is no parapet above and staff suggested that a parapet be put in here. He said similar, pointing to another section, that he believes a parapet needs to be put here. On the plan, recesses are shown at the end of the corridors and are not dimension. It is not clear from the elevations if the recesses actually exist. However, the renderings seem to indicate a recess. This needs to be clarified. Mr. Steube said there is no rhythm to the fenestration on the western facade in the whole area. The types of windows on the facade are incompatible. Furthermore, the large arched windows appear to be over scaled given its location below the setback and the diminutive window above. He believes that this entire composition needs to be restudied. There is also no indication how the HVAC units are to be vented. If they are to be vented below the windows and the spandrel, a careful study detailing notes of venting should be included in Part II so they will know what they are going to get. With regard to the variance for improving Montgomery Street he believes is City owned property, his understanding that when the ordinance was revised was that an extra height would be allowed if you reopened space that was privately owned. Similar to the garden space between the Green Meldrim House and the St. John's Church which is private space. If this was reopened then you could get another floor. He does not know if the ordinance applies here.

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that he concurs with Mr. Reed and Mr. Steube comments. HSF has a close working relationship with DNA. Mr. Steube serves on the HSF Architectural Review Committee. Mr. Carey said

HSF agrees with Mr. Steube's observations and recommendations. HSF Architectural Review Committee scrutinized this project at their monthly meeting yesterday because it is an important proposal that warrants their full attention. A building in this magnitude and complexity deserves very careful consideration. Therefore, they reviewed the packet, staff's comments and recommendations. As they have seen and heard from the petitioner today, there are a number of improvements and reasons to be very optimistic about the potential final product; such things as lowering the height and greater access to the riverfront and so forth. Towards this end, they greatly appreciate the petitioner's efforts to be responsive to the many comments that this project has elicited. Staff's report, however, raises a number of questions and makes points for further study and causes for significant adjustments, but comes to the conclusion that the project should move forward. HSF respectfully disagrees with this conclusion. He said to approve Part I, Height and Mass, the criteria to allow for an additional story should be fully met, even if it is just one, getting close to two is not the same as getting one. At this time, they believe that there is too much guess work to confidentially allow an extra story and the changes required to meet the criteria significant enough that the petitioner should come back before this Review Board. If the criteria are not met, then the building would be one story shorter which affects its massing and this in return would require or necessitate further review. Mr. Carey said he is sensitive to the fact that the petitioner is close and the staff understands this, but Ms. Ward also suggested what is pretty significant was the phrase she used. He believes if it is significant, this is enough to not obviate this Board's ability to review it. Because giving an extra story to a building is not a small matter and they should not take this lightly (he was not suggesting that they are), but thinks it requires a number of eyes to look at this. They agree that it is important that the ground level along MLK be fully utilized as retail space to encourage pedestrian activity along the street all the way to the river. He said they strongly agree with staff's comments on page nine (9) and their recommendations under the parking areas that the parking be restudied to meet the standards along MLK. Such restudy, however, is not a simple matter and pulling one lever moves another. Therefore, in their minds this underscores the need for further review by this body.

Mr. Carey said he wanted to cover some other specifics. He believes that Mr. Howington and others mentioned these, but there are many styles and variations of fenestration on the mixed facades. By their count, it may be a dozen. They did not get fifteen (15). More voids need to be provided along the western portion of the Williamson Street facade as indicated by staff. They also encourage further study of the design and fenestration of the two-story structure at the southwest corner. They agree that this is a major focal point for the building and he believes that the petitioner understands this. But, they agree that it seems out of character and out of place with the rest of the buildings in this area. It seems more of a curio than anything else. It ought to be a little more related to the building. In summation, Mr. Carey said they believe this building is too large and too complex to delegate to staff the hammering out of so many significant conditions. While HSF trusts the good word of the petitioner, they prefer to see the changes in detail before moving ahead. This calls for more accurate drawings and renderings. In the resolution of questions regarding criteria for additional stories, parking, etc., he believes the question the Board need to ask is whether all of their questions and concerns are adequately addressed. If not, this needs to be either denied or invite the petitioner to continue with revised plans. He said they appreciate the petitioner's desire to move ahead as soon as possible, but they should not rush considerations in light of the fact that a decision this

afternoon will be living with them for many decades to come.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Shay if he wanted to respond.

Mr. Shay said they worked very hard for the interim period to work through the staff's checklist and comments that they heard from the Board. To make the revisions, they provided them with an item-by-item checklist of everything that they had done. He believes that the things that are listed in the staff's report and are recommended to this Board can be done if he can look at a different profile for the pediment or the other things. However, he does not think the other things materially affect the height and mass approval. Mr. Shay said over and over again the people that spoke in good conscious did say that it needs to be studied in detail. Frankly, we are not asking for detail design approval today. We are asking for height and mass approval and the opportunity to come back and show you what those details are. We are confident that we are good listeners and that we can address many of the comments, but clearly as a petitioner he cannot take every comment from every person and every opinion and figure out how to reconcile that into one definitive document. They hear loud and clear what the Board wants and some want them to figure out how to get retail on the corner of MLK and Williamson and he will work hard to do this. He said he will ask his client if they are willing to forgo the parking spaces that are in this corner so that they can put some kind of activated use on this corner. Mr. Shay said he cannot stand here and promise them what is retail and what is not. He believes that the ordinance says that you need to have addressable entrances. He does not believe that the hotel intends to put meeting rooms or exercise rooms here. The elevator does not even connect to the level along River Street for guests to be able to do that. But in regards to the fenestration, he will not take exception to the way people count, but basically what they have done, is that they have presented two sizes of singles and then some combinations of singles with flankers or doubles that all grow out of the same root form for the windows. But, they have not yet gotten to the level where they have decided whether they are going to be industrial windows, palladian windows, single-hung or double-hung windows. They have tried to give the Board some hints as to what their thinking was with what they have presented. But, this is clearly design detail and they would like to have the opportunity to come back and be held to the same high standard at the design detail submittal as they are holding them to the height and mass. Rather than go through and identify the specific comments (unless the Board would have him to do that) he would rather respond to comments of the Board, itself.

Mr. Engle asked that picture 18 of 38 be pulled up on the monitor as he had a question. He believes the question that was raised is the void. The void that the windows create is being asked to be approved today, not the style of the window, but the opening that this window will go in. Therefore, if they approve that fenestration void today, the opening has been approved; not just the window type, but the opening for that window. Mr. Engle said earlier he talked about Williamson Street, the back of the building, but is't this a loading dock right below the stairway where the maid is coming out of it? Does this mean that the garbage dumpster will be right at the grand staircase? This is a bit problematic if this is to be a great ceremonial entrance and they are making it the delivery entrance for everything.

Mr. Shay said one of the unique challenges, Mr. Engle, of this site is that it does not have a lane; does not have a single place for the arrival of deliveries are the removal of waste. Therefore, they created what they thought, which was as good as they could do, was to find some place for this. If he wrecks up River Street, there will be some that will not be happy

with that and he does not have the ability to do all of it on Williamson Street. So, yes, he agrees with Mr. Engle that it is something that they need to study further and they also frankly need to be able to work with the City of Savannah because they are the waste haulers. He said if the Board is going to place him in a situation where he has to negotiate all of this directly with the City of Savannah without the benefit of some kind of indication from the Board that they think they are mostly there or almost there, then they will place his client in a position where they have a "catch twenty-two." He cannot go to the City and ask for permission to do something unless he shows them something.

Ms. Ramsay asked Ms. Ward to give clarification on the position about reopening a street. She asked if the intent of this was to reopen a private street.

Ms. Ward said they discussed this the last time this was before the Board. The staff feels that this standard could apply to this situation if they restore the sidewalk along River Street, which is mostly on private property and they sought the improvements along Montgomery Street, which has a number of easements in them. She said yes this is currently City property, but it is not improved in any way and this is an opportunity to get it improved. Ms. Ward said she does not believe there are any encroachments in there right now, but there are a number of easements that have to be worked out.

Ms. Ramsay informed Mr. Shay that her understanding was that his client was not necessarily going to pay for those improvements on Montgomery Street. She asked him if his client is willing to pay for the improvements on Montgomery Street, the stairway.

Mr. Shay answered that this is a breathtaking question to ask him on behalf of his client, given the fact that they don't know what the City of Savannah exactly wants in this right-of-way. He believes that what he said to the Board and what he will restate is that his client is willing to participate, but they have to understand what they are being asked to participate in and one of the ways that they are already participating is to give up access to that side when it comes to vehicles. City streets that are reopened under the other standards are most frequently reopened to vehicles. He does not want to make too fine a point of it, but his client is willing to participate to the extent that the City of Savannah is willing to say what they want done and when they will do it.

Ms. Ward commented that they touched on this at the last meeting as well that a few years ago prior to the review of the historic district ordinance that actually codifies what the criteria are; there was a hotel proposed for this site and they sought an additional story above the height map and this was considered and approved with the understanding that they would also seek to do the Montgomery Street right-of-way improvements. At this time, it was that they would provide an agreement between that private individual and the City of Savannah on the specifics of how this would be done. Ms. Ward recommended that this would be a solution here that there is some kind of memorandum of agreement between the two parties pertaining to who is responsible for what aspect. The Board's approval could be contingent upon that agreement.

Mr. Merriman said he is a little confused; he thought that with the renderings what happens on the Montgomery Street is what Mr. Shay was proposing to do to meet the criteria which mean they would do it, pay for it and give it back to the City. He asked Mr. Shay if this is what it would take to meet the criteria.

Mr. Shay answered, no sir it does not. He explained that what it says is that they would participate in it to make it happen. The City, frankly, is being encouraged and they will

continue to encourage them to do something that is as nice as what they have presented. Mr. Shay said please let's not get confused. It is the City's property. Therefore, they cannot dictate to them what is to be done nor can this Board. What they all are saying is that they are making a good faith effort to make sure that it meets this Board's criteria and that his client is willing to participate in this cost. Is this what is being represented? No; Is it 100%? - Doubtful; is it somewhere in between? - He was sure it is. Mr. Shay said there are a hundred year old utilities that are in this same area. They have no idea what it is going to take to relocate these and to redo them. They are confident that it can be done and they have enough research to do that. Georgia Power has indicated that they are willing to help with some of this. But as far as he being able to present to the Board a memorandum of agreement right now is not what he does. He is an architect.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Shay if he agrees to do the MLK retail. Clearly, this is sort of a nippy thing with the Montgomery Street. It looks great. He is not sure about the mass, but everything else really stands up. He asked Mr. Shay if he could give them the MLK retail.

Mr. Shay said the question has been asked in a way that is very difficult for him to answer. They will study and seek their client's concurrence to provide an addressable entrance that is on this corner and that entrance would seem to be a logical thing for retail. However, he said, please understand that by creating seven (7) addressable entrances on River Street, he feels like his client has already demonstrated that they have gone a pretty far piece. The examples that were presented here today show that the opposite corner is a retail store; they have presented a plan that shows the opposite corner where the grade and the building meet in a logical way is retail. The building that was shown across the street had an entrance that was at the upper level; stairs that came down a blank wall that went about 30 or 40 feet. He believes their site will be a lot better than this. But, for him to tell the Board that it is going to be retail; he would like for it to be.

Mr. Johnson said he believes that Mr. Shay has submitted a much improved design as he remembers seen before. He believes there should be some further study. Like Mr. Shay has said, the City is going to play a part in this, too. But it depends on what conclusion this Board comes to today. However, Mr. Shay will still have to get the okay from the City as they own the property. He respects the comments from the public and he knows they know what they are talking about. However, it is left up to this Board. Mr. Johnson said he believes the project should go on. He knows this area very well and Georgia Power is involved and he believes that the City will get involved also. But, it is left up to this Board to live with the decision. Mr. Johnson said he believes there needs to be further study with the cooperation of all of them.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Ramsay if the Board was under its discussion.

Ms. Ramsay answered yes.

Mr. Shay asked if this means that he needs to step down from the podium.

Ms. Ramsay answered yes.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he agrees with his fellow members; he agrees with the Historic Savannah Foundation and he agrees with the Downtown Neighborhood Association. He thinks this is

a one in fifty years opportunity and he believes that Montgomery Street and MLK are not being taking into account the way they should be. Mr. Engle said he does not believe they are there yet. He cannot approve this as it is. He agrees with all of staff's comments. There are still issues with MLK; he believes it ought to be worked out with the City first. The Board is being asked to go along with a grand staircase that might never happen; then what are they going to have? A two-story drop off. Right now it is a mess and this could mean that they will have a brand new block owned hotel next to a grassy knoll that is a mess. They need to vote on something that they can vote on and he does not see it here yet. This has made a lot of progress and is better than the first time.

Dr. Henry said he believes this is a great improvement. He also believes the Board needs more details. He has a couple of questions to ask Ms. Ward. He asked Ms. Ward if it is correct that height and mass refers to voids and not window styles.

Ms. Ward answered correct.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Ward if it is correct that they have no business declaring use.

Ms. Ward replied correct.

Dr. Henry said what Mr. Stuebe said is what they thought at one point that they were proposing hotel for commercial use and an underground floor and it turned out to be an exercise room. But, they have no control over this.

Ms. Ward said correct. But, what they can require is what is in the ordinance. If they want the additional floor and if they applied the criteria, they used multiple ground floor active uses that are permitted in the zoning district, spanning the length of the facade and that they use individual primary entrances.

Dr. Henry said he fully disclosures that he is a member of the DNA board and he would agree and would like to see that when you have at least three on the staff's recommendation that uses the word "restudy" gives him some heartburn; this is not definitive enough for him.

Mr. Merriman said he wants to agree with Mr. Engle. He was ready to vote "yes" on this just because of what they have done with Montgomery Street. He really likes it, but if it is not chiseled in stone, how can they make a decision on height and mass when they don't know if the height is going to be approved or whether they are meeting the criteria or not. Mr. Merriman said he does not see how they can possibly do this.

Ms. Simpson said they have not seen the finished product.

Mr. Johnson said they need to make up their minds. They have been going back and forth.

Ms. Ramsay told Mr. Shay that he has heard the comments from the Board.

Mr. Shay asked if they were to continue, which comments would the Board have them to address. Would it be staff's comments; comments from individual Board members; or comments from interested people of the public?

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Shay if he could quickly list the comments that are made by the Board members relative that are not covered by the staff's recommendations. He said it seems to him to be a pretty high level of overlap.

Mr. Shay answered that Mr. Howington seems to make a lot of suggestions that were architectural detail. The main comment seems to be making the corner of MLK and Williamson Street have another addressable entrance that is accessible from the sidewalk as it descends the hill. This is something that he is confident that they can come back and address.

Dr. Henry said basically the only new comment he think is just one. Is this what you are saying that was not already covered by the staff's recommendations?

Mr. Engle said no. They are talking about Montgomery Street to.

Ms. Ramsay injected that she needs to comment that this is related to height and mass. If there are specific design detail comments on the specific type of window or whatever, but the height and mass comments are the ones that needs to be addressed in Part I. Mr. Stuebe brought up a number of inconsistencies that were height and mass; she believes he brought up three. These probably should be addressed.

Mr. Shay asked if someone could restate these for him so that he will know what the charge is because he does not want to miss it.

Dr. Henry said they could ask Mr. Stuebe to restate them.

Ms. Ramsay said that Mr. Stuebe cannot do so.

Mr. Engle said in a way the issue is too much detail and not enough. He is showing detail, every mullion, but that is not in the consideration today. What they should perhaps be looking at is a wall with openings and the issue raised about fifteen (15) different window styles is valid, but it is not valid for this review, Part I. All that matters on this one is the width, the hole and the height of the hole. But they are getting so much detail, including the grand staircase which should not even be here because if it is going to be developed by the City, then why are they even considering it? They should be looking at what would happen if the hotel is built without Montgomery Street even being here. Why are they reviewing the staircase that may not be built? They are being asked to look at the design and the compatibility and this may never be here. Therefore show them the bare wall. If the City goes out and paves that slope, what is it going to look like? Because this is the reality of height and mass and not all that detail; he does not care if they are granite or limestone. This is detail, but it is not now. Mr. Engle asked Mr. Shay if this makes sense.

Mr. Shay said he was asked early on to address the issue of what is going on here very specifically. Therefore, he made a good faith effort. He asked if what they want him to do is come back and give them a design that shows a dirt slope. He guessed he could do this; he thinks the chances of this being the final solution are nil.

Mr. Engle stated that this probably is too.

Mr. Howington said he just wanted to answer the question about what were some of the items mentioned. He explained continuing the parapet; putting parapets on the corner or may be looking at the parapet instead of the metal railing, this could be the mass or design detail; deleting the post modern balcony. This also affects metal balconies on this side; and then simplifying the form of the meeting room into something more simple; the corner meeting room at Williamson and MLK. This whole shape to him is a mass portion of this. Mr. Howington said he believes these seem to be the main mass items. It is not to discourage as he is very excited about this project. It is a very nice project.

Mr. Shay asked Ms. Ramsay that if he may, there was also a comment made that they should not move forward until there was something definitive with the City of Savannah. He said with due respect, he does not know how to make this happen. If what he is being told today is that they need to forget about criterion number one and hope that someday something neat happens with this slope, he can deal with this and he will go and actively pursue criteria number three and he can assure the Board that it will never turn out to be as good as what they are showing on the screen. But, this is not this Board's purview.

Ms. Ramsay said they don't know; this is just pie in the sky. She asked Mr. Shay why it is so difficult to meet with the City.

Mr. Shay answered that he has met with the City. He has met with the Mayor; met with the City Manager; and has attended the SPR Committee with everybody from Traffic Engineering and Park and Tree. He explained that the reason it is difficult to meet with the City is that the City has many voices. There was and he thinks Sarah may have been invited to this meeting, he heard that there was a meeting being facilitated to bring together a committee of voices, but he was not invited to attend this meeting. Therefore, he does not know what the status of this is.

Ms. Ward commented that this item was at the January meeting. Therefore, the petitioner has taken two months to try to meet with the City, reach out to them and redesign and take into consideration the comments from the last meeting. Ms. Ward explained that they did meet; there was a small group of people from the City. There were the Assistant City Managers, representatives from Downtown Services, Tourism, and Economic Development to talk about what they wanted to see for the Montgomery Street ramp. It was discussed at this meeting that they would move forward with a proposal to the City Manager for establishing a design for this area in hopes that there could be an agreement with the developer that they would implement the design as a part of this project to get that additional floor. This has not yet been approved by the City Manager.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Ward if the City is clear that they are expected to pay for it.

Ms. Ward answered that she does not believe that the details of this has been specified and she does not know that this would be the agreement. She does not see that the City has the ability to pay for all of this right now. Ms. Ward believes that they may say they will work out with the utilities what they need to work out with Georgia Power and may allow some encroachments onto the right-of-way for tables and chairs and these kinds of things. But, she thinks they will expect some participation from the developer to implement the plan. Now, what the details of this agreement would be she really believes this would need to be worked out between the City and the adjacent developer property owner.

Ms. Simpson said she does not feel comfortable that the criteria have been met for the participation.

Mr. Shay stated for the records that he has met with the City Manager and has discussed this with her. He thinks it was prior to this report landing on her desk, but he has no idea when it did so, he made it clear that the developer was interesting in participating and this was well received. But, it was not a condition that the developer would be expected to pay for everything that happened in this right-of-way, especially.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Shay if he was requesting a continuance.

Mr. Shay answered based on what he has heard and the comments with regard to height and mass, he thinks as an architect he knows what the issues are that he needs to address. If he seeks a continuance for the opportunity to come back would be the best way to serve the interest of this Board. He said that he could not speak for the owners to what remedies and what other things they would pursue in the meantime in order to better define their rights. But from an architectural standpoint, he knows the laundry list that the staff came up with and he knows the things that Mr. Howington identified that he believes are also things that affect the height and mass of the building. He believes he knows what to do if his client allows him to come back before the Board. With this understanding, he would ask for a continuance.

Board Action:

Continue to the meeting of April 11, 2012 at the petitioner's request to address comments and to fully meet one of the criteria to qualify for the additional story. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Not Present

6. [Petition of Todd Huntington for GPD Group | H-12-4578-2 | 504 East River Street | New Construction, Part I and II](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial Map 2007.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Plans and Elevations.pdf](#)

Mr. Todd Huntington 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 and Part II Design Details, of a one- and two-story commercial structure at 504 East River Street. The property is located on the north side of River Street along the Savannah River within the Factors Walk Character Area of the historic district. The demolition was previously approved under a separate application. The petition for Part I Height and Mass was continued from February 8, 2012.

There have been a number of changes made to the design in an effort to respond both to the Board and staff comments from the previous submittal. The front yard setback has increased from 14 feet to 22 feet to not be sited above the existing utility easements. The petitioner received this comment from the City and it was brought up at the beginning of the last Review Board meeting that they were going to have to set it back to not build upon the easements that are here. This is consistent with the adjacent development that is some distance away. Additionally, the petitioner has moved the building over slightly because when they pushed it back, the building ended up too close to where they need to have a ten (10) foot minimum pedestrian set back along the river. Therefore, the building was moved over and back to accommodate the comments from the Site Plan Review team. The ADA ramp has been relocated to the east elevation within the side porch. The center recess within the building has been eliminated. It is now flush with the rest of the building. The design has been restudied to feature two distinct segments. The prior design was three segments. The petitioner has reconstructed the model and it is on display for the Board's review.

Ms. Ward stated that because most of the historic context for the north side of River Street is lost, visual compatibility for any new construction must focus on the existing historic resources on the south side of River Street and the design standards which were created to provide for compatible infill development consistent with the historic development pattern for the north side of River Street. Ms. Ward said when the petitioner received the staff's report last week, he took all of the items into consideration and has addressed most of staff's concerns.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the amended petition for new construction, Parts I and II, with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final review:

1. The cables above the porch roof or return to the shed style that was previously submitted;
2. Reduce the number of light fixtures on the western segment of the south facade from five to three;
3. Correct the detail where the privacy wall meets the building on the west facade; and
4. The coping and the string course project a few inches from the face of the building;

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Ward if this would be on the side elevations also, as no return is shown on any of the pediments. It is only shown on the front elevation. The sides are flat.

Ms. Ward answered yes. She was saying around the entire building .

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Huntington thanked Ms. Ward for going over the items. He stated that as Ms. Ward reported, they received the staff's report last Thursday and proceeded to address the staff's and Board's concerns as shown in their revised elevations and sections that are before the Board today. They met with Ms. Ward this morning and went over their resubmitted items. They have added the turnbuckles and suspended cables to the additional side of the roof. They agree that this will break up the wall plain above the canopy. This will be added on the east and the river side elevations. Mr. Huntington explained that the reasoning for the columns, basically the span of the actual awning as far

as how far it projects out, the turnbuckles on the front do not have columns and are able to support the wall. The sides and the amount that sits off the building as well as on the back, is significantly longer and the columns are needed for extra support to brace the building. Mr. Huntington said, therefore, the turnbuckles will help, but they cannot completely remove the columns. This is why they took the additional comment about not having the wood columns and went with the metal columns.

Mr. Huntington explained that he agrees with the additional comment that was made about the top header course being all the way around the building. They can bump it out so that it will not be completely flat. This will be carried around to every roof on every side of the building. He pointed out that at the last Board meeting they had the bar area located along the front and some issues were raised about having visibility through the building. He stated that to provide this, the storefront windows will provide as much visibility as possible throughout. Mr. Huntington, pointing to a section, said they have provided this along the front door, the area he was pointing out as well as on the back, and went with the fifteen (15) light windows. To provide consistency, these are larger than the eight (8) light windows that they previously had. Consequently, they have provided additional windows and visibility into the building and also relocated the bar area to the middle so that when you are looking through, you are not looking at the back of a bar area, but looking into the dining area. Tables will replace the booths here, but booths will be in the back as they don't want to block the first forty-two inches of the window. Therefore, they made the tables so you can actually see into the dining area. One can see through the entire area all the way to the back, providing visibility from the street.

Mr. Huntington said regarding the revised elevation that they have submitted, the comment about the number of light fixtures, they have no issue on reducing the number of fixtures. They tend to agree with Ms. Ward to put them on the end of the facade as well as on the side of the door. They, too, will be looking for suggestions from the Board as far as what they prefer to see. His opinion is possibly eliminate the two at this location and keep two on the side and one in the middle. Therefore, there will be three on the facade and one on each side of the door. He believes this would look significantly better. However, as he as stated, they are open to suggestions from the Board in this regard.

Mr. Huntington said he believes that everything has been addressed as far as the staff's comments. They have provided the additional sections to show the Board what the front entrance looks like; they have the sample board of the brick. He apologized that the rendering is not a brown brick, but more a red brick with some color variations. This is similar as to what is on River Street.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Huntington to address where the privacy wall will connect to the building.

Mr. Huntington said they talked with Ms. Ward about the wall this morning. This was missing a line in the rendering. It will be approximately four to six inches behind the pier. Therefore, there will be a difference in how it will be set. They do not have an issue with this and changing the coping. They are not using the same cap on the parapet as they are using here to give them some variation and adding the piers to break up the solid wall. They will keep the door openings and, as he has said, the consistency of the windows throughout; using the fifteen light windows (which are larger than the eight (8) light windows) and

carrying them around the entire side of the building. One other point he wanted to make was about the canopy which was carried all the way around the back; they reworked the interior layout and basically pushed the restrooms a little further out so that they could get an access behind here and have the canopy. He said that some comments were made at the last meeting about too much open wall space here and not utilizing what they have. They will be able to add some voids in the back and provide the railing and canopy to project all the way to the end. He believes this breaks up the back and they agree with what the Board said at the last meeting.

Mr. Engle asked if the fixtures will be gas or electric.

Mr. Huntington answered that the fixtures will be gas.

Mr. Engle asked if the gas fixtures will be approximately ten feet off the ground.

Mr. Huntington replied yes; they will be roughly nine and one-half feet.

Mr. Engle said he agrees with the staff. He believes two would be great; three might be alright, but five would be too many. They will not serve any lighting purpose; therefore, they would be just for atmosphere.

Mr. Huntington said they would provide some illumination on the building, but they would not project onto the sidewalk and provide foot lighting. But as he has said, they agree with the number not being used. However, in his opinion, if they remove the two, they would still have the one in the middle and on the ends and keep them next to the door. But, if the Board believes something would look better, they are amendable to making the modification.

Mr. Engle stated that on the door, they are five and one-half feet. If they are gas, they will get hot and this could cause a real issue. In a way it makes a metaphor between an industrial commercial building and a residential building. On the other side of the door since there is a potential danger for burning your hands as they are low. But on the others you will not burn your hands on them unless you are twelve feet tall. This might need to be restudied as it really conflicts with what has come along way. He personally feels it is a good design and has come along way. It is industrial and it works, but he does not agree with the lights.

Mr. Huntington explained that having to use the gas lights, when they were in this area and looked around there are some on Bay Street and River Street. They have seen this application done and trying to utilize some of those features into this building, he believes they have gotten to a point where it is a consistent look and an industrial theme. They can restudy how they are going to do the fixtures. If the gas fixtures are a concern, the heat and touch of them, they can do an electric fixture that has an industrial look. As he as said, may be they can space them further out to alleviate that concern, but he guessed their concern is what fixtures they use and where they put them; obviously they want it to look good and they don't want to just put something up there that will not look nice on the building.

Mr. Engle said he was not saying that they do not look good; they are nice, but just make sure they are safe.

Dr. Henry stated that he likes gas, too. He said he agrees with using the metal columns,

but it would be great if the columns had the 19th century warehouse look that is seen around town. He believes this would be a nice touch.

Mr. Huntington said Ms. Ward mentioned about applying a base to the column. This is something they can do; they can rework it and work with staff to find something that will be agreeable to both parties.

Dr. Henry stated that this is a vast improvement and he appreciates the petitioner being so forthcoming.

Ms. McClain said she, too, likes the gas lights.

Mr. Huntington said the gas fixture is the feature that they have used on other applications and on other buildings. He believes they do look nice, although they will not provide complete illumination. But he believes there are things they can do regarding safety concerns. It is a low burning light. They can space them and figure what they can do to ensure that their customers are not burning their hands.

Ms. McClain stated that what she saw today is a great improvement from what she saw at their last meeting. It really looks good.

Mr. Howington said it is a great improvement and really looks nice, but he had a couple of questions on the new canopy. He asked if there will be internal gutters and will a roof be here.

Mr. Huntington said they will have some exterior gutters that will be the same material as the roof metal. What they have done in the past, so that they don't have water dripping off on the customers as they walk into the building, they pitched it back towards the middle to a drain and shoot it out the side, have the gutter come out this way.

Mr. Howington said his concern was that heavy rains are here some times. He was not sure how the rain would come off.

Mr. Huntington said it would not be shooting off. They will provide gutters to catch the rain and take it off on the side.

Mr. Howington stated also the staff report suggested, he believes Mr. Huntington is in agreement, that the windows on the River Street elevation should be consistent on the east and River Street sides. There are three different size windows here. The large windows are nice on the front elevation, on the side the windows are smaller and on the back they are a different style. He asked Mr. Huntington if he was in agreement that they should take the same pattern all the way around, the smaller windows.

Mr. Huntington said what they discussed initially they had the fifteen (15) light windows. They had three of these and added one. Therefore, this took care of that comment. They had eight (8) light windows and they are smaller in width and height. The comment how they perceived it and discussed with Ms. Ward, is that the windows are different than what they used on the front. Mr. Huntington explained, pointing to a section, these are the same size windows and the storefront windows are different to provide the visibility. The

two types of windows they have on the front were not matching what they were using on the side as well as on the rear. They carried the eight (8) light around here and have the fifteen (15) light over there. Therefore, the variation is what they had and they are showing what was revised. They have carried the windows throughout to the side and on the River Street side in order to be consistent with what they are using. Consequently, there is a fifteen (15) light window; he believes the exact dimensions are three feet ten wide by six and one-half feet tall. The windows start directly at the table height so that you can look into the restaurant. These were used on the side as well as on the back. Essentially, they have two window types. They have the fifteen light and also the storefront windows on the front and back. As he has said, this is to provide as much visibility into the dining area as they could from River Street.

Mr. Howington said he noticed that the other doors do not have transoms; may be they can do this. He said he guessed his point is to get to the sense of openness, this is the way he understood the staff's report, was to have the larger windows on the east and River Street sides as transparency. He believes transparency is a big concern.

Mr. Huntington said he mentioned earlier that they relocated the bar to the center. One of the things with relocating the bar is not sacrificing how many seats they will have in their dining room. The best way to get seats into the dining room is to use booth-style tables on the perimeter. These were eliminated from the front so they could get the visibility into the dining room and with the bar on the side, a large storefront type window on the side would be looking directly behind their bar where all the mechanical equipment, coolers, beer coolers, etc. However, the way he interprets it and may be is wrong, Ms. Ward can speak to this, but it is more consistency of the windows between here and the eight windows they are using on the side.

Mr. Howington asked if transoms are over the doors.

Mr. Huntington said, pointing to an area, that they could add some. It would not be an issue.

Mr. Howington asked that to clarify, the shutters are bi-fold and operable.

Mr. Huntington stated yes, they latch, close and are operable.

Mr. Howington said the baluster has a little detail on it. He would prefer seeing just a straight simple baluster.

Mr. Huntington asked Mr. Howington if he was saying on the railing.

Mr. Howington answered yes.

Mr. Huntington said they show every third picket will be a design feature so that it is not so simplistic. There are some applications of this that they have seen on River Street on some of the other buildings. This is to give it some sort of feature so that it is not just plain in their opinion. He said may be they could use less of them and increase the spacing so that they are not so predominant. But, they knew if they went from an eight inch spacing to a four inch spacing they would have a lot more railing. Therefore, doing them every three might be a little over-detailed. Therefore, this is roughly a nine foot spacing

and may be they can put it on every three feet.

Mr. Howington said the way he read it was that it would be on every one.

Mr. Huntington said with the decrease spacing, he agrees it would be a significant amount. But, they can play with the spacing and come up with something and work with staff on what would be a good spacing and how many you would really see; whether it is two to three per column spacing. They can work this out.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Todd Nolen said he was at the Board meeting last month pertaining to this building and is present today. However, in neither of these meetings has anyone commented, addressed or asked what is on the second floor of this building. Is it dining room? Why does this building need to be two-stories? Mr. Nolen said having lived in Savannah twenty-five years, any time he has guests in town they always go to River Street, the guests always comment about the view down the river. If this is just open space and last month it was two stories on the west end, but now it is even larger across the second floor. Mr. Nolen said 150 years ago when people built things on the river and no one particularly cared what they looked like, he guess there was a precedent for buildings, but he does not understand why this mistake needs to be made again. Why do they need to repeat something that is no longer there, but over the years disappeared. If the second floor of this building is not utilized or is not necessary, he does not why the second floor has to be here. This building keeps getting bigger and bigger and no one has addressed anything about what the second story of this building pertains to.

Mr. Patrick Shay said he has been asked to speak on behalf of Ms. Ann West who is a next door neighbor on the other side of River Street. Ms. West has asked him to read the letter into the record which was actually composed before this design was made available to the public at large. Mr. Shay said, therefore, the first sentence is slightly inaccurate, but he will read it anyway.

Mr. Shay read, "The intent to construct in an enclosed building with the height of 28 feet, the length of 120 feet and an depth of 90 feet between the four story original structures on River Street and the Savannah River is ludicrous at best. The proposed structure is too massive and high for the old Marine tug boat facility at 504 East River Street. The concerns are deterioration of view of River Street looking south onto the City and the view from River Street looking north onto the Savannah River. The already overtaxed traffic on River Street cannot handle the loading and unloading of all the vehicles necessary to service this restaurant.

Parking and traffic from the patrons of the restaurant would be a hindrance to the safety and well-being of the pedestrians as they try to navigate River Street. If this building is constructed and its original purpose fails, then we will have a building that may create even more potential problems. The overlay district architectural guidelines states on page 35, "this area presents a building typology even more tightly defined by precedent than the Oglethorpe planned area. There is no other interface between city and river like it in America, if not the world. Nothing should threaten its integrity. Any demolition would be a significant loss. Likewise, the assertion of tall and/or large scale developments in this

area threaten its integrity both by singular action and precedent for future action. Parcels between River Street and the river, itself, should not be developed so as to obscure the consistent and legible edge to the city made by buildings fronting the south side of the street. If the structure is deemed necessary, such development should be consistent with the historic precedent such as the 18th century warehouses which used to stand west of City Hall and where photos exist." Mr. Shay said this was quoting from the guidelines.

He said returning to what Ms. West wrote, "as Hutchinson Island is developed, the view from across the river and on the river is probably unique in the United States. The historic buildings on this end of River Street with brick and stucco architecture and balconies will no longer be seen as they have been seen obscured for over a century. A building of this size and height will not only block the view, but will block the natural light of the street. The view from the south side of the street looking north will be eliminated from several of the businesses and living quarters on River Street which defeats the very foundation of the development of River Street under the Urban Renewal program.

I feel strongly that the above information should be given serious consideration before approval of any plans to put this building on this property. I request that this memorandum be placed in the minutes of today's meeting."

Mr. Shay stated that he believes the comments about the pedestrian activity along here, he knows that this is the Historic Review Board and they don't have purview over traffic control, but this is a unique situation in the sense that the twenty (20) feet from the edge of the public right-of-way and the front of the building is actually on private property. The street here is so narrow that there is only about a four foot sidewalk on the other side of River Street. Yet, it is very safe to say that well over one million people or may be many times more than a million people per year walk along this area. He believes the petitioner wants to do a good job and he hopes so, but he has not seen anything in the drawings that helps him to be able to help Ms. West get over her fears that this won't be done as well as it should be done. There are also a couple of vacant lots to the immediate east of this site and it is not known exactly what the purpose of this will be. It is hard for him to imagine that there will not be the temptation for surface parking here; given that they have close to one thousand seats in this restaurant and there are no parking spaces provided whatsoever. Mr. Shay said he realizes that zoning does not require it, but as a practical matter there is some probability at least that this area will become at least in the near term for surface parking. He believes there are strict regulations as to how surface parking would have to be screened.

Mr. Engle stated that the Historic Review Board does not deal with zoning. What is being proposed is fully within the ordinance. Whether they agree with this or not, the ordinance was reviewed two years ago, two and one-half years ago, and three years ago. They have rights to build a two-story building. If Ms. West was against this, the time to raise her issue was last year, the year before and the year before that, but this Board can not change the ordinance.

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said the design of the building is much improved. He appreciates the petitioner being so responsive to their multiple emails and suggestions about how this might be affected. It appears that the petitioner has followed a lot of what the HSF recommended and this is gratifying. Mr.

Carey said he is a little curious and it might be due to the fact that Dr. Williams is not present today and he does not want to confine this any further, but last month they had a lot of discussion about how the building would be sited on the property. Whether it is parallel to the water or perpendicular, whether it would have gable ends more akin to market buildings immediately to the west. Mr. Carey believes that he was in the minority at the last meeting arguing for something like this, but there was quite a bit of discussion from the Review Board about this, both about is the building perpendicular to the water. The staff's conclusion in their report says that it is, but to the HSF it does not appear so. He brings this up because they are talking about the river view which is so important from River Street. The building is approximately 7,500 square feet and just by sight it is wider; it is longer east/west than it is north/south. Therefore, to him the way it is sited, appears to be parallel to the river, not perpendicular to the river. Mr. Carey said he needs some clarification on this or he is misunderstanding what it means to be perpendicular to the river. However, he believes the precedent of the two market buildings to the west, which are perpendicular to the river were designed and sited this way to ensure greater view to the waterfront as you walk by.

Mr. Carey said this is a big building with a big footprint and if it is wider than it is deep, then they are blocking more of the view than they would be enabling it. Whether they want to open up Pandora's box on the gable ends he will not commit on this, but wanted to remind them that it was discussed quite a bit last month, there was a lot of debate and a lot of reference to historic photographs, renderings, and so forth. He believes the question really is with height and mass, can it all be shrunk. This is a big building, serving a lot of people and taking up a lot of the waterfront. Is the second story necessary? How will the windows be treated? What are they looking at when walking down the street if the second story is here.? Is this necessary and what about preserving as much sort of visual access to the riverfront? This has a lot to do with how the building is sited. He said there is not necessary a solution or conclusion on the part of the HSF, but he believes it is important that these questions are raised and hopefully the Board will consider and discuss them in their deliberation.

Ms. Celia Dunn stated she has lived in Savannah in an old home in the Historic District all her life. Ms. Dunn was thinking about what they are going to do to their Historic waterfront. She realizes that there is so much that they can control, but she believes that the size and capacity of the building exceeds anything that they should have to deal with on the waterfront. She asked where are the trucks going to load and unload. Is this a consideration? She understood that the kitchen is on the west end. Also when she went down and looked at it, previously on the east end of the building where there is a parking lot, it was anticipated that it would be sold and another building would be built. It will not be a grassy green area or a beautified parking area. Ms. Dunn said she does not know if the Board realizes what they are doing, but wanted them to consider what is happening to our beautiful waterfront. The eastern end has been the end that has not been destroyed. The river side has been kept somewhat clear at least where there is some visibility. Ms. Dunn wanted the Board to think about the beauty.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry wanted clarification on whether the Board has in its purview the consideration of views, etc.

Ms. Ramsay said no. They look at preservation standards.

Mr. Merriman said the petitioners have the right to build whatever is within the ordinance. It is the Board's purview to say whether it is visual compatible.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board's purview is to see whether the project meets the preservation and the design standards.

Ms. Simpson said the Board has no control over what is speculated to go on the back of the building.

Mr. Merriman said no; this is private property.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Huntington if he had any responses to a couple of points about parallel versus perpendicular and the second story.

Mr. Huntington said the west end of the building is the kitchen and restrooms. As a part of the restaurant use, there are return uses, condensers, and vents. All of this equipment needs to be screened. Therefore, having this screened, what they essentially had here is story building, a parapet roof screening this equipment so that it will not be seen from the street or any angle. He said regarding the perpendicular and parallel nature of the building, to simply say it is wider than it is deep is really directed to the size of the site. To get a reasonable size building here that a restaurant can operate, have the kitchen, restrooms and dining and all the amenities that the kitchen needs to operate and the size they need, they can not simply take 30 feet off the building in order to call it perpendicular. There are some features on the side such as the patio. River Street is here and trying to utilize River Street and the views they have along with the patio, then with the restaurant use on the west side of the building, there is the dumpster enclosure. When they talk about the perpendicular nature of the building, if they took these off it is roughly a 95 by 95 by 100 foot building. It is oriented towards River Street. They are opening up the views onto the river trying to make this as visually compatible as they can and trying to meet all the guidelines of the historic context of this site. However, with the additional setback requirements they have with utilities on the front side, the river walk on the rear side, they are dealing with a lot of constraints of what they can do and trying to get a building that is going to work for Joe's Crab Shack.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Huntington to identify the spandrel glass for the record. On the second floor, there are windows in the back. He assumes some spandrel glass will be in the restrooms on the rear.

Mr. Huntington explained that in talking with Ms. Ward, he does not believe it will be spandrel glass, but will be clear glass that has some gyp behind it.

Mr. Howington asked if this will be for all the windows.

Ms. Huntington answered yes.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Huntington that since he has moved the building down, was any consideration given in flipping the building. It seems that the folks from the market would

want to come to the restaurant. He realizes they have passed this point, but he was just wondering about this.

Mr. Huntington answered that there have been a lot of changes. This is somewhat a loaded question. They have looked at a lot of different layouts; where they started from initially; having the ADA entrance; knowing that they have the marketplace shops and having the space between the marketplace shops and what they are doing on this site along with knowing that restrooms are going in this area, he believes makes it more amendable to have a patio not facing the restrooms.

Mr. Engle commented that he believes this site is far more accessible than it was previously when it was a tug boat office with a cyclone fence around it and a split-level house. It is now being open up to the public. As long as it is being opened up consistently with the ordinance, he does not see what the objections are about at this point and time. The time to work is to change the ordinance if there is something that you don't agree with it. This site will now be more accessible to the general public than it was many years ago.

Ms. Ramsay stated it is just as she stated at the beginning of this meeting, this Board deals with the visual compatible, design standards and preservation standards.

Mr. Engle said a two-story building here works, a one-story building would be totally inappropriate on this site. It would not be compatible with anything in the area that is historic.

Mr. Johnson said the Board has no authority with the lot next to it. It is private property.

Ms. Simpson said she believes that the five lights are excessive. She is in agreement with the lights that were suggested by the petitioner.

Mr. Howington stated that the petitioner has followed the ordinance and is within the guidelines. It is the obligation of this Board to follow within that respect.

Board Action:

Approve the amended petition for new construction, Parts I and II, with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final review:

1. Incorporate suspension rods above the canopy on all sides of the building;
2. Reduce the number of light fixtures on the western segment of the south facade from five to three; - PASS
3. Correct the detail on the west facade where the privacy wall meets the building wall; and
4. Provide a reveal for the string course and coping on the parapet.

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Ebony Simpson

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

7. [Petition of Andrew Barber for Coastal Canvas Products Co. Inc. | H-12-4587-2 | 300 West Bay Street | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Site Visit Photographs.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Engle left the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

Mr. Andrew Barbour of Coastal Canvas was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a new ground supported awning at 300 West Bay Street. The proposed awning will be located over an existing exterior stair, in an interior courtyard on private property. The proposed awning is 14 feet-eight and half inches long and five feet wide. It will feature a three color scheme of Coastline Plus fabrics in "Bone" (CP2749), "Dawn" (CP2740), and "Gull Gray" (CP2717). The awning face will feature a "Q" that is one square foot. The awning will be minimally visible from the Bay Street elevation; however, it will be visible from the Montgomery Street elevation. The petitioner has submitted a rendering of the proposed awning.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the supported awning at 300 West Bay with the condition that the multicolor scheme be eliminated from the design and a solid color fabric is selected.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Ramsay asked the petitioner if he had any problems with complying with the staff's recommendation.

Mr. Barbour said their client would like to see something that closely resembles their color scheme. When they initially proposed this to them, all of it was green, but their clients made this change and asked Coastal Canvas to seek approval.

Mr. Johnson asked what color are they recommending. It needs to be one solid color.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Barbour if their client is opposed to one solid color. He realized multiple colors were proposed.

Mr. Barbour said the clients are opposed to one color, but he does not know whether this would be detrimental to finishing the job.

Mr. Howington asked the petitioner if the Board approves one color, would the clients approve of it or not approve it.

Mr. Barbour stated that he believes the clients would go either way.

Dr. Henry said the Board could approve a single color of the client's own choice with staff's approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for the ground supported awning at 300 West Bay Street with the condition that the multicolor scheme is eliminated from the design and a solid color fabric is selected and submitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

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

8. [Petition of Haresh Bhojwani | H-12-4591-2 | 30 Barnard Street | ATM Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Jyoti Bhojwani was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to alter the existing door, on the Congress Street elevation at 30 Barnard Street to install an ATM in the glass portion of the door. The proposed alteration to the door includes removal of the existing glass and installation of an ATM in the existing opening. The existing glass light is 27 inches wide by 43 inches tall, the proposed ATM will be installed within this existing opening; it is 15 inches wide by 35-8 inches tall. Neither the door or door frame will be altered, and a wood infill will be constructed to fill the gap between the ATM and the existing door.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the alteration to the existing door with the condition that the wooden frame of the historic door not be damaged, removed, fastened to or altered and that the installation of the ATM and surround be reversible.

Ms. Simpson asked if the petitioner is able to guarantee that the wooden frame of the door will not be fastened to or altered.

Ms. Bryant said this is what the staff is recommending. This is a question that the petitioner needs to answer regarding the technical installation.

Mr. Merriman asked Ms. Bryant to show the rendering of the ATM in the doorway.

Ms. Bryant stated that the ATM is not to scale. Therefore, what is shown is not an accurate representation of what it will look like. Originally, there was some confusion on how large the ATM would be, but upon further discussion with the petitioner, they learned that it would just be in the panel where the light was. This is much smaller than the existing light.

Mr. Merriman asked if a surround would be built underneath and none of the door would be seen.

Ms. Bryant answered that it will be the door, the ATM and the glass light.

Dr. Henry asked if a person would have to open the door to use the ATM.

Ms. Bryant answered no; you would be able to access it from the street. The ATM will project.

Mr. Merriman explained that you walk up to use the ATM; but it will be serviced from behind. This will look like an air conditioning window unit stuck in the panel.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Bhojwani how could they guarantee that the door would not be damaged, removed, fastened to or altered.

Ms. Bhojwani answered that the people they are buying the ATM from told them that the machine would fit exactly in the glass of the wooden frame and that it would not be damaged at all.

Mr. Merriman asked how would it be fastened if it is not going to be screwed to the wooden frame of the door.

Ms. Bhojwani said her brother knows all the details, but he had to leave the meeting to go pick up his children. She is only filling in for him. However, according to her understanding, it will be done from the inside. The customers will do their transactions from the outside. All the fittings will be done on the inside. Nothing will be damaged; only the glass section will be removed and the machine will fit into this.

Ms. Ramsay explained to Ms. Bhojwani that she sensed from the Board that there are a lot of unanswered questions.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation said obvious it can not always be anticipated with what would be needed in buildings in term of ATMs or walk-up windows, etc. Mr. Carey said, however, he was wondering with all the seemingly trouble that will be had in installing this ATM, would it not be easier to have it on the inside of the building. They are relatively small, and if you are having to service it and access it, it will have to be blocked off some way. They will be losing store space for this; therefore, why not just put the ATM behind the door and come inside to use it. However, he knew that they are not here to design things for petitioners, but the HSF asks that no additional light be on the ATM. The ATM will probably be lit enough and visible without adding more light. There should not be any other illumination of any kind connected with the ATM. Mr. Carey said he is sure that the lighting that is here will be more than adequate.

Mr. Carey said he guessed the petitioner needs to be asked to think about their space and that it might be more practical and feasible to put the ATM on the inside of the store.

Ms. Ramsay asked the petitioner if she wanted to respond to Mr. Carey's comments.

Ms. Bhojwani said no.

Mr. Johnson asked staff what they thought of this application.

Ms. Bryant explained that upon receipt of the application, she went around the district and viewed how the other ATMs were installed throughout the district. She noticed that they all are involved with banks. You really do not see any kind of installation of ATMs on exterior in private businesses. Therefore, she does not believe it is necessary to have, but as far as it damaging the historic fabric and our standards, she did not find a reason to say no.

Dr. Henry explained to Ms. Bhojwani that if she asks for a continuance to the next meeting, the Board would be able to talk with her brother perhaps more productively.

Mr. Merriman asked Ms. Bryant that upon viewing the ATMS in the various banks, were any ATMs installed in the glass where the light would be.

Ms. Bryant answered that when she did the staff review, she pulled mainly from the Wells

Fargo where they installed a new ATM in the storefront. It is essentially the same standards that she applied here that the Board approved.

Dr. Henry said the Board does not have enough information.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board does not have enough information to move forward in a positive way on this application.

Ms. Bhojwani asked for a continuance.

Board Action:

Continue to the meeting of April 11, 2012 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle - Not Present

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Not Present

9. [Petition of John Lowe | H-12-4595-2 | 131 East Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new signs at 131 East Broughton Street for the new businesses Subway and Taco del Mar.

Ms. Bryant reported that the staff recommends approval for the two fascia signs, one fronting onto Broughton Street and one fronting onto Abercorn Street, for the business Subway with the condition that the sign is restudied to be individually mounted letters that are either back lit or externally illuminated and resubmitted to staff for final approval. Staff recommends approval for the illuminated corner projecting sign for the business Taco del Mar with the condition that the mounting plate is painted to match the building face.

Ms. Simpson asked where is the location of the Taco del Mar.

Ms. Bryant answered that two businesses will be at 131 East Broughton Street.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lowe said he is the owner of All Brite Signs and he will install the signs for Mr. Patel.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Lowe if they had any objections to the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Patel, owner, said they had no objections.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for the two fascia signs, one fronting onto Broughton Street and one fronting onto Abercorn Street, for the business Subway with the condition that the sign is restudied to be individually mounted- PASS letters that are either back lit or externally illuminated and resubmitted to staff for final approval.

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Sidney J. Johnson

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

Board Action:

Approval for the illuminated corner projecting sign for the business Taco del Mar with the condition that the mounting plate is painted to match the building face. - PASS

Vote Results

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

10. [Petition of Doug Bean for Doug Bean Signs | H-12-4597-2 | 11 Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Doug Bean of Doug Bean Signs was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a new non-illuminated principal use projecting sign at 11 Whitaker Street for the business Tiffani Taylor Gallery.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the principal use sign at 11 Whitaker Street with the condition that the mounting plate be painted to match the building face.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Bean stated that they do not have a problem painting the mounting plate to match the building face. He appreciates the staff indulgence and the Board's indulgence with the last minute change. He nor his client were aware the owner's association had such authority over the sign. Therefore, they had to make a last minute change. It is a smaller sign, although the technique and textures are the same, the black background is actually a result of the property owner's criteria. His client, just as staff, prefers the blue, too. But, they are trying to satisfy the owner's association.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Bean if he thought the owner's association would have a problem with the mounting bracket being painted to match the building face.

Mr. Bean answered no.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for the amended sign design with the condition that the mounting plate be painted to match the building facade. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle - Not Present

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Not Present

11. [Petition of Doug Bean for Doug Bean Signs | H-12-4598-2 | 38 Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Doug Bean of Doug Bean Signs was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a new illuminated principal use projecting sign at 38 Whitaker Street for the business Sweet Carolina Cupcakes. Ms. Bryant said initially there was some confusion on how the sign would be illuminated. The original application showed that the sign would be externally illuminated. However, at one point, they were told that the sign would be internally illuminated. Upon further clarification with the petitioner, they learned that the sign would be externally illuminated. The petitioner is present today to speak on the type of lighting materials and how the lighting will be attached to the sign. Ms. Bryant assumed that the lighting would be in the same location that was originally proposed.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the illuminated principal use projecting sign with the condition that the black aluminum sign border is reduced in size and that the mounting plate is painted to match the building facade.

Ms. McClain asked what dimension should the sign be reduced to.

Ms. Bryant explained that the black border is a little thick and heavy. The staff is not recommending so much that the sign be reduced in overall size, but that the size of the black aluminum border is not as thick and heavy as shown.

Mr. Howington stated that slide three shows that the sign is over a column. Where is the entrance to the building? Is it at the end?

Ms. Bryant pointing to a section said, "the entrance will be here."

Mr. Howington asked Ms. Bryant if she new why the entrance was moved to that end.

Ms. Bryant answered that she does not know.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Bean apologized as his staff has submitted a black aluminum border that is much wider than the customer's logo. He was not sure if something was lost in digital interpretation. He showed the black aluminum border to the Board on the monitor. Mr. Bean said the black border is not nearly as heavy and the pink border that separates the black and the white is much wider. He said his client is somewhat adamant about the border. The border is slightly esque and slightly asymmetrical. However, his client tells him that this is a critical part of their identity that they have established in other locations on the Internet, etc.

Mr. Bean said when he received the staff's recommendation, he was a little confused as he was not aware that they had submitted a drawing with such a bold black border.

Ms. McClain asked the petitioner if this would be the color of the mounting plate.

Mr. Bean answered no; the color of the mounting plate will be whatever color staff wants it to be.

Ms. Ramsay said she assumed Mr. Bean was asking approval for the lighting scheme.

Mr. Bean answered yes and said his feeling here is that the lights need to be absolutely discrete as possible. He believes the sign speaks enough for itself. Therefore, what the Board sees is their intention to do.

Mr. Merriman said following up on Mr. Howington's question, he asked why is the sign over the column instead of over the entryway.

Mr. Bean said his understanding is that there was some discussion with the landlord who wanted to sort of split the frontage as opposed to identifying something about the lane. He was not privy to this, but does know that discussion between client and the property owner was held. This is the property owner's preference.

Ms. McClain asked if the Board could speak to the location of the sign.

Mr. Bean said the sign is centered over the frontage which is typical for a projecting sign.

Dr. Henry said he was not clear about what it means when the petitioner says centered over their frontage. Does it mean the sign is in the middle of the store?

Mr. Bean answered yes.

Ms. Ward explained that she believes the critical question is, is this the actual entrance to the business. She asked Mr. Bean if knew the answer to this question.

Mr. Bean answered that he is not 100% familiar with exactly where the entrance will be.

Ms. Ward said the only reason she suggested this is at one point the property owner met with her when they were looking for a tenant for this space and they discussed the possibility of turning one of openings into an additional store frontage and keeping the entrance on the lane. She is not sure whether the door is really the entry.

Mr. Bean asked if the staff believes that the door on the lane end is the entrance. His understanding is this is the door that goes to the upstairs. The entrance is to the left of sign.

Ms. Ward said this is what she is asking. She does not know where the entrance is located.

Mr. Bean stated that he believes the door that is identified is not actually the entrance to the business. He believes this is a stairway that goes to the second floor. However, he knows that the landlord wants the sign centered over the frontage of the business.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation said he believes he heard that the dimensions are twelve inches thick. He said this seems thick to him and may be this dimension is more than necessary. Initially, he thought may be it was this thick because it would be internally lit and room would be needed to put the bulbs inside. But, now he understands that it will be externally lit, he is curious and may be Mr. Bean can explain why it needs to be twelve inches thick.

Mr. Bean said he believes the twelve inches are the overall depth of the sign. The graphic letters elements are raised. The pink and white area is actually raised off the face a little. Therefore, overall he would offer that the sign cabinet is probably eight or so inches deep. Although if it is the Board's preference, this could be altered without any difficulty.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry asked the staff that apparently this is the first time that they have seen what the sign will look like. How does the staff feel about the sign?

Ms. Bryant said she recommends approval of the sign.

Ms. Ramsay asked staff if they recommend the lighting also.

Ms. Bryant answered yes.

Dr. Henry asked staff if they recommend the depth, too.

Ms. Bryant said she believes the depth is fine. She does not have an issue with it.

Board Action:

Approval for the amended sign design at 38 Whitaker street with the condition that the mount plate and bracket be painted to match the building facade. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle - Not Present

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Not Present

12. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-12-4599-2 | 1 West Liberty Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Brenda K. Pearson of Dawson Architects was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations to the commercial space at 1 West Liberty Street. Signage for the business will be submitted at a later date under a separate application. Ms. Bryant said the petitioner submitted samples of the exterior sconces and they are included in the packet given to the Board today.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the alterations, including reconstruction of the storefront, new IPE boards, removal of the corner entry, and relocation of the principal entrance onto Liberty Street with the following conditions:

1. The IPE boards must be stained or painted and the color submitted to staff for final approval; 2. The Bull Street egress should be a wood door to match the proposed doors to be installed on Liberty Street;
3. The doors must be inset no less than three inches from the building façade;
4. The storefront glazing must be inset no less than four inches from the building façade; and
5. The height of the door lights should align with the height of the storefront glazing.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Pearson said she wanted to clarify a small error that was in the staff's report. The

doors are seven feet high, not six feet high.

Ms. Ramsay asked Ms. Pearson what is her response to the staff's recommendations.

Ms. Pearson stated that their response regarding staining the IPE, they prefer to keep it in its natural state. She said she brought with her some samples. It is a marine grade, very durable dense wood. From her understanding, the IPE does not generally take or hold stain well over time. Ms. Pearson said IPE has a tendency to turn silver over time. If oil is used on it as maintenance, it will retain its original appearance and not turn silver over time.

Dr. Henry said that teak will do the same thing.

Mr. Merriman stated IPE is heavy; the first piece he picked up he thought it was steel.

Ms. Pearson said it is wood and as she has said if the Board wants to see it, she has a sample of the IPE with her.

Mr. Howington said the design looks good. However, he does not believe it is visually compatible with the building. He likes the storefront and the entrances, but believes the design is in the wrong area. If it was in a more market area or urban city such as in New York. He asked her if they would reconsider going back to more traditional columns such as shown in the picture. There is such a large area on the left side, the south side. Maybe a panel could be put over there and keep this whole front and everything else more traditional at the base.

Ms. Pearson asked Mr. Howington if he was suggesting that the area which is the feature wall with the variegated wood to retain this area.

Mr. Howington replied the area could be retained or make it more of their trademark.

Ms. Pearson said the columns actually would be just the butt jointed IPE boards.

Mr. Howington said he likes what has been done with the columns, but he would like to see more traditional.

Ms. Pearson showed a picture and explained that this is a similar treatment that they envision for the columns. They will still read as wood, but will not have the staggered affect or variegated affect as it would be a flat wood surface. This is their way of maintaining the work across the whole facade; rather than having it be a different wood or different wood treatment than the IPE, they want it to be a continuous aesthetic element around. Ms. Pearson said a distance from Liberty Street, she guessed the feature wall would not be seen and this is just the way of carrying it around to make the design continuous.

Ms. Pearson said the signage will be submitted in a separate petition and will be put on the feature wall in the center. She said she wanted to make one more comment on one of the staff's comments regarding the door on the Bull Street side. Ms. Pearson said the single door with the staff's request to change it from the storefront door to a wood door, they would prefer to maintain it as a part of the storefront system. The function of the door is

intended for the code required secondary means of egress. It is also a double acting door that will act as the service door for the servers to access the people who are setting on the sidewalk and it will also act as where they are going to receive their deliveries. Therefore, it really has a service and an emergency egress function. They don't want it to be misread as an entry door, they have the wood doors on the front on the Liberty facade to be the main entry and they want it to read as the entry. This is where the stained wood will be to match the IPE. Ms. Pearson stated she believes it would function best for the service and efficiency of the restaurant if this is maintained as an aluminum store front door on the Bull Street side.

Dr. Henry asked if they were talking about Charlotte's Corner.

Ms. Pearson said yes.

Dr. Henry said he was looking at the picture of Charlotte's Corner. He asked Ms. Pearson to point out where the IPE will be going.

Ms. Pearson explained that as the Board could see, there is no exterior expressed columns on the existing facade. If they look at the plans, there are some interior columns that are supporting the deck above. What they are doing is building out exterior columns to match the rhythm of the interior columns and rebuilding the store because the storefront is really in an horrendous condition. The only IPE that will actually be seen would be the eight inch columns that are between the sections of the storefront until you get over to this area, there is a portion of wall where there is no window, it is current stucco. She said they will remove the plywood treatment and put a feature wall that will have a variegated IPE feature. Their client intends to put their signage in the middle of this wall and then the IPE wrapped columns, but will be flat and flush joining the IPE; basically, where they see the existing molds between the storefront windows because they are currently aligned where the structure columns are on the inside.

Dr. Henry asked how big is the panel.

Ms. Pearson guessed that the panel of the variegated feature wall is ten to twelve feet.

Mr. Johnson asked Ms. Pearson if she was aware of the staff's recommendations for the alterations.

Ms. Pearson replied yes. She said she had one more response to one of the staff's recommendations regarding raising the bottom rail of the door to meet the granite base. Ms. Pearson if they retained the storefront aluminum door, which they prefer to do, to help with the functionality of the door. The wood door at the front is a seven foot door, they feel that raising the bottom rail might make it look too stout and not proportional. She said she drove around and saw some examples around town that have a similar condition such as Banana Republic on Broughton Street, as a similar simple wood door with only a one foot bottom rail in a higher storefront base adjacent to it. Ms. Pearson said she believes the staff's recommendation is to raise the height of the bottom rail to meet the height of the base, the eighteen (18) inches. They prefer to keep it at twelve (12) inches, if possible.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Pearson to repeat her other responses to the staff's

recommendations.

Ms. Pearson stated that they prefer not to stain the IPE and just apply oil to it in order to maintain its natural appearance; they prefer to maintain the door on the Bull Street facade as a part of the aluminum storefront system so that it does not appear as an entrance door to patrons because it is a double acting door; they prefer to leave the bottom rail at the front door to its current configuration rather than raising it up to meet the adjacent granite base.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation said they agree with the staff's recommendations, but not the use of IPE. He said he is in favor of fresh treatments of buildings and fresh designs, but this is not visually compatible. As a matter of fact, he does not know where it is visually compatible in the Landmark District. He would like for staff to tell him where are the other places it has been used and he would argue that it was a mistake. Mr. Carey said he believes Mr. Howington is right. It may be the right treatment some place, but not in the Landmark District at all and certainly not on this building.

Mr. Carey said he does not know if they should be harvesting Brazilian hardwood for treatments on exterior of buildings and certainly not in the Savannah Natural Historic Landmark District. They are opposed to the IPE board, but everything else is fine with the HSF.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Merriman agreed with Mr. Howington. It does not seem to fit downtown. He has worked with IPE board and it is hard to paint or stain. However, if you treat it with oil or something to keep it from getting the silvery look as Ms. Pearson said, would be better than trying to stain or paint it.

Ms. McClain said she struggles with this, but thinks it is a wonderful design.

Mr. Merriman said if the Secretary of the Interior Standards are applied, it would have to differentiate from the original building, but at the same time be visually compatible.

Ms. Ramsay said it would have to match the design standards and the visual compatibility standards.

Ms. McClain said when she looks at this and thinks where it is located, which is across from the hotel, the design looks good, but she would like to see the picture more in color with the board. She believes it would do a lot for this location and would add more character.

Mr. Merriman explained that oil would be better on the IPE board than stain or paint.

Ms. McClain said she likes it as it is.

Ms. Ramsay said the stain or paint will cause the IPE board to turn gray or silver.

Ms. McClain stated she likes the color with the location and what she sees here, would do a lot for the area, but she would like to see more.

Ms. Simpson said she, too, struggled with this because as a Board they often talk about things being different. However, she believes it meets some of the standards and guidelines in other areas.

Mr. Johnson questioned the base of the door and being seven feet instead of six feet.

Ms. Simpson said she did not believe there was an issue with the base of the door. She can see the door being wood or aluminum.

Mr. Johnson stated there seems to be a problem with the IPE board.

Ms. Simpson said a number of the Board members have worked with the IPE board. Therefore, she would go along with their recommendation regarding the IPE board.

Mr. Merriman said the IPE board would be alright with an oil treatment instead of painting it.

Ms. Bryant said the staff only recommended painting or staining the IPE board because physically unfinished wood is not allowed.

Dr. Henry asked staff if they feel the IPE board is compatible.

Ms. Bryant answered that staff feels the IPE board is compatible because historically this space was constructed out of wood and documented in the 1916 Sanborn. She believes it is compatible as the petitioner will be constructing what the Board sees in the photo where they have storefront and wood columns.

Ms. Ramsay asked Ms. Pearson if she would consider a continuance to work with staff and prepare a more detailed color rendering in order to provide additional information to assist the Board in their decision.

Ms. Pearson asked if she asks for a continuance, would this mean that they would need to wait until next month Board meeting.

Ms. Ramsay said yes.

Ms. Pearson said she would have to confer with her client.

Mr. Jamie Doyle, owner, said they appreciate the Board's time and comments. He said in a matter of public opinion from the other folks they have shown the design to who live in the area and they have had a lot of consultation with others; although it may not be specific to the current designs, he wanted the Board to know that they are trying to introduce a new concept without being too far off. He feels this is a great way to bring back a corner in Savannah that has been gone for a really long time. The wall will be a large portion of the building will actually be color tables. It will not be a glaring wall, but will be an accent piece to their entrance and corner and what they think will revitalize the corner of Liberty

and Bull Streets.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board feels this may be visually compatible, but at this time they do not have enough information. The Board, itself, cannot vote on a continuance unless the petitioner asks for it.

Mr. Doyle asked for a continuance.

Board Action:

Continue to the meeting of April 11, 2012 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Reed Engle - Not Present

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Not Present

13. [Petition of Dorothy Rich Miles | H-12-4600-2 | 111 West Perry Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Plans and Elevations.pdf](#)

Ms. Dorothy Rich Miles was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to install a metal fire escape on the rear of the building at 111 West Perry Street. A similar stair previously existed at the rear and was removed; the request is to reinstall the stair and extend it to the top level. The stair will project 21 feet - nine inches (21'-9") from the rear of the building. It will connect to the existing fourth floor porch and extend across the facade and out toward the lane. The railing is 42 inches in height.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the metal stair at the rear of the building at 111 W. Perry Street with the condition that it be screened from view to the extent possible by installing a wooden fence at the lane to be compatible with the district.

Ms. Simpson asked if the petitioner would need to come back to the Board to install the fence.

Ms. Ward answered that it would be the Board's decision if they want the petitioner to come back before them to install the wooden fence or authorize the staff to approve the wooden fence.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Miles stated that she did not have a problem with the fence other than she has a place for three cars in the back. The fence may interfere. The neighbors have a fence. They have a private courtyard. Maybe it does not need to be a straight fence, but something that jets out and around.

Mr. Merriman asked the petitioner if she would be parking in the back.

Ms. Miles answered if she cannot have a gate here, she would not have any off-street parking.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry asked staff if what the petitioner said is desirable from their standpoint.

Ms. Ward answered that she does not see how his would interfere with parking.

Board Action:

Approval of the metal stair at the rear of the building at 111 W. Perry Street with the condition that it be screened from view to the extent possible by installing a wooden fence at the rear to be compatible with the district and resubmit to staff for approval. - PASS

Vote Results

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

14. [Petition of Billy Nelson | H-12-4602-2 | 427 Habersham Street | Fence and Arbor](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Mr. Billy Nelson was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to replace the existing brick and wood fence with a brick and wood fence and arbor in the rear of the property at 427 Habersham Street. The proposed fence is comprised of vertical wood planks between brick piers painted to match the main residence. The arbor or trellis is wood and is also painted to match the residence. The Mayor and Aldermen granted an encroachment agreement on March 8, 2012 for the fence to project further than the property line over to the sidewalk.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for the replacement fence and arbor with the following conditions:

1. Provide a brick pier adjacent to the brick residence to be consistent with the material of the main residence;
2. Provide brick wall sections between piers where gates are not present to meet the design standard;
3. The wooden trellis above the fence be fully contained within the property.

Ms. McClain asked staff if they are asking for a higher design standard.

Ms. Ward explained that staff is asking that it be considered; presently the petitioner has a wood fence that clearly does not meet the design standards and anything to the site would be an improvement over what is here now. The petitioner has attempted to address this by incorporating the brick piers with the wood sections. The staff would like for the petitioner to consider going a step further and where there is not a gate to consider the brick.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Ward if she was saying have brick sections instead of wood.

Ms. Ward answered yes, where there is not a gate, consider putting brick there. She pointed out the sections that staff was recommending that the bricks be installed.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Nelson said his preference for the fence is wood. But, if necessary he will do the brick.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah (HSF) said the staff made them aware of their recommendation. The HSF holds an easement on this property. The petitioner has built a model and he believes they can see how well the fence fits together with the wood. The HSF prefers all wood to the brick panels in the middle. He believes the panels will not tie-in as well. They agree with the staff's recommendation regarding the piers.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. McClain said she agreed with Mr. Carey’s comments about the model. At first she was in agreement with it being totally wooden, but once she saw the model, she gathered another viewpoint that the pieces that staff said are functional would be wooden and the pieces that are stationary would be brick. Therefore, she looks at the functionality of the different uses of this wall.

Ms. Ward explained that the reason the staff struggled with this was because the existing fence is wood. They questioned if it is replacement in-kind as to what is here. But, staff could not find an approval of the existing wood fence. It clearly is nonconforming with the ordinance. She was not saying that the wood fence was not approved, but it is not conforming now. Therefore, staff believes that what is proposed is an improvement over what is there now. The petitioner has incorporated bricks in the columns were they could and for the petitioner to meet the standards, they need to reconsider the brick. But if the Board believes it is in-kind with the replacement of the wood, she believes the petitioner could do it this way. However, she hopes that this would be worded in the motion.

Board Action:

Approval for the replacement fence and arbor with the condition that a brick pier be installed adjacent to the brick residence because the fence meets the preservation standards, is visually compatible and- PASS is replacing the existing wood fence with in-kind materials.

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

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

15. [Petition of Timothy Bright and Christian Sottile | H-12-4603-2 | 22 Barnard Street, 151 W. Bryan Street, and 110-150 W. St. Julian Street | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photos.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Proposed Sign Guidelines.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Elevations.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Simpson left the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

No action Taken. Continue to the Special Called Meeting of March 21, 2012 due to loss of quorum.

16. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects/ Doug Bean Signs | H-12-4605-2 | 425 East River Street | Sign](#)

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

NOTE: Upon motion of Mr. Merriman, seconded by Mr. Johnson and carried, approved that this item be reversed with the Petition of Timothy Bright and Christian Sottile | H-12-4603-2 | 22 Barnard Street, 151 W. Bryan Street and 110-150 W. St. Julian Street | Signs.

Mr. Doug Bean was present on behalf of petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a non-illuminated principal use projecting sign at 425 East River Street for the new business River Street Liquor. Additionally, the petitioner is requesting approval for a tapered metal planter, located six inches below the proposed sign. The planter will be 10 inches at the top and tapered down to six inches long at the base, it will be one foot-six inches wide and taper down to eight inches wide at the base. It is one foot-six inches tall. It features the bottle logo and will match the red-brown color scheme of the proposed sign.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Bean stated that he would be remiss if he did not say something about the planter, but he accepts the staff's recommendation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for the non-illuminated principal use projecting sign at 425 East River Street with the condition that the planter be omitted from the design. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

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

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

17. [Petition of Greenline Architecture | H-11-4408-2 | 108 West Gordon Street | 12 month extension for an addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - original application and specifications.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Plans and Elevations.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Howington recused from participating in this petition. He is an employee of Greenline Architecture.

Board Action:

Continue to the meeting of April 11, 2012 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Sidney J. Johnson

Reed Engle - Not Present

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Not Present

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

18. [Petition of Richard E. Davis | H-12-4592\(S\)-2 | 208 East Gaston St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4592\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4592\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

19. [Petition of Coastal Canvas | H-12-4593\(S\)-2 | 310 W. Broughton St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4593\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4593\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

20. [Petition of Painter Graham, Inc. | H-12-4594\(S\)-2 | 318 East Gaston St. | Cleaning and Painting](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4594\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4594\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

21. [Work Performed Without A Certificate of Appropriate \(COA\)](#)

Ms. Ward reported that work was performed on the following addresses without a Certificate of Appropriateness: **1. 205 West River Street; 2. 125 East Jones Street; 3. 51 Barnard Street; 4. 109 East Jones Street; 5. 510 East Charlton Street; 6. 5 East Broughton Street; 7. 109 West Broughton Street; 8. 305-309 Williamson Street; 9. 302 East President Street; 10. 130 West Lower Factor's Walk; 11. 307 East President Street; 12. 302 East Oglethorpe Avenue/144 Lincoln Street; and 13. 314-318 West Taylor Street / 321 Berrien Street.**

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

22. [Items Deferred to Staff](#)

Ms. Ward reported on the items deferred to staff between January 9, 2012 and March 14, 2012. Stamped plans for the following properties for building permits: **23 West Perry Street; 409-415 East Perry Street; 209 West Congress Street and 413-419 Alice Street.**

Staff conducted final site inspections for the following properties: **411 West Congress Street; 10 Whitaker Street; 313-319 West River Street; 13 West Perry Street; and 246 Broughton Street.**

Ms. Ward said a letter and an application were sent to the following property owners who failed to obtain a COA prior to execution of work. Representatives for all of properties

addresses made contact with staff about applying for a COA; however no applications have been submitted as of today's meeting: **5 West Broughton Street; 109 East Jones Street; 510 East Charlton Street and 125 East Jones Street.**

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

23. [Next Meeting - Wednesday April 11, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

24. [Spring 2012 Historic Preservation Commission Training, March 30-31 in Valdosta, Georgia](#)

Ms. Ward reported that Mr. Merriam will attend the training.

25. [Recent Historic Site and Monument Decisions](#)

Attachment: [Decision 109 MLK Mural.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Decision 437 Abercorn Street Public Art.pdf](#)

No action taken. For Information only.

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

26. [Final draft of amended HDBR Bylaws and Procedural Manual](#)

Attachment: [DRAFT PROCEDURAL MANUAL and BYLAWS-2012.pdf](#)

No action taken. The Board members will send Ms. Ward their written suggestions.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

27. [Adjourned.](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic Review Board, Ms. Ramsay adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m..

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah P. Ward

Preservation Director

SPW:mem

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