



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
April 14, 2014 1:00 p.m.  
Meeting Minutes

**APRIL 14, 2014 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING (RESCHEDULED  
FROM APRIL 9, 2014)**

**HDRB Members Present:** Keith Howington, Chair  
Ebony Simpson, Vice Chair  
Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian  
Reed Engle  
Dr. Nicholas Henry  
Stephen Merriman, Jr.  
Linda Ramsay  
Marjorie Weibe-Reed  
Robin Williams, Ph.D

**MPC Staff Present:** Tom Thomson, Executive Director  
Ellen Harris, Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation  
Leah G. Michalak, Historic Preservation Planner  
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

1. [Order](#)

**Chair Howington** called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. He outlined the purpose and role of the Historic District Board of Review. Mr. Howington apologized to the public that the April 9, 2014 meeting was rescheduled due to lack of a quorum. There are three seats vacant on the Historic District Board of Review. City Council is working on this. Hopefully, by the meeting in May the three seats will be filled.

**Mr. Howington** explained that they have an extensive agenda today. He laid out the ground rules for handling the agenda. The petitioner will have 15 minutes to give his/her comments and the public will have 15 minutes to make their comments.

## II. SIGN POSTING

## III. CONSENT AGENDA

### 2. Petition of John Deering, Greenline Architecture | 14-000675-COA | 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue | New Construction Part II: Design Details

- Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Application - 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue Lane 14-000675-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Aerial - Facing South.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Mass Model.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs and Drawings.pdf](#)

#### **Board Action:**

Approval for New Construction: Part II, Design  
Details of the proposed two-story carriage house at  
502 East Oglethorpe Avenue as requested because - PASS  
the proposal is visually compatible and meets the  
design standards.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: Linda Ramsay  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Abstain  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye  
Linda Ramsay - Aye  
Marjorie W Reed - Aye  
Ebony Simpson - Aye  
Robin Williams - Aye

### 3. Petition of Flint North, Speedi Sign | 14-001178-COA | 118 Bull Street | Signs

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

#### **Board Action:**

Approval to install one projecting principal use  
sign and one fascia sign at 118 Bull Street because - PASS  
the signs are visually compatible and meet the  
design standards.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Linda Ramsay	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

4. [Petition of Signs for Minds | 14-001179-COA | 107 West Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval to install one projecting principal use sign at 107 West Broughton Street with the condition that the existing sign bracket be taken down, and with the agreed condition with the petitioner to move the sign to the right of its proposed location so that the sign will be mounted between the window trim and pilaster. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

5. [Petition of Signs for Minds | 14-001180-COA | 17 West Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval to install one projecting principal use sign at 17 West Broughton Street because the sign is visually compatible and meets the design - PASS

standards.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

6. [Petition of Natalie Aiken for Hansen Architects | 14-001184-COA | 309 East Gaston Street | Addition, Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

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

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

**Board Action:**

Approval of the proposed alterations to 309 East Gaston Street because the project meets the preservation and design standards and is visually compatible, provided that the following is submitted to staff for review and approval:

- Provide additional information to Staff regarding the paint removal treatment from the brick;
- Ensure that Preservation Brief 2: Repointing Mortar Joints is followed, including conducting a mortar analysis and providing to - PASS staff. Install a four foot by four foot test patch of the repointing prior to repointing the remainder of the building;
- On the north façade, ensure that the new door beneath the front stairs is inset at least three inches from the façade and provide a door specification;
- Ensure that the height of the railing does not exceed 36”.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: Linda Ramsay  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Abstain  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye  
Linda Ramsay - Aye  
Marjorie W Reed - Aye  
Ebony Simpson - Aye  
Robin Williams - Aye

7. [Petition of Jennifer Deacon AIA, Dawson Architects | 14-001185-COA | 4 East Jones Street | Sign](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approval of the installation of a projecting principal use sign at 4 East Jones Street because the sign is visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: Linda Ramsay  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Abstain  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye  
Linda Ramsay - Aye  
Marjorie W Reed - Abstain  
Ebony Simpson - Aye  
Robin Williams - Aye

8. [Petition of AA Graphics LLC | 14-001196-COA | 15 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Application-15 MLK Jr. Blvd..pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photos, Drawings, and Specifications.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval of the Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd

principal use fascia sign, one projecting sign on West Bryan Street, and three supplemental identification signs on Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd, - PASS with the condition that the petitioner works with staff to meet the size requirement for the fascia sign on the north elevation [Sign #8].

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

9. [Petition of Bridget Lidy for the City of Savannah | 14-001290-COA | Wayfinding Signage Master Plan](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Wayfinding Bid Package.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Wayfinding Signage Program.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 2 East Bay Street 14-001290-COA.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval of the Wayfinding Signage Master Plan because the overall proposal meets the visual compatibility criteria and sign standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

**IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

10. [Adopt April 9, 2014 Agenda](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the adoption of the April 14, 2014 agenda. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

**V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

11. [Approve Minutes of March 12, 2014](#)

Attachment: [03-12-2014 Minutes.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the Meeting Minutes of March 12, 2014. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

## VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

### 12. [Petition of Tracy Harvey | 13-005761-COA | 612 Price Street | Alteration](#)

#### **Board Action:**

Continue the petition to the June 11, 2014 HDBR meeting. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Ebony Simpson

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

## VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

### 13. [Petition of Hoffman Engineering Group, Inc. | 14-000181-COA | 522 East Gaston Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Application - 522 East Gaston Street 14-000181-COA.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Part II Photographs and Specifications.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Existing Fence Photographs.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

**Mr. Tom Hoffman** was present on behalf of the petitioner.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details for a duplex with attached carriage houses to be located on the vacant property at 522 East Gaston Street. The Board approved Part I, Height and Mass for this project at the March 12, 2014 meeting with the condition that the applicant provide additional voids on the west façade of the one-story portion of the main building to meet the "distance between windows" standard. At the meeting, the Board discussed that this condition may not be necessary based on the precedent set by the surrounding contributing buildings with a similar wide side yard. The petitioner has



provided photographs of three surrounding contributing buildings with similar sized yards and similar window spacing. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the proposed window spacing on the west façade of the one-story portion of the main building.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details for a duplex with a carriage house to be located on the vacant property at 522 East Gaston Street with the following condition to be submitted to staff for final review and approval.

1. Ensure that the spacing between the balusters on the front stoop railings does not exceed four inches.
2. Revise the stoop column material to wood to meet the standard.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Hoffman** said that they agree with the staff's recommendation. They will change the stoop column to wood. The spacing between the balusters on the front railings will be four inches.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation** said they have a few minor comments. The HSF suggested that consideration be given to sills below the casement windows. They know that the architecture is a little more contemporary, but they believe they need to connect a little more with what is surrounding the street. Ms. Meunier said they believe that the design is contemporary enough for sills to be considered which will add to the design.

**Ms. Meunier** said she is a little confused about the stairs. She understands that the columns will be wood and the base of the stoop and walls will be stucco. It says that the stair treads and risers are wood; however, the detail does not appear to be evident. Therefore, they are concerned about how this is happening. Where is the stucco and where is the wood? How will this relationship take place? Ms. Meunier said the HSF suggests that foundation piers be added in the stucco and in the details to bring it more to a traditional concept even though it is a very contemporary design.

**Mr. Howington** invited Mr. Hoffman to respond to the public comments.

**Mr. Hoffman** explained that they feel the design they have for the windows adequately covers this. He said that CMU will be used and stucco finish. The parapet will be wood stringers off of the stucco.

**Mr. Engle** said it appears that there is a drip cap over the first floor windows. But, there is not a drip cap over the second floor windows.

**Mr. Hoffman** said drip caps are on the second floor windows.

**Mr. Engle** said that the Board does not have the details of the windows.

**Ms. Michalak** said the details were in the packet. Somehow they were omitted when sent

to the Board. She showed the Board this section on the screen.

**Mr. Engle** said a sill is shown.

**Mr. Howington** said it appears from this drawing that there is an apron below, but not a sill underneath the window. A drip cap is shown.

**Mr. Hoffman** explained that the window has a sill.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Merriman** said that he does not recall seeing many sills with an apron underneath the sill. Usually, the aprons are on the inside.

**Mr. Howington** stated that on wood sided houses there is usually no apron, but just an outside sill.

**Mr. Merriman** said the treads and risers need to be the same material; not one stone and the other wood.

**Mr. Howington** said the petitioner said the risers and treads are wood. The base of the building will be stucco.

**Ms. Ramsay** said this is something that could be worked out with staff.

### **Board Action:**

Approve the petition for New Construction: Part II, Design Details for a duplex with a carriage house to be located on the vacant property at 522 East Gaston Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval.

1. Ensure that the spacing between the balusters on the front stoop railings does not exceed 4 inches. - PASS
2. Revise the stoop column material to wood to meet the standard.
3. Restudy the proposed front stoop stair materials and design.

### **Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye

Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

14. [Petition of Lott + Barber | 14-000634-COA | 540 Selma Street | New Construction Part I Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff recommendation.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Summittal Packet- Project Description.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Aerial Map 000634.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Choctaw Ward.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [O'Neil Ward.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Walton Ward.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Drawings- 1.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Drawings 2.pdf](#)

**Mr. Forrest Lott** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for Part I: Height and Mass of a five story multi-family residential housing complex with parking below. There will be one story of parking underground, one story of parking on the first floor, with retail at the street level, and four stories of residences above. The total project size is 232,55 gross square feet with a ground floor footprint of 43,416 square feet.

Variances are requested from the following standards:

1. 75% lot coverage standard (89% is proposed); and
2. Structured parking setback.

**Ms. Harris** said that this project was reviewed by the Board on March 12, 2014 and was continued to allow the petitioner to restudy the following:

1. Reduce the height to be visually compatible;
2. Reduce the massing and scale to be more visually compatible;
3. Increase the fenestration on the ground floor of all facades except Selma Street, and on all the north façade (facing Purse Street);
4. Restudy the footprint in order to meet the 75% lot coverage equipment;
5. Ensure that the curb cut does not exceed 20 feet in width;
6. Redesign the bay pattern to meet the standard of not less than 15 feet nor more than 20 feet in width;
7. Along Selma Street, where paired windows in a single column are utilized, align the windows and doors vertically;
8. Redesign the "bonus story" (if HDBR finds visually compatible) to meet the standard which requires the mechanical and access structure to be located within the additional story;
9. Increase the linear footage ground floor active uses along Selma Street (if the HDBR finds the bonus story is visually compatible); and
10. Increase the number of primary entrances to seven.

**Ms. Harris** stated that additionally, the Board continued the variance requests for the access structure to not be contained within the additional (bonus) story; the structured

parking setback; and 14% lot coverage variance from the 75% lot coverage standard (89% is proposed) until the other concerns related to height and mass are resolved.

**Ms. Harris** stated that the petitioner has revised the design as follows:

1. The window spacing along Selma Street has been revised to ensure that the windows align vertically and the windows are spaced more evenly;
2. The awning structure above the second floor pool courtyard has been eliminated and a more traditional railing is proposed;
3. Significant cornices have been added to the proud bays of the building;
4. The number of primary entrances along Selma Street has been increased from five to seven (or nine, if the lobbies are included); and
5. The curb cut at Cohen Street has been reduced to 20 feet wide.

**Ms. Harris** stated that as they know, this project is located outside the National Historic Landmark District, but within the local Historic District. She reported that staff recommends continuance of Part I, Height and Mass for the petitioner to restudy the following:

1. Reduce the height to be more visually compatible. Five stories is not visually compatible on the entire building;
2. Reduce the massing and scale to be more visually compatible;
3. Reduce the steepness and drop from five story to one story to be visually compatible in the pool area;
4. Increase the fenestration on the ground floor façade except for Selma Street, and on all floors on the north façade;
5. Restudy the footprint in order to meet the 75% lot coverage;
6. Redesign the bay pattern to meet the standard of not less than 15 feet nor more than 20 feet.

**Ms. Harris** also reported that staff recommends approval of the structured parking variance; but continuance of the variance requesting 14% lot coverage variance from the 75% lot coverage standard (89% is proposed) until the other concerns related to height and mass are resolved.

**Dr. Henry** asked staff to explain the difference between the 100% and the 75% related to this case. This is a residential complex.

**Ms. Harris** explained that this property is currently zoned B-C which allows 100% lot coverage. But the use the petitioner is proposing is not allowed in the B-C district. Therefore, the petitioner is requesting to rezone the property to R-B-C-1. The R-B-C-1 district that allows this use only has 75% lot coverage. Consequently, they have to consider the property as if it is already rezoned. Ms. Harris said she believes rezoning the property has been recommended for approval by the MPC. But, she does not believe that it has officially been approved by City Council. However, the indication is that City Council will approve the rezoning. Therefore, this Board needs to take into consideration what it will be rezoned to and not what it is currently zoned.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Lott** stated that this is obviously a big and important project for the City of Savannah. He said that they appreciate the diligence that the staff has shown in working with this

project. However, this project is different than what the Board normally looks at. The site is in a different configuration. It is outside the Oglethorpe Plan; it is on a diagonal street; it is a large footprint; it is located in one of the edge districts that has been talked about since Chadbourn came to town. These districts were identified as those areas of opportunity where they could do projects. They are a little different than the ones that might be allowed around the squares on the trust, tithing and bounding lots. This is a high density and a large project and is in an area where large projects are anticipated in the future with the expansion of what is being considered across the street. The buildings that they will be looking at are anticipated to be five stories with the same opportunities for bonus story that this project has.

**Mr. Lott** said staff has already pointed out that the area is significantly altered from its long time historic uses over the past. This was done by the railroad. It is located in one of the edge districts since Chadbourn first came to town. These districts were identified as those areas of opportunity where they could do projects, but they were a little different than those that might be allowed around the squares on our Trust, Tithing and boundary lots. This is a high density project; it is a large project and is in a location where large projects are anticipated in the future with the expansion of downtown and what is being considered right across the street. The buildings that they will be looking at are currently anticipated to be five stories with the same opportunities for bonus stories such as this project.

**Mr. Lott** stated the site is unusual and has a long frontage on Selma Street. It is longer than a typical city block. They have approached the project by not looking at this as a building, but as a block long development. They have tried to use the available tools of the ordinance to address this. He said they appreciate the work that they have been able to accomplish in changing this and working with staff. He believes they are in a really good position to talk about some of the specifics that staff has brought up. In the interest of time, he will not talk about the things that the staff and they agree on.

**Mr. Lott** said one of the issues is the rhythm of solids-to-voids in the front façade. This primarily relates to what is shown on the drawing as the upper side. As noted, Purse Street is the public right-of-way that dead-ends and serves as access to an old strip of parking that the Board of Education uses. It is not highly public and he believes that staff has already recognized this and recommended a setback variance for the parking use that will be here. But, the ordinance talks about those windows on the street fronting façade. A lot of the comments that they received from staff seem to look at the building as though every side of the building is a public façade fronting a street. Mr. Lott said he believes that at least on the ground floor that some of those facades ought to be considered in the same way they consider a lane. They do not abut public right-of-way. They essentially face the back yards of their neighboring uses. Their conversations with the neighbors who will be here suggest that they would rather see a solid wall buffered by some landscaping than windows that look into the parking with headlight issues and so forth. Their preference would be to articulate that façade with recessed openings similar to what Central of Georgia railroad shops have done and not have the openings there. The code issue is here; but they can put in fake windows and openings; put louvers in those openings or put in recesses.

**Mr. Lott** said he believes that putting a solid wall here, buffered by landscaping, is the neighbors' preference. If the Board looks at the upper stories of the building, it has a lot of windows. If the Board does not think this is satisfactory, they will certainly be glad to talk

about this. The second issue that they are totally not in agreement with is the rhythm of structures on the street. This particular language talks mostly to the openings between buildings. If the Board looks at the site plan, there is an opening within the Frogtown development on either side of that small historic structure there. The opening between them and the adjacent Frogtown building is larger. Therefore, in looking at the open space between buildings, he feels they have done a good job and they probably do comply with that. Mr. Lott said what is left is the overall massing and scale of the building. The building does one thing that he believes is great for Savannah. It takes the parking and does something with it other than creating an asphalt surface lot, which would require that it be screened by a vegetative buffer or building or have an elevated parking deck. The density and use are similar to One West Victory Drive. He knows that they all have driven by this building and there is structured parking adjacent to four stories of residential use. Now, what they have done is to depress one layer of parking; kept one as a base story and put four stories, just as that other project, above it. If they think in terms of massing that this is a four-story apartment building sitting on a one-story base, you get some different viewpoints on it. He said regarding the lot coverage, if they consider the massing above the base where the pool deck is at the first level of parking, their coverage for the mass of the building that goes up is 75%; it is exactly 75.8%. Therefore, their overall massing lot coverage is where it would be and it is the fact that they have placed the parking under the building that is creating that statistical anomaly of the 89%. Therefore, in terms of its impact on the height and mass, their coverage is probably where it should be, which is right at 75%.

**Mr. Lott** said when they start looking at the distances, bays that are 15 or 20 feet wide, the Design Manual talks about the typical 60 foot wide lot working in those modules; he wonders how you meet that and he started looking through his Historic Savannah Foundation book and looking at different buildings. When he goes through the statistical criteria that affects the projects, especially the large projects, he finds that no one is capable of designing a building that meets every statistical requirement within these ordinances. He said he asked the staff to find the numbers that affect this and they end up with bays or grouping of windows with columns or pilaster of 15 or 20 and then have a 60 foot primary module that you build in 15, 20 or 30 foot wide elements and you are left with a lot of numbers.

**Mr. Lott** said he thinks that the courtyard that is here and a similar setback on the backside of the building, both of these really serve as one of the additional elements that they can really address the massing of a building. Staff has said that they have not chosen this standard. He said that they have probably done a poor job of indicating which one they met. He explained that they probably checked two boxes and stopped. Maybe this was their error, but the setback standard says that if they are a minimum of 24 feet wide and a minimum of 8 feet deep and have windows on the flanking walls, that this is one of the tools that they can use to address the massing on the buildings. He said that they do this twice on the second floor. Another tool that is available to adjust the mass of a building is to have a change in the roofline and they have done this at two locations.

**Mr. Howington** informed Mr. Lott that it would be helpful if he would show the elevations to the Board as he makes his presentation.

**Mr. Lott** [pointing to an elevation], said that the brown, or darker module, are all 30 feet wide. This reflects the rhythm of lot sizes that they have throughout the district. They have tried to treat these as a series of townhouses; proportionate elements that walk down the

street. He believes that the setback is allowed under the way the tool is described is that it can have the first story come out. This is similar to the Garden Apartments that are across the street; the DeRenne Apartments have that sort of formal gauge that comes forth. This is a residential block and the reasons the courtyards exist are to provide light and air to the residential occupants that are behind. He said he believes that they have worked hard to try to address a lot of the comments they heard at the first meeting. He believes also that the lot area of coverage should be considered from its history and impact on the overall massing of the building. Lastly, he would say that the entire reason they are pursuing the R-B-C district is a student housing project owned or operated by an educational institution can have 100% lot coverage in a B-C district. Therefore, if they were Georgia Southern, Savannah State, Armstrong or SCAD they would be allowed 100% lot coverage. However, since they are not owned by an educational institutional [now more and more student housing is privately developed], the zoning language does not give them that option. Consequently, this is why they selected the R-B-C zoning classification and this is how the 75% lot coverage comes up. As he has said, he believes this area is looked at as opportunities for development; is looked at has an area that has 100% lot coverage by norm and is allowed. This is an area where higher buildings are anticipated.

**Mr. Noble Boykin** said at the last meeting he probably said everything that he needs to say, but today he just wanted to reiterate that when they bought this property, they looked at an opportunity for the property to be developed as a larger development. They felt this was a perfect spot because it is not in the Landmark District, but near the Landmark District as is also in what the MPC has identified as a downtown expansion area. One of the criteria is the need for more density to be in this area; but, yet, they don't want to necessarily put it in Landmark District where you would have a historic house with a big structure right next to it. Mr. Boykin said this area is where you could commute in, walk-in, and have bicycles here. Therefore, they felt this was a perfect spot where there could be more density. He said since he was here at the last meeting, he has looked into more of the history of this area. Until just a few years ago, this was an unlimited height and map area. Then when the Height Map came in, there were basically four stories in a big swamp area. Selma Street is right across the street from I-16; it has a chain link fence and it has no concrete on it. This street is behind the En-Mark that is on MLK Jr. Boulevard. This is an area that is crying out to be repopulated. He believes that this entire area was decimated improperly years ago when they wiped out the entire worker housing.

**Mr. Merriman** asked, for clarification, if Mr. Lott said that if they were an institution of higher learning rather than a developer that they would not have to rezone the property and that they would be entitled to 100% lot coverage? Because they are a developer, this puts them in the 75% lot coverage bracket.

**Mr. Lott** answered yes. If they read the ordinance definition of student housing it is restricted to institutional owed. But if you strike owned by a college out of that definition, they would be entitled under the zoning ordinance to 100% lot coverage in the B-C district and they would not be seeking a variance or the zoning change.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they believe that progress that has been made in the design and the cornices help the massing and height. They feel that the window spacing that they brought up at the last meeting has been addressed. The implication of the differentiation with materials and colors that they are

getting, they realize that they are not in Part II yet, but it gives them a better feel for the massing. Ms. Meunier said overall they agree with the staff's general comments about the mass and scale being not compatible and inappropriate. Ultimately, they believe that there is a lot more studying and work that needs to go into this to get it to a point where the massing would work. Mr. Lott made a comment that this being multiple buildings and possibly a block, they are certainly receptive to this idea, but think it would require a little more variation, some of the facades and at least the heights of the different phases that they are looking at with a little more variation in the roofline which might help it to look more like a block than one building spanning the entire street.

**Ms. Meunier** said another way to possibly address the massing [they certainly realize and understand the capabilities and rules that need to be involved in this project that are driving how it is being built], but they believe that there are some areas that the footprint and the massing could be broken up; particularly, at the stair tower on this end that has the butterfly roof. They understand that the stair tower does not go all the way to the back of the building and that some open space is here. Therefore, they suggest that maybe the petitioner consider that this may be an option to consider where they could open up this space and have outdoor stairs which would create pedestrian access to Purse Street. She said that this would break up some of the footprints of the large massing that they are looking at. Ms. Meunier said there are lots of ways to look at this and consider it. Therefore, they believe at this point that more options need to be looked at because the massing and scale are a lot more than they think is appropriate.

**Mr. Howington** invited the petitioner to respond to the public comments.

**Mr. Lott** said he believes that they have tried, as it has been recognized, to look at this as a block long building and address it. He believes it has been acknowledged that the building is what it needs to be for its use. He understands the Review Board's guidelines are focused on the exterior of the buildings' view from the public way. But, no one builds buildings that do not have an interior use. This interior use is balanced for the viability of the project. As he has said, one floor of its massing is the result of doing something that they think is good. They will look at material expression and altering the stair tower and how it is treated. It is what it is and is four stories of student housing on top of one above ground layer of parking and one below ground layer of parking. As has been mentioned, it is located on a rather unique piece of property. They believe that it is an opportunity that was envisioned for these kinds of districts where they can do the things that they cannot do in other districts.

**Mr. Howington** commented on the variation of the roofline. Even if the extra story is allowed some of the other stories are popping up even higher.

**Mr. Lott** stated that this has been discussed numerous times. They did some preliminary sketching on it. Their concern is that if you don't like five stories, you do not like six or seven. Is this the right answer? They have worked hard to break the massing up of the courtyard. If you look at each building in terms on either side of the courtyard, then you get a different view of that. If this was a city block and it was developed to the density incrementally over time nobody would have any objections to it. But, he believes because it is a single project coming on a single lot and to do this much at once, it's a big building. The scale and massing and how it is treated, is not too dissimilar from how the 300 foot long, 90 foot deep lots grew up over time.



**Ms. Ramsay** stated that some of the problem could be resolved by having two layers of underground parking instead of just one underground layer.

**Mr. Lott** said they looked at this and also looked at the soil testing and the total challenges are they cannot get the access ramps underground or can't they alter their grade beyond the perimeter of the building. He said given that the area was zoned for four plus one, they met the requirements. This was the best balance for the project and they thought it was compatible.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** said on one hand reference is made to the project being outside the Savannah Oglethorpe Planned Area and on the other hand references are made to the characteristics to something within that plan. He stated that he believes the site should be celebrated as something unique in the same way the petitioner addressed the hotel complex on General McIntosh because of the unique curbing site. He said the 480 feet ought not to be discouraged by the fact that this is a unique opportunity. As a matter of fact, west of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard some of the old railroad sheds are as much as 800 feet long. Therefore, he believes that aspect of the project should not be discouraged, but actually celebrated. He said for him the problem is that there is too much breaking up and actually the horizontal linear frontage on Selma Street that ideally there would be some kind of continuity that is celebrated even if it is just the ground level. There are all sorts of devices here that are striving so hard to break it up. Dr. Williams said reference was made to the One West Victory project, which to him is the most disjointed aesthetically unresolved project that he has seen in Savannah in a long time with five or six different building materials; changes of expressions; and not even an attempt to match new brick with old brick nor patterns. He said, therefore, the idea that the darker brown elements are referencing 30 foot wide lots to him is contradicting an opportunity on this site which is to celebrate the industrial railroad heritage that starts at Savannah Station at the end of the street. He believes that there is a missed opportunity and for him the height and zoning coverage are smaller issues. Dr. Williams said to him this is a special opportunity. Therefore, he believes that through the design, height and maybe some roofline variations are called for, but he believes that the place where this begins to be like One West Victory is around the rear elevation. It is discontinuous and does not seem to be pulled together. It lacks cornices; has a different rhythm; space is between the vertical elements all through the site. Dr. Williams said he believes that there are some overall massing issues that are incoherent here.

**Mr. Howington** stated that some of this could be cleaned up in the materials.

**Dr. Williams** said that he understood that the materials and the color pallet are in Part II. Therefore, he was trying to keep away from that point; and this is why he made the point that the rhythm, massing, lack of cornices of this corner are so different than the rest of the building. He believes that the horizontality of this project has not changed. He said that HSF suggested perhaps opening up one of the entranceways as a clear way through. If they had a situation such as the Jepson where a building bridge is over the site, does this count as lot coverage?

**Mr. Howington** answered yes.

**Mr. Engle** said he agrees with Dr. Williams. When he looks at page 6, he almost thinks that he is looking at Bay Street. Instead of getting into the massing of Bay Street, the

building is five stories tall and is differentiated only by material. But, here they are getting into "in and out" and it looks just like a bad hotel. All of the hotels until recently used the same techniques. Just as Dr. Williams has stated, the Board worked with the developer to get a brilliant industrial character of that hotel. Mr. Engle said he does not know why the Board is treating this project differently. It should be going for an industrial character. It is not a hotel. However, he believes that the recess criteria, even though giving an extra floor, is not working for the design, but working against the advantage of the design.

**Mr. Engle** said his second point is, yes schools can go to 100% coverage but schools have tons of open space. However, this project wants to go bigger and it is taking away from open space. Therefore, they will not have open space because they will have 75% lot coverage. This is a big issue with mass also because where is the public space for all these people?

**Mr. Merriman** said that Dr. Williams is correct in his assessment of One West Victory; it is a hodgepodge.

**Mr. Howington** reminded the Board that they are only talking about the project that is before them today.

**Mr. Merriman** stated that the fact that there are so many different colors with this building, it really keeps it from being what Ms. Ramsay called a few weeks ago "the brick box" with the design that they see on the hotel on the corner of MLK and Oglethorpe Avenue. If the Board does not like the fact that it is chopped up, he can go along with that, but the fact that it does look different and it is not a brick box is nice. At the last meeting he thought it was too big, but the fact that these people are being held hostage by a word game with the ordinance. Why can schools get 100% lot coverage, but these people cannot? Something is wrong with this. Mr. Merriman said he wants to see that the petitioner gets the recommendation for the variance; this is only right. It was said about wanting a public space for the people who will live here, but they will have the entire downtown area for public space. They can go to one of the squares. The developer is not required to provide a public space for the people. The petitioner should be able to get the same thing that somebody else is given.

**Mr. Howington** said that his only comment about the "ins and outs," is that the petitioner was only trying to adhere to the ordinance. He also feels that on the hotel across from the SCAD museum, which has "ins and outs" is that the materials wrap around and it still feels like one large mass even if some of that recess happens.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes that the Embassy Suites project works in that the ground floor has a very large scale foot print and wraps around pretty evenly all the way, including across the front area where it drops down to one story. He said even where they have the one story, the developer has chosen, successfully, the fenestration pattern and framing devices. There are a lot of efforts to break things up even on the ground floor.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes there are opportunities to find a balance. He also thinks the pedestrian stairs belong here especially with seven retail spaces with the potential on the elevated sidewalk. Dr. Williams said he believes this is a unique situation for Savannah. He said he also believes that the "ins and outs" will take away from this experience. He believes this is a great opportunity to work with the brick wall that exists and have a linear space. Maybe the recesses can happen above the ground floor like they do on the hotels. Dr. Williams said he believes there are some opportunities here to gain horizontal

coherence and tie it together.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** said initially she did not dislike what she saw. She likes the variations of setbacks, color and texture and believes it is modern enough for this location.

**Mr. Howington** said it is at the discretion of the petitioner to ask for a continuance.

**Mr. Lott** stated that Dr. Williams has expressed some of the same challenges that they have when they work on a large mass building with guidelines that were created out of studying a finely grained urban fabric. They say all of this is good and they like all of this, then when they want to apply it on something that is over a block long, then it is said that it is not so good. The articulation that the Board sees up there, some like it, while some do not like it is a direct result out of trying to adhere to the numerical requirements that exist in the ordinance. Nowhere in the ordinance does it say what Dr. Williams has said that a special site like this might benefit from a more industrial scale approach. Mr. Lott said they like it as a sort of design expression such as the Georgia Railroad Shop. It is very historic and they use large structural bays and are not "in and out" nor "up and down" and do not do a lot of the things of which they are talking. They have simplicity and other sorts of things that come to his mind are the 19th Century textile mills. They are this size; they are of this height; but they will not meet the current guidelines. He said in talking with the owner where they are, this is the project; the parking is as is and this is what works. When they start talking about them giving them another floor here; taking away over there is a significant challenge to the project. He realizes that the Review Board does not deal with the building code, but it gets to a certain height and the building code completely changes the type of construction that they can do in more than a four-story area. The general dialogue of being able to express something that might be a little more agreeable, industrial or not being constrained by a lot of the nuances within the ordinance, they would be happy to continue to explore, but going higher and some of the fundamental changes to the height and mass, he asks the Review Board to consider the mass of the building. It is at 75% and is only the parking podium that is beyond the 75%. Therefore, if they built something there that does not provide parking, the mass would be fine.

**Mr. Lott** said they would be happy to continue the application one more time if they have some latitude for some of the criteria that have been strictly adhered to. He said they would like to continue the petition in order to refine this overall height and this mass. If they move forward they will need the variance lot coverage as recommended. He agrees that this should not set a precedent because of the parking or with the building above it. Mr. Lott said he also agrees that this Board should be looking at the percentage of lot area coverage as it impacts visual compatibility within the district. His argument was that once you get above the first floor, they are 75% and they think that is a visually compatible mass; because it is podium construction with sticks over concrete, the way it has to be built is the way it has to be built. They would like to see the opportunity to see the project continue to move forward. If they cannot find that 75% above podium level as a mass is visually compatible and they think that it is an incompatible mass, tell them now. If they have an opportunity in continuing the design, then they are happy to continue all of it to allow the Board the chance to come back and see the drawings. Mr. Lott said they understand why this is important, but if they go through the time and effort and the Review Board goes through the time and effort to look at another redesign, and now they hear that the lot coverage comes down, then they all would have wasted a lot of time. What they want is to understand where the basic geometry of the upper story massing above the parking podium

is something that they can continue to work on to adjust as they have talked about to make it visually compatible given the mass that it is.

**Mr. Lott** said if the Board is completely against any area of coverage whether it's 89%, 75% or 100%, it would be helpful to know that.

**Mr. Howington** informed Mr. Lott that the Review Board appears to be split. He believes it has to do with the visual compatibility. He knows that the lot coverage is a sticky issue; but he sees this as a unique property where it used to be 100%, but now it is changing to 75%. Therefore, he believes it is a very unique property and situation.

**Mr. Boykin** stated they own the property and if the petitioner's project is not approved, they will still own the property. He stated as he understands it presently, they have 100% lot coverage under the existing zoning. The petitioner needs it to be rezoned for the purpose to have student housing. Mr. Boykin said, however, as the owners, they do not necessarily need it to be rezoned. They can keep the 100% lot coverage and possibly build a "Red Roof Inn." He said his question is, that with the downtown expansion plan that will be forthcoming in approximately one year, he believes that Mr. Thomson said at the last meeting that it will be 100% lot coverage at that time as well. Is this right?

**Mr. Howington** explained that he does not recall what was said and he would caution this as the Review Board can only look at what is in front of them today.

**Board Action:**

**Continue** the petition for New Construction, Part 1: Height and Mass, for the petitioner to restudy the height and mass; and continue the variance request for the structured parking setback; and the variance requests for the 14% lot coverage variance from the 75% lot coverage standard (89% is proposed) until the other concerns related to height and mass are resolved. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: Robin Williams  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Abstain  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye  
Linda Ramsay - Aye  
Marjorie W Reed - Aye  
Ebony Simpson - Aye  
Robin Williams - Aye

Alterations

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Historic Photographs.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Application, Photographs, Drawings, and Specs.pdf](#)

**Mr. Patrick Phelps** was present on behalf of the petitioner.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations to the commercial building located at 25 East Broughton Street. The petition was continued at the March 12, 2014 HDBR meeting in order for the petitioner to consider:

1. Consider retaining the existing door opening and recess proposed to be removed on the Drayton Street façade in order to maintain a higher level of solids-to-voids on this façade.
2. Consider using a smaller ceramic tile on the storefront base or consider a different material.
3. Redesign the two, double-door Broughton Street entrances to be recessed from the remainder of the storefront.
4. Reconsider removing portions of the existing canopy.
5. Relocate the storefront closer to the outside face of the proposed stucco columns.

**Ms. Michalak** said the petitioner has addressed all of the above items. The remainder of the property has stayed the same as previously proposed.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that a COA was approved by the Board on December 11, 2013 to remove the non-historic concrete panel facade, stucco façade, tile façade, and metal canopy for this property. She said also that a COA was approved by staff on November 25, 2013 for exploratory demolition on the stucco façade. Neither of these projects have been initiated to date and this proposal indicates that the scope of the work has changed and the non-historic façade will not be removed, but altered instead.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for alterations to the commercial building located at 25 East Broughton Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the design standards.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Phelps** said he understands that this item was on the Consent Agenda, but was pulled by a Board member. He will answer that Board member's question now, assuming that this is the only issue.

**Mr. Howington** stated that Mr. Phelps was correct as this item was pulled from the Consent Agenda and placed on the Regular Agenda.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Savannah Historic Foundation (HSF)** said they are pleased that the canopy was kept; they prefer the revised design.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** stated that he had this pulled off the Consent Agenda as he felt it was a big project. There were several large projects on the Consent Agenda. Since the Board asked for this project to come back to the Board, he asked that it be pulled. Mr. Engle thanked the petitioner for listening to the Board's comments and stated that the petitioner has done a good job.

#### **Board Action:**

Approval for alterations to the commercial building located at 25 East Broughton Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the design standards. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

### **16. Petition of Jeff Cramer | 14-000693-COA | 505 East Congress Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass**

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 505 East Congress Street 14-000693-COA.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

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

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

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

**Mr. Jeff Cramer** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 2 ½-story detached residence on the vacant property located at 505 East Congress Street.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 2 ½ story detached residence on the vacant property located at 505 East Congress Street with the following condition to be submitted to the Board for review with Part II, Design Details.

1. Staff recommends revising the paired window in the gable peak on the rear façade; the window arrangement appears crowded.

### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Cramer** came forward and stated that Ms. Michalak has explained his petition well. He said he understood the staff's comment about the crowded windows on the rear façade. Mr. Cramer said he believes he can go to a single window from a double window. A bedroom is up here and he definitely would like to have some light in there. He entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Howington** clarified that Mr. Cramer is in agreement of putting a single window on the third floor.

**Mr. Engle** said on the dormer he sees no sills, no heads, and no frames. Are they just left out in the detailing?

**Mr. Cramer** explained that he has a band running above it that is a little different. However, he sees what Mr. Engle is saying. He said that he could probably lower the windows on the sides and he will show this in Part II.

**Mr. Engle** said the lower sash appears to be sitting on the belt-course with no sill.

**Mr. Cramer** said they were struggling to get the 2 ½ story workable bedrooms up in the roof. But, they will restudy it and do something else.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Cramer, what is the inspiration for the dormer? He does not believe that he has seen anything like this.

**Mr. Cramer** explained that he had to have a dormer up there for the stair to come up to the 2 ½ story. He has seen some like this, but he will have to go and look for them.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said their comments are mostly to the dormers also. They believe the dormer is a little heavy for the roof. Therefore, they suggest that instead having multiple smaller dormers as opposed to one big dormer, possibly two or maybe even three dormers that they typically see with a single window. Based on the floor plan, on the east side a stair is here which might make it not possible, but it is not as easily viewed. Ms. Meunier said, therefore, they would be more concerned with the larger dormer that faces Price Street, potentially resyudying this and do smaller dormers.

**Ms. Meunier** said that when the HSF's Architecture Review Committee was reviewing this, the porch that wraps around onto Price Street encroaches four feet onto the sidewalk

thereby reducing the size of the sidewalk. She said they thought this was a little extreme; therefore, they thought that based on the simplicity of some of the rest of the houses that they are looking at on this block that maybe the porch could just be limited to the front and not actually wrap around.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Cramer if he wished to respond to the public comments.

**Mr. Cramer** said he has done a scheme of three dormers on the side. He said regarding the comment about the porch encroaching four feet onto the sidewalk on the Price Street side, a set of steps sticks put next to the sidewalk four feet. This is the same amount that he is trying to stick out and it just kind of blends in with the continuous wall. Mr. Cramer said if you look down the street there are big trees and other things on the sidewalk. Encroachments are everywhere here.

**Dr. Williams** said he prefers the scheme with the one large gable. This is a corner building, but if it was mid-block he would probably be less inclined to go with this dormer, but as it is on a corner. He said if they look at the front elevation, they will see that a part of the gable projects out quite a bit. There might be an opportunity for this to be restudied and pull the overhang. He said personally he likes it and he also likes the double gallery wrapping around. There are a few instances that this is allowed in the district and he believes this is an appropriate place for it.

**Mr. Engle** stated that he agrees with Dr. Williams. In fact, he believes that at a previous Board meeting they said how much they like the large dormers. He hopes that the petitioner sticks with them; they are different. Mr. Engle said everything has three dormers in its roof and this is fine to have something unusual and it is not sloppy.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** said she is not settled with this arched window in the center of the dormer. It seems to her that it has a fancier feel and the rest of the building does not jibe visually. Maybe it's the roofline. It needs to be simplified a little more without getting into the design.

**Mr. Howington** stated he feels it is a little large. He is concerned how the roof will look in real life. He agrees with Ms. Weibe-Reed that the center windows seem a little out of place. The roofline on the model and the roofline on the drawings are different.

**Dr. Williams** said the model is not showing the projection of the extension of the roof out which is about 18 inches.

**Mr. Howington** said the dormers feels "top heavy." He believes that they seem out of place with the style of the building. On the right it appears that there is a shed and the other is showing a hip roof. It is not clear actually which way the roof is going. Some hips are going back toward the main gable on the left, and then a shed is on the right. It is out of scale. Mr. Howington said he personally likes the three separate dormers.

**Mr. Engle** said the Board could approve Part I and ask the petitioner to simplify the dormer.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the dormer would be brought back with Part II.



**Mr. Engle** stated that as Dr. Williams has said, the upper projection of the arched window's roof on the model appears to be flush with the lower base of the dormer, but it is not shown on the drawing. If the petitioner pulls this back it would simplify this immensely.

**Mr. Howington** said the roof needs to be cleaned up. He is not sure what is happening there.

**Dr. Williams** said maybe the scale of the windows need to be restudied.

**Mr. Howington** said the entire thing maybe needs to be reduced. However, this is left up to the petitioner. But, he definitely believes that it needs to be restudied and it appears that the Board is in agreement that this be done.

**Board Action:**

Approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 2 1/2-story detached residence on the vacant property located at 505 East Congress Street with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board for review with Part II, Design Details. - PASS

1. Revise the paired window in the gable peak on the rear façade; the window arrangement appears crowded.
2. Restudy and simplify the dormer design.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

[17. Petition of Jeff Cramer | 14-000696-COA | 507 East Congress Street | New Construction: Parts I and II](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 507 East Congress Street 14-000696-COA.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Site and Surrounding Photographs.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Context and Design Study Photographs.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Mass Model.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Color Samples and Specifications.pdf](#)

**Mr. Jeff Cramer** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction for a 3-story detached residence on the vacant property at 507 East Congress Street. The Board reviewed Part I at last month's meeting and accepted the petitioner's request for a continuance. The Board stated that Part I and Part II would be heard at today's meeting.

**Ms. Michalak** said the continuance was based on requesting the petitioner to consider the following:

1. Redesign the three-bay curved-header windows on the front façade.
2. Redesign the offsetting pattern of doors to windows on the front façade to be a more regular pattern.
3. Redesign the front porch to be more compatible with buildings of similar designs.
4. Redesign the cornice.

**Ms. Michalak** said the petitioner has addressed all of these concerns and made a few other changes to make those changes more visually compatible.

**Ms. Michalak** said staff recommends approval of both Part I and II.

**Ms. Wiebe-Reed** asked if the columns will be painted.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that the columns will be painted white.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Cramer** said staff stated that the columns are 8 inch diameter; however, he hopes that he did not put 8 inches on the plan as they are square columns. He entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Engle** stated that this building is proposed to be a masonry building and it bothers him when there are lintels that do not project beyond the opening. Lintels are shown everywhere, but on a masonry buildings the lintels are supposed to bear on the masonry. On a frame building this does not matter, but on a masonry building it should extend beyond the opening.

**Ms. Wiebe-Reed** stated she believes if the petitioner removed the trim on either side that it would be fine as it would truly represent a masonry building.

**Mr. Howington** said it could be extended four inches over.

**Mr. Cramer** said he definitely would extend it out a little further as it would help with the water on the windows. He explained that at one time he had the heavy arched windows, but

they projected too far out and did not work.

**Mr. Howington** asked if wood trim is actually on the side of the window.

**Mr. Cramer** answered that it was not wood, but thickened stucco.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Cramer if he intends to have thickened stucco around the window.

**Mr. Cramer** stated that this is what is shown, but he believes putting the lintels and taking off the side pieces is a good comment.

**Mr. Howington** asked if the recess will occur all the way across the porch wall where it steps back on the parlor floor.

**Mr. Cramer** stated that they needed some clearance to get in the door. The front door only is recessed.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they agree with removing thickened stucco on the sides and just leave the lintels over the doors and windows. She said regarding the doors that go out onto the porches, they could have a more similar configuration in the lighting pattern to the windows. Ms. Meunier said that the HSF suggests that either French doors or something that has four panes or two panes. In other words, it needs to be something that is more in keeping with the window pattern and removing the transom and make it a full height door.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Cramer if he wanted to respond to the public comments.

**Mr. Cramer** declined to make comment to the public comments.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Henry** said he is in agreement with what has been said about the lintels, sides and doors.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the Board is saying they would like to see a four light door or a two light door here.

**Dr. Williams** asked what are the concerns about the transom.

**Mr. Engle** stated that he likes the transom.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes the comment was that some definition is needed instead of just that full light door.

**Board Action:**

Approval of the petition for New Construction:  
Part I, Height and Mass for a 3-story detached  
residence on the vacant property located at 507  
East Congress Street because the proposed project  
is visually compatible and meets the design  
standards.

Approval of the petition for New Construction:  
Part II, Design Details for a 3-story detached - PASS  
residence on the vacant property located at 507  
East Congress Street with the following conditions  
to be submitted to staff for final review and  
approval.

- a. Redesign the glass doors to have a lite  
pattern.
- b. Remove all vertical window trim (built-up  
stucco trim).

**Vote Results**

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye

18. [Petition of Adam Fins | 14-001047-COA | 207 East River Street | Directory Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Mr. Engle motioned that because of a heavy agenda today, the petitions of Adam Fins 14-001047 and 14-001048 would be heard jointly as they are essentially the same issue. This was seconded by Ms. Ramsay and unanimously carried.**

**Mr. Julian Weitz** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for two directory signs for the business "*Fabulous Finds Under \$20*" located at 207 East River Street. One directory sign is proposed to be located on the sign pole near Drayton Street at East Bay Street. The other is proposed to be located near Abercorn Street at East Bay Street. The directory signs are proposed to be 18 inches high by 24 inches wide with a red

background and white text. They will be double-sided aluminum signs. The petitioner is requesting variances from:

- the maximum size requirement for directory signs.
- the maximum distance from the business to the directory sign poles, and
- the uniform color requirements for all directory signs.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that directory signs were originally erected by the City. The areas where these poles are located are known as "approved kiosks" in the sign ordinance. Over time, the size, location, maximum distances to the poles from the businesses, uniform color, and even maintenance of the poles and signs has not been consistent. A variety of sign sizes, color, and locations now exist. Many directory signs still exist on the poles for businesses that no longer exist.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval of the two directory signs as requested because they are visually compatible and recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for sign size, color, and location variances.

**Dr. Williams** stated that he was looking at previous signs and poles that were shown on page 7 which is big, but it looks recent. He asked Ms. Michalak if there is a timeline on when they will be approved.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that none of these have been approved.

**Mr. Howington** stated that, therefore, the petitioner is trying to do the right thing by coming before the Review Board.

**Dr. Williams** asked, therefore, the ones shown on page 7 where erected on poles, but did not come through this process. What is preventing enforcement?

**Ms. Michalak** stated that she does not know. This is the City's enforcement. The ordinance states that this is the City's Traffic Engineering enforcement. She does not know what is preventing them from enforcing this.

**Mr. Merriman** asked Ms. Michalak if she was saying that none of the signs has been approved.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that she could not find where any of the signs were approved.

**Mr. Engle** stated that he could not remember that the Review Board has used the fact that other people don't follow the law, therefore, that they do not feel someone has to. This bothers him and is a horrible looking mess. If this was on River Street, it would be okay. Mr. Engle said he believes that the Review Board needs to be pushing that the ordinance is enforced; and not saying that it is okay to ignore the ordinance.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked who is responsible for developing the sign ordinance. She said that a group of people need to get together to revisit the sign ordinance as this is quite frankly visual clutter. She said this has nothing to do with the sign that is being requested, but what is here directly affects this sign and any other sign to follow. How does this Board revisit the sign ordinance to present something that is more tasteful and maybe it's a kiosk with all

the same sizes.

**Ms. Harris** answered that the City's Traffic Engineering Department is responsible for enforcing the ordinance. The Board may ask that the sign ordinance be enforced.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the Board should pass a resolution to this effect.

**Mr. Engle** said this Board at this time should not ask the ZBA for a variance to ignore correcting this situation. The sign ordinance is good; it is 6 inches by 24 inches and they all are supposed to be the same size.

**Dr. Williams** said there is one sign in the middle that looks to be about six inches.

**Ms. Michalak** said she knows for a fact that this sign was not reviewed as this is a new business.

**Dr. Williams** stated, however, this sign is close to the dimensions that are allowed.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked how many poles are allowed.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that there are no restrictions on allowable poles.

**Mr. Merriman** said the poles have to be erected by the City or by some nonprofit organization.

**Mr. Engle** said the distance is a valid issue and this means that there should be another pole so that they can meet that criteria, but the entire point of having the ordinance was to have a uniform aesthetic. However, they are saying forget the uniform aesthetic; at this meeting the Board approved the new downtown signage plan. This was on the Consent Agenda. Now, they are going to say it is okay to have these signs which do not come close.

**Mr. Howington** stated that he was not saying that it is okay to have this as it does not meet the ordinance.

**Mr. Engle** said the new signs will not meet the ordinance. The three new signs that will be installed do not meet the ordinance.

**Mr. Howington** said if the variance is granted, it will be met for that particular sign.

**Mr. Merriman** said he believes that the petitioner should ask for a continuance and come back with signs that meet the criteria. He said then in the meantime, they are under a new business. Therefore, at the appropriate time he will make a motion recommending that whoever is in charge of enforcement have the signs removed and then have them comply with the ordinance. Things should not be approved that do not comply as this will only perpetuate the situation.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENT**

**Mr. Weitz** said his son-in-law brought their sign requests to the Review Board. They try to

do things the right way and supports what the Review Board does to make this somewhat a consensus. If he thought no one was going to have a sign up in a reasonable amount of time, he would be satisfied with the outcome of this. However, either way the Board asks him to ask for a continuance he will do so and reapply. But, if he comes back in one or two years and still see these signs up there and he not have a sign up there, he would not be pleased with this. Therefore, he needs the Board to tell him how to handle this and be fair with him.

**Mr. Weitz** said, therefore, he is willing to do what is best as long as the Board does what is best for him.

**Dr. Williams** said it sounds like the petitioner is requesting a continuance and at the appropriate time he will make a motion to that effect.

**Mr. Engle** told Mr. Weitz that the Board appreciates his coming to them. He said that the Review Board will pass a resolution to the City to try to do something about the signs.

**Mr. Weitz** asked if anybody goes up and down the streets, look at the signs and see whether it was put up according to guidelines.

**Mr. Howington** stated that there is enforcement that does this. Maybe this has fallen through the cracks, but the Review Board will try to get this resolved.

**Mr. Weitz** asked if he should reapply and use the existing things in anticipation that everybody will be doing the same thing if they want to put a sign up.

**Mr. Howington** answered "yes" if this is acceptable to him.

**Ms. Michalak** informed Mr. Weitz that he does not need to start the application over, but he can revise his size and colors and resubmit this and when he is ready, she will resubmit the petition to the Board.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**None.**

#### **Board Action:**

Approval to continue the petition and the variance request for two directory signs for the petitioner to redesign the signs (size and color) to meet the sign ordinance. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

19. [Petition of Adam Fins | 14-001048-COA | 121 West River Street | Directory Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Mr. Engle motioned that because of a heavy agenda today, the petitions of Adam Fins 14-001047 and 14-001048 would be heard jointly as they are essentially the same issue. This was seconded by Ms. Ramsay and unanimously carried.**

**Mr. Julian Weitz** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a directory sign for the business "Fine Things Under \$20" located at 121 West River Street. The directory sign is proposed to be located on the sign pole near Barnard Street at East Bay Street. The directory sign is proposed to be 18 inches high by 24 inches wide with a black background and white text. It will be double-sided aluminum signs. The petitioner is requesting variances from:

- the maximum size requirement for directory signs.
- the maximum distance from the business to the directory sign poles, and
- uniform color requirements for all directory signs.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that directory signs were originally erected by the City. The areas where these poles are located are known as "approved kiosks" in the sign ordinance. Over time, the size, location, maximum distances to the poles from the businesses, uniform color, and even maintenance of the poles and signs has not been consistent. A variety of sign sizes, color, and locations now exist. Many directory signs still exist on the poles for businesses that no longer exist.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval of the directory sign as requested because it is visually compatible and recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for sign size, color, and location variances.

**NOTE:** For comments from the Board and the petitioner, please see File 14-001047.

**Board Action:**

Approval to continue the petition and the variance request for two directory signs in order for the petitioner to redesign the signs (size and color) to - PASS



meet the sign ordinance.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Reed Engle

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

20. [Petition of Josh Ward, Ward Architecture | 14-001181-COA | 711 Price Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Sanborn Maps, Photographs, and Drawings.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Design Concept Photograph.pdf](#)

**Mr. Josh Ward** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to construct a two-story addition with a roof structure to the south of the existing duplex at 711 Price Street. The petitioner is also requesting a 29 foot variance from the structured parking setback standard.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval to construct a two-story addition with a roof structure to the south of the existing duplex at 711 Price Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval.

1. Submit all proposed color selections to staff for final review and approval.
2. Revise the material for the proposed concrete front stoop stair to be a material permitted in the ordinance.
3. Provide additional information regarding the rear entry stoop to ensure that the design meets the standards.

**Ms. Michalak** reported also that staff recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for a 29 foot variance from the structured setback parking standard required under Sec. 8-3030(n)(14)b. to allow a one-car garage set back one foot from the Price Street property line.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked if this is for Part I.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that this is a request for an addition. Therefore, the entire request is

looked at the same time.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** said she did not see the site lines.

**Ms. Michalak** said this was handled with the renderings.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the garage on the west face align correctly with the lane.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that it does not align as they currently have a parking easement.

**Dr. Williams** asked if there is a site plan that shows how the car would get into the garage.

**Ms. Michalak** pointed that an easement already exists. If there are additional questions regarding the easement, the petitioner will be able to answer this.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ward** said this is a challenging and a unique site. He believes that what they have come up with is workable. He has done the study on getting into the garage. It is not ideal for sure, but given the client's needs and what they have to work with, he believes a solution is there. Mr. Ward entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Engle** said this building will utilize the same interpretation as the building on the corner of 37th Street. He believes small shingle is used here.

**Dr. Henry** said this is a nice job.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** stated that they have one comment for consideration which is to include a window or windows on the ground level of the south façade of the addition. There is some space between the garage and the building next to it. The window would not be seen driving down Price Street, but as a pedestrian walking on the sidewalk it would be visible.

**Mr. Howington** invited the petitioner to respond to the HSF's comment, if he wishes.

**Mr. Ward** stated that the window is something that they can certainly study.

**Dr. Williams** said the plan shows two windows on the ground floor overlooking the car. He asked which is correct.

**Mr. Ward** answered that the plans are incorrect.

**Mr. Howington** stated that the petitioner said the plans are incorrect and they want to remain with the elevations if the Board deems that the elevations are okay.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** said the elevation is 19 feet. Therefore, it is not a long south elevation. Did

he hear that a fence is in the front?

**Mr. Howington** said he believes that a fence is in front of it.

**Ms. Michalak** said a fence is along Price Street.

**Dr. Williams** said that in relation to the shortness of the south elevation and the presence of a fence, he agrees with the petitioner's design.

**Mr. Engle** said in a similar situation, the Board has asked that a window be put in. They cannot guarantee that the fence will remain here as it is the neighbor's fence.

**Mr. Howington** asked if this was a contemporary interpretation.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Engle if he was talking about the one on East Broad Street.

**Mr. Engle** said it was discussed at their last Board meeting. They said that a window should be there.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes this was before them today and it was not required. He believes the petitioner looked at it and decided not to do it. Mr. Howington said the Board voted on this today.

**Mr. Engle** said only one window was on that elevation on the first floor. Does this meet the ordinance?

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Ward how far is the next house to this site of this wall.

**Mr. Ward** answered at least 60 feet. The next house is on the corner of Price and Gwinnett Streets.

**Mr. Engle** said he does not believe two windows are needed on the side, but a window should be on the front. You will see the top of the window over that fence.

**Mr. Ward** said they will study this.

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition to construct a two-story addition with a roof structure to the south of the existing duplex at 711 Price Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval.

- a. Submit all proposed color selection to staff for final review and approval.
- b. Revise the material for the proposed concrete front stoop stair to be a material permitted in the

ordinance.  
c. Provide additional information regarding the rear entry stoop to ensure that the design meets the standards. - PASS  
d. Add a window on the east portion of the south façade.  
Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a 29 foot variance from the structured setback parking standard required under Sec. 8-3030(n)(14)b. to allow a one-car garage set back one foot from the Price Street property line.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

21. [Petition of Jeff Cramer for Diversified Designs | 14-001183-COA | 615 Habersham Street | New Construction Part I Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Stephens Ward.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Photographs.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Public Comments- Phelps email.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Public Comments- Re email.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Supplementary Photographs.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Public Comments- du Toit email.pdf](#)

**NOTE: Ms. Simpson left the meeting at 5:00 p.m.**

**Mr. Jeff Cramer** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to demolish an existing non-contributing building at 615 Habersham Street and construct five new townhomes facing Habersham Street. The buildings are proposed to be three stories tall with a full garden level, and raised stoop to the first floor entrance. Parking will be provide beneath each home, at the rear, with the entrance to the parking area provided off East Hall

Street. Ms. Harris said each townhouse has a four bay rhythm on the front façade with a one story full front and bay windows. There are also bay windows on the Hall Street façade of one of the homes.

**Ms. Harris** stated that when this project went to Site Plan Review (SPR) with the City, there is an existing tree on the north end of the property which Park & Tree felt was critical to keep intact and be accounted for in the design of this building.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the demolition of the non-contributing building at 615 Habersham Street because the building is not eligible for historic status. Staff also recommends approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for five new townhomes at 615 Habersham Street with the condition that the porch and stair relationship be restudied to be more visually compatible, to be submitted with Part II, Design Details, because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards.

**Ms. Harris** reported additionally that staff recommends that the Board recommend approval of variances to the Zoning Board of Appeals from the following standards:

*"Access to parking shall be from lanes or north-south service streets. When a property does not front a lane or north-south service streets, parking may be accessed from east-west connecting streets or trust streets.*

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

Because the variance criteria have been met.

**Dr. Henry** said he was trying to understand the proposed parking at this location.

**Ms. Harris** explained [pointing to a section] that the driveway to the parking will be here and will go through a gate and will be underneath each of the homes. There will be a shared drive that each of the homes will access.

**Mr. Engle** asked if 16 feet garage doors will be on the back.

**Ms. Harris** answered that they will not be visible because of the eight foot tall masonry wall and solid gate.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Cramer** stated that he believes the entrance to a townhouse is important. The person wants to feel as if they have a private entrance to their townhouse. Therefore, the indentation in the porch helps with this feeling and also focuses on the door. He said he wished he had a better picture of the porch on the corner of Habersham and Gordon Streets. There are two Victorian style houses that have the recessed porch entrances. When you look at the porches "head on" you only see the stairs and the front door. Now, you do see the porch, but your focus is on the front door. Mr. Cramer said they can restudy the porch and probably do some different things. Mr. Cramer entertained questions from the Board.

**Dr. Williams** said the mass model shows a single pitch across the full width, while the drawing on page 6 of 9 shows something complicated.

**Mr. Cramer** said they recessed where the door is between the porches eight inches. They have the same pitch, but just sets back a little because of the bay window. Basically, a skirt is on the bay window and when you recess the pitch about eight inches it recesses the door more to make it more important. It has the same pitch as the rest of the roof.

**Dr. Williams** said that the part on the diagonal face of each bay, the roof seems to come down to a valley.

**Mr. Cramer** said gutters will be here. The valley is being created just like the skirt. There will be a slight valley that sits between the skirts of the bay window.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Cramer if he considered an alternating rhythm that instead of five houses with projecting bays, maybe have three houses with ends in the middle and the other two be simpler.

**Mr. Cramer** asked Dr. Williams if he was saying that some would not have bays.

**Dr. Williams** answered yes and explained to Mr. Cramer that he was asking him if this was a solution that he considered or studied.

**Mr. Cramer** answered that he did not consider or study this, but he understands what Dr. Williams was talking about.

**Mr. Engle** said he was looking at the top riser on the steps. There cannot be more than a foot between this and the bay. When he measures this, it is two feet - nine inches from the front bay to the baluster on the porch. Therefore, you could not get a piece of furniture on this porch. Also, this does not agree with what is shown on the plan. Mr. Engle said he does not believe that there is more than 18 inches between the front elevation of the bay and the top riser. Something has to be wrong with the way the stair is laid out.

**Mr. Cramer** stated that on the side view, it does not look like it very much, but it is recessed.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Cramer if there was a reason that he did not turn the stairs parallel to the front elevation so he could have pulled it down a little.

**Mr. Cramer** answered that the ones he has seen in this area are straight forward such as the ones on Gordon Street.

**Mr. Engle** said they ought to be off the ground.

**Mr. Cramer** said they are about ten feet; therefore, this is far off the ground.

**Mr. Engle** said this would be four more steps.

**Mr. Cramer** said it is nine and one-half feet off the ground.

**Mr. Engle** said he believes the design needs to be simplified.

**Mr. Merriman** asked which drawing is wrong? Is it as it appears on the elevation or the stairs go all the way up? There is a very small space on the plans.

**Mr. Howington** said something appears to be inconsistent. He said when you look at the side elevation, you are actually looking at the top riser, which is in line with the bay beyond.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Mr. Patrick Phelps** said he was speaking as a neighboring resident at 308 East Hall which is two doors down from the project. Mr. Phelps said no disrespect to Mr. Cramer or staff, but he believes there are some fundamental issues with the siting of the project that are leading in other things that are causing some difficulties.

**Mr. Phelps** said he will talk a little about the larger Forsyth Park District which is a character area that has defining guidelines and there have been a number of larger townhome, row-home projects that have been proposed in this area. However, it all applies to this specific project. The Forsyth Park Character District is from Gaston Street to Gwinnett Street all along Forsyth east, west from East Broad to Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. The homes described in the guidelines are single family detached or semi-detached homes. They have large front yard setbacks; they have side-yard setbacks and have large back yards. Traditionally, in the Oglethorpe Plan this was mostly farm land and was developed mostly in large lots. These are large homes, but they all are single-family. A single-family home is here; a house has been converted into an office. Mr. Phelps said, pointing to an area, that a side yard single-family house here; single-family duplex; single-family that has apartments in it now; single-family is now used for a hostel; single-family and actually a 12-unit condo building that has been successful even though he does not appreciate the styling of this.

**Mr. Phelps** said the Board can see that every portion of the houses are setback ten to 20 feet out from Hall Street. Even though staff made reference to the frontage of buildings on east-west streets, in the ordinance it pertains to the Oglethorpe Plan; but he wants the Board to understand that from probably River Street all the way to Victory Drive, a majority of the homes that are on east-west streets face north and south. This is Savannah typology. He said to take this plan and rotate it to face Habersham Street, granted that there are some instances that this does happen, but typically there would be a front building that faces the east-west street and then the lot is sub-divided and then there is a minor building that faces Habersham Street or there is a corner condition where the building has two frontages either on Habersham Street and the east-west street, similar to what's on Huntingdon and Habersham Streets or even up on the squares where there are wrap around porches that address both streets. He said, however, the primary frontages are always on the east-west street and not the north-south street. He said that he has specifically highlighted some of the ordinances that were in conflict and they are attached for future reference.

**Mr. Phelps** said he combined the two Sanborn Maps together to get a good idea of the ward. He pointed out the location of the lot and said that the building that is here, he

believes it just went through modification is the original carriage house to the house that was on this lot, has been added onto towards the lane to the west side. Therefore, multiple condos have been put onto it, but it gives the Board an idea of the scale of the building that was here. He said it was a large Victorian building. They see the pattern of the lane where there are large buildings that face Hall Street, the lane with the secondary building, there is a secondary row of four two-story townhomes that probably dates to the 1800s; and then there are buildings that actually face Huntingdon Street. Also, throughout this ward, all the buildings on the east-west street face the south and not towards Lincoln Street, Abercorn Street, or Habersham Street.

**Mr. Phelps** said as they look down Hall Street, they will see an example of the setback that is established. It may not be in a specific to the historicalness, but it does stay within the City ordinance that setbacks should be whatever is established on the street or a set number that is set within the ordinance. Therefore, if there is a precedent that is set along the street front, that setback should be respected. He said continuing down Hall Street from Drayton Street all the way to East Broad Street all the buildings are either setback at least five feet or more such as 20 to 25 feet depending upon what block it is in.

**Mr. Phelps** informed the Board that if they envision that the building now fronts the opposite direction, the pattern is setup where there is frontage on east-west; smaller service buildings against the lane; and then you get to the plan that matches the existing context. Mr. Phelps showed a diagram of the established setbacks. He said in looking how the buildings are situated where they will be placed, they have some issues. Mr. Phelps said, pointing to an area, that he understands that an existing curb cut unfortunately from here all the way down and from here all the way. However, if they can picture the building rotated, this would allow access from Habersham Street which would be in compliance with the ordinance and a variance would not need to be requested to allow this on the east-west street as it is not prohibited.

**Mr. Phelps** said he is not against the density as he believes it can support a five unit townhome here. The lot is a good size; there are buildings, especially the one next door, that supports 12 one-bedroom condos. He believes the height of the building could be worked on a little because primarily the structures in this neighborhood are two-stories over a partial basement. There could be a solution of either recessing the parking to drop it down so that it becomes a little more in context with the existing buildings below grade and providing that lower basement level. Mr. Phelps said he agrees with staff's recommendation to look at the porches; he said the porches could be combined so that it works like a larger building with shared entrances. A good example is the building on the corner of Huntingdon and Habersham Streets. There are shared stairways and porches. This eliminates so many stairs coming down from the porches.

**Mr. Phelps** said that he encourages the Board to look at the patterns that are established on this street and that the petitioner reconsider the placement where the setbacks are; how the building relates to the street in the existing context.

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** stated that they believe the demolition of the existing building should be conditioned upon Part II. The HSF is not in agreement of just demolishing a building for the sake of it. With regards to the proposed design, they do not think that it is compatible with the surrounding context. Ms. Meunier said that the HSF agrees with everything that Mr. Phelps said. She said that an



appropriate proposal would be a single-family garden home or a duplex that is oriented towards Hall Street. This is really a specific context for that street and area. They are not really in favor of reorienting the current proposal of row-houses to Hall Street because they do not believe that there is much of a precedent for rows on Hall Street.

**Ms. Meunier** said in looking at the proposal as presented, overall they think the design is very heavy both in terms of height and mass and also detailing. They believe it needs to be simplified. She said they believe that the overall hip pitched roof needs to be simplified by reducing the pitch, not only so that multiple plains are less visible, but also to reduce the height. They would love to see the ground floor restudied in order for the height to be reduced any way possible. She said that the HSF suggests making the porch and the portico roofs a continuous roofline instead of the recesses over the porticos. They believe that this would provide a lot of simplification.

**Ms. Meunier** said they are concerned about the width of the garage doors. They think that they maybe visible through the gate on Hall Street. The standards say they should not be wider than 12 feet and they appear to be larger than 12. Regarding the detailing; particularly the porches, they think that it could be more delicate; thinner columns, more delicate railings, balusters, and so forth. A lot of the buildings that they went and looked at in this area that kind of mimic this form of the bays, even if they are stucco or masonry, tend to have wooden porches with much more fine detailing even from the photos. She showed the Board some of the photos that were shown in the packet.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Meunier if she said HSF believes the railings should be simpler.

**Ms. Meunier** answered that they believe the railings should be more delicate. There are a lot of buildings that are ornate with their detailing on those porches that are more delicate; they are not suggesting this, but they are saying in general that the massing of some of the columns and balusters as they look now could be more delicate. By this, they mean not as heavy in massing.

**Mr. Howington** said they could be a little lighter.

**Ms. Harris** explained that staff received three emails in their packets regarding this petition. Two of the emails were not in favor of the petition and one recommended approval.

**Mr. Howington** invited Mr. Cramer to respond to the public comments.

**Mr. Nick Areorgakakos** asked if the address is on Huntingdon Street or Hall Street.

**Mr. Howington** answered that he really does not know. He assumed, however, that at one time the address was on Hall Street, but now it is on Habersham Street. Mr. Howington explained that the Review Board does not deal with address, but with visual compatibility, height and mass.

**Mr. Cramer** said they studied several orientations for this property. They have done their due-diligence. They went to two Site Plan Review meetings with the City and talked with Mr. Gordon Denny about removing the tree that is on the north side. Mr. Cramer said

that there are some row houses on Hall Street right on the curb across from Habersham Street. They are along this street and are not setback at all. He drove down Habersham Street today and noticed that there are orientations of houses that are on corners of east-west streets that faces Habersham Street. The Victorian house that the Board saw is on the square and on the corner of Gordon Street.

**Mr. Cramer** pointed out their lot and immediately to the north, a duplex sits on the corner of Huntingdon Street and has a Habersham Street address.

**Mr. Howington** said the house is single-family and not a duplex.

**Mr. Cramer** said in the historic book, this house has two addresses. However, it looks like it was built as a single-family. He said two houses located on the corner of Gordon Street near the square have Habersham Street addresses. Therefore, he just wanted to point out that it is not totally true that you will not find a house that faces east-west streets. There are some in the area. They believe they have a nice wall of continuity going down Hall Street. When you walk up and down Hall Street you will see walls and fences all the way down that creates a wall of continuity, especially from Lincoln Street to Abercorn Street. A complete wall is all the way along this street. Mr. Cramer showed the Board a photo of the continuous wall that goes down Hall Street. He said that there are a lot of setbacks already, but the wall, as he said is continuous and breaks down on their block. The house behind him has six units in it; it is raised up four feet and has 2 and one-half stories; as far as the mass, it is basically a three-story building. This is a very large building.

**Dr. Henry** said most of the houses on Hall Street have large porches and small gardens. He would say that half of the houses have setbacks.

**Mr. Cramer** explained that he did not say that the houses did not have setbacks, but said that there is a nice wall of continuity going down the street.

**Dr. Henry** stated that his reference was to the four hundred block of Hall Street.

**Mr. Howington** stated that Dr. Henry lives on the south side of Hall Street between Habersham and Price Streets.

**Mr. Cramer** said his point is that there are a lot of different things around the buildings.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said a good case was made why this is not compatible to the neighborhood.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** said, to her, a lot of windows are crammed onto the façade. It has an opportunity to address the corner, but it does not. She believes this is a missed opportunity and she could not vote favorably for this project.

**Dr. Williams** said he was searching in Google maps trying to get a feel of what might be helpful. He said the Board received a taste from Mr. Phelps's diagram. He believes that Mr. Phelps made a very compelling argument of how the buildings are oriented towards the east-west streets, especially on the main streets and towards the back end of the blocks. In fact, the pattern is fixed and also even on this block more so than one block to the north of

Huntingdon Street. Dr. Williams said there are quite a few rows or pairs of buildings that are tighter together, but on Huntingdon there is a significantly different character. Hall Street by comparison has a lot more space between. The Board has looked at the area and have endorsed in the past looking beyond just the immediate confines of a given block. He said he thinks there is enough deviation from pattern traditions including the setback of the row and as much as he respects calling this a wonderful continuity of fences and low walls as a line of continuity, but the proposal is to bring the house right up to the line and then overhang the bays. The example of Gordon Street is an interesting comparison because there the house does come out to this kind of line, but all the other houses on Gordon Street also come out to that line. They do not have the 30 to 20 foot setbacks. The house with the wrap around porch really does anchor a corner looking over the squares as well as fronting Habersham Street.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes that a lot of missed opportunities are here and that a compelling case as been made. The units should be fronting Hall Street and not Habersham Street. Maybe an opportunity is here to have two units front Hall Street and something behind fronting Habersham Street.

**Mr. Engle** said that every lot cannot always be developed with the maximum number of units; this seems to be the case here. The petitioner might want to drop one unit.

**Mr. Howington** said this is a complicated building and most of the buildings in this ward of simple and are deep. He said the only thing he is in agreement with is the lot coverage. The density reads as five different townhomes and he believes this is too much; even though the unit behind this has 12 units. But, when you look at it, it looks like a duplex. This is more keeping with the neighborhood. He believes the orientation is incorrect.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Cramer if he wishes to ask for a continuance.

**Mr. Cramer** said he wanted to bring to the Board's attention that he does not have a lane such as all the other great properties. He has a corner lot and it is an important lot, but he has to create his own access. They will have to take down a tree to get back there; they need five driveways. He is only 60% of the density on this lot.

**Mr. Howington** clarified his statement by saying that he does not believe it is the density, but the appearance.

**Mr. Cramer** said as far as the orientation on Hall Street would be forcing his client to look at a parking lot because they have historic references that the houses face east-west. A parking lot was allowed to go across the street. How historic is that? Will he have to look at a parking lot because they like houses oriented that way because they were built this way in the 1800s. Mr. Cramer said he was only telling the Board what he is dealing with. He is not disagreeing with anybody.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes the Board sympathizes that it is a complicated site.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Cramer: "what are the dimensions of the complete site?"

**Mr. Cramer** answered that it is 96 feet on Hall Street and basically a 100 on Habersham

Street.

**Dr. Williams** said virtually the site is square.

**Mr. Cramer** said to get a development on Hall Street, the oak tree would need to be cut down. After he went to SPR meeting, they all decided that the access of all the utilities that it is better to create your own lane and go out Hall Street and connect all the utilities. The lot that is immediate to the north on Habersham Street is setback also.

**Mr. Merriman** said he realizes that Park & Tree said Mr. Cramer could not get rid of the tree, but is the tree on his property?

**Mr. Cramer** answered that the tree is in the right-of-way.

**Mr. Merriman** said there is a way of getting around this.

**Mr. Cramer** said the way he looks at the development is if you had to setback on Habersham Street it would be in keeping with the district. Looking at it from the corner, you would have one front of a building. If you see the setback from Hall Street what is the difference from seeing it on Hall Street of the other houses. The wall of continuity is broken down by his end of the block and he is trying to build it back.

**Mr. Howington** asked if there are any other examples of five townhomes in this area. He knows this area well as he has lived here. He does not remember five townhomes being here.

**Mr. Cramer** said there is one on Gaston Street is practically the same size and has stairs coming out. But, it is setting on the east-west street and is setback.

**Mr. Howington** said the ones that he remembers are setup as duplexes.

**Mr. Cramer** showed the Board a photo of a building on Gaston Street and said it is not much different than his building. It is the same scale of what he wants to develop. It is three stories tall and is very attractive.

**Dr. Williams** said a part of the issue is the orientation; this faces north.

**Mr. Cramer** said he does not have a lane behind his building, but the one on Gaston Street has a lane for access. He asked for a continuance.

**Mr. Engle** said this is a hard case. He believes that Park & Tree is saying they are going to keep the live oak at the expense of the entire property not being able to be developed. He does not believe that they can do that. They are going to require replanting a significant number of trees.

**Mr. Howington** said the Board will not get involved in the tree. He asked the Board to vote on a motion for continuance.

**Board Action:**

Approval to continue the proposed demolition of an existing non-contributing building at 615 Habersham Street, variance requests, and Part I: - PASS  
New Construction of five new townhomes facing Habersham Street.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

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

22. [Petition of Neil Dawson, Dawson Architects | 14-001189-COA | 302 Williamson Street | Rehabilitation, Alterations, and Additions](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Sanborn Maps, Photographs, and Drawings.pdf](#)

Attachment: [1954 and 1973 Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

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

**NOTE: Ms. Weibe-Reed recused from participation in this petition. She serve as a consultant for Dawson Architects.**

**Ms. Emily Dawson and Ms. Jennifer Deacon** were present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations for the commercial property located at 302 Williamson Street. The project pertains only to the 3rd and 4th floors of this building where a new hostel and restaurant will be constructed. The exterior work will be limited to the Williamson Street façade and the Factor Walk Bridges. On the third floor, a previously "bricked-in" window opening will be opened and altered; a new hollow metal door with a full width glass transom above will be installed. A new bridge/walkway will be constructed from the new door and will connect to the existing bridge/walkway and stair to the east on Upper Factors Walk.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for alterations for the commercial property located at 302 Williamson Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Provide all required awning information to staff for review and approval including:
  - Dimensional scaled elevations of the front and sides of all proposed awnings.

- Dimension the clearance from the bottom of the awnings to the walkway.
- Indicate all proposed signage/graphics on the awning elevations and the total square footage of all signage/graphics.
- Provide the final color selection for the awning fabric.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Michalak to explain what she said about the 1880 Sanborn Map.

**Ms. Michalak** said they are similar.

**Dr. Williams** said he has his doubts. The one they are looking at now is 1884 and the second to the left is 1888.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that when she said similar it means that the majority of it is shown covered.

**Dr. Williams** said they were not covered at the Bay Street level. As they can see by all the staircases, the platform is probably what is called Upper Factors Walk or even may be lower.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that the last one would be below.

**Dr. Williams** stated that he is not convinced that this is being read correctly because where there are bridges such as it says cotton shed to the right, that would go from the edge of the wall to the building. But, he does not think that this condition ever existed on this building straight across the full width. Over on the left, the stairs are still there, but these are complex structures; however, he believes the closest to this came was in the 1916 map. He said it seems to him that they are going in the wrong direction. The applicant supplied two images that are directly above the historic photo on the same page.

**Dr. Williams** said what is being endorsed is essentially something that has been removed, he thought what is being aimed at here is to open up Factors Walk as much as possible not cover it over. Every project that has happened along Factors Walk that he recalls, Bohemian and actually Ryan had complete decking and a part of the deal to get the extra story was to remove the decking and open up the view down to Factors Walk. Here they have views down to Factors Walk, but now the proposal is to cover it over.

**Ms. Michalak** said staff is recommending approval to cover this over.

**Dr. Williams** asked if staff feels this is appropriate.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that staff feels it is appropriate.

**Dr. Williams** said they will take this under consideration.

**Mr. Engle** said he agrees with Dr. Williams as this will make it go back to way it was.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Dawson** thanked Ms. Michalak for the report. They are still working with the owner for size and graphics for the awning. They will be happy to continue to work with staff to

ensure that the signage and awnings meet the ordinance. She has with her today their revised awnings drawing where they provided some dimensions that will give more insight into what they are doing. Ms. Dawson said that Ms. Deacon would inform the Board about the decking.

**Ms. Deacon** explained that they worked with their client to try to come up with a solution that would work best for what they were attempting to do. They believe that the improvements they are planning will provide a better space for both outdoor and indoor comparative to what is going on here now. Currently, there are nonconforming awning situations. Also, they believe that there is enough of a precedent with the existing door opening that is a bridge to nowhere. If there were three separate bridges going into the building, she does not believe that it would be an improvement to how that space operates. Ms. Deacon said they are open to the Board's comments. She entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Engle** asked if there were three separate bridges, how usable would that be.

**Ms. Deacon** answered that she believes it would be unusable. She believes it would be less usable as an individual space. It could be that the building was separated into two different units at some point and this could be why there were different bridges or why they were removed over time and some of those spaces were combined. Ms. Deacon said they do not know the answer to this, but currently as an outdoor space, they believe that this would be an improvement and would improve the functionality for their client.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** said he believes that the Cotton Sail could provide a good model. He said if he reads this correctly, the current bridge is between here and this wall. He asked [looking at a section on plans] this entire area will be open and this is the existing bridge on the other side. Is this correct?

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** said, therefore, in his opinion there are opportunities, such as at Cotton Sail, that this area here could be left open. However, he believes that they are trying to move away from the Factors Walk areas because who knows in the future what might happen at those lower levels. To different development projects to the east of this have gone in this direction and removed complete decking and allowing openings. He said this kind of covering will be problematic. But, he believes there are opportunities where decking could be going all the way across, but not necessarily all the way from north to south.

**Dr. Williams** [pointing to a line] asked staff if this aligns with the top of the wall.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes.

**Mr. Engle** said he has not heard a single thing that they will be restoring what was there. It is being said that they want to put the bridge/walkway here so they may have a café. As Dr. Williams has said, they would be going backwards. They are not restoring, but it has been said that they are putting it back using the same techniques and railings, but, yet, it was probably never there. He said he cannot see approving this.

**Ms. Dawson** said they did a couple of plans for partial decks and their client wants to see if it would be possible to approve. She said going forward they will provide drawings with the approval of staff that would speak to what they did at the Ryan Hotel and scale back the decking. She said that replacing what decking is here would be positive for restoring the continuity of the historic building. The new decking will be important and they have some partial seating and still activate the street, but they will look into and study leaving this area open further.

**Mr. Howington** informed Ms. Dawson that it appears that the Board would vote for denial. He explained to her, however, that she can request a continuance. If she wishes to do so, she can ask the Board to vote on the petition.

**Ms. Dawson** asked for a continuance.

**Dr. Williams** said the Board believes that she needs to be maximizing the open space. The goal of the new decking and bridging is a worthwhile goal, but this also needs to be balanced with as much open view down to the bottom. This is what the Board will be looking for. It is not just a token increase in the open area.

**Board Action:**

Approval to continue the petition for alterations to the commercial property located at 302 Williamson Street in order for the petitioner to redesign the Factors Walk bridging - the redesign to cover less of the Upper Factors Walk below. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Abstain  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye  
Linda Ramsay - Aye  
Marjorie W Reed - Abstain  
Ebony Simpson - Aye  
Robin Williams - Aye



Rehabilitation Amendment

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 14-001283-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Application and Supporting Documentation.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Previously approved drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Previous Board Approval 13-004878-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Supplementary infor.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [SHPO Correspondance.pdf](#)

**Mr. T. Jerry Lominack** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to amend the previously approved rehabilitation of 660 East Broughton Street, the Kehoe Machine Shop building. The original rehabilitation proposal was approved by the HDBR on October 10, 2012. On March 12, 2014, the petitioner requested a similar amendment to change the previously approved windows on the north, east and south facades from Kolbe & Kolbe Magnum wood, double-hung, single pane, true divided light windows to Kolbe & Kolbe Ultra Majesta wood, metal clad simulated divided light windows. The request also included a paint color change from the windows and storefront from the previously approved SW7742, Agate Green and Kawneer Atlantic Gary to SW6992 Inkwell. This will match the storefront in the new construction. The Board denied the request to change the windows to the double pane, metal clad windows and approved the paint color change.

**Ms. Harris** explained that the current request is to change the previously approved windows on the north, east and south facades from Kolbe & Kolbe Magnum wood, double-hung, single pane, true divided light windows to Kolbe & Kolbe Ultra Majesta wood, simulated divided light windows. The shadow mullions between the glass will be SW6992 Inkwell, to match the windows color. This request differs from the previous request because the window will not be metal clad. The request includes a variance from the design standards.

**Ms. Harris** explained that the petitioner has provided some supplementary information including a detail of the mullions as well as an example of a hotel in Atlanta that is an historic building that used the same windows and received Federal tax credits on this project. She said that when she received the supplementary information, she contacted the State Department Preservation Office to find out more information about this project. Ms. Harris said she included, in the Board's packet, a copy of the correspondence she received from the State regarding the project. The correspondence stated that the Winecoff Hotel did receive Federal tax credits, but not State tax credits because they felt the existing windows could have been repaired. Ms. Harris said the correspondence read that "replacement windows using insulated glass can be acceptable, provided they are a close visual match (same size, light configuration, profile details and other visual qualities). Not infrequently, a proposed replacement window of this sort just replicates the light configuration, which is almost never enough."

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends denial of the request to amend the previous approval to change the approved windows to Kolbe & Kolbe Ultra Majesta, wood, simulated divided light windows because the amendment does not meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation or design standards. She said also that staff recommends denial to the Zoning Board of Appeals from:

- **The Secretary of Interior's Standard with state**, *"Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence."*
- **The design standard which states**, *"Historic windows, frames, sashed and glazing shall not be replaced unless it is documented and verified by the Preservation Officer that they have deteriorated beyond repair. Replacement windows on historic buildings shall replicate the original historic windows in composition, design, and material."*

Because the proposed amendment does not meet the criteria for a variance.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Harris if the windows at the Winecoff Hotel were deteriorated beyond repair? Then a similar window would have been acceptable. He said that the correspondence stated that "even so, they did use acceptable windows in the context of replacement for deterioration beyond repair." He said that the State is making the determination that the windows are beyond repair. He said if he is reading the correspondence correctly if the windows were beyond repair, then the windows that is being requested would have been acceptable in that context. Dr. Williams asked Ms. Harris if he was reading the correspondence correctly.

**Ms. Harris** answered that this is her understanding.

**Dr. Williams** stated that the second paragraph of the correspondence states that if the windows in question are in fact deteriorated beyond repair, then replacement windows using insulated glazing can be acceptable provided they are a close visual match.

**Mr. Merriman** said his understanding of "deteriorated beyond repair," is the staff would have to come and check it out, but the profile of the mullions would have to match existing and would have to be true divided light, single pane, and wood.

**Ms. Harris** answered that's correct.

**Mr. Merriman** said he works on historic windows and to him "deteriorated beyond repair" means that when he sticks his knife in the wood, it goes all the way through.

**Mr. Howington** asked: "what if the windows are missing or inconsistent and you do not have anything to check?"

**Mr. Merriman** stated that's the problem. If they are not there or inconsistent, then you do not have anything to go by.

**Mr. Engle** asked Ms. Harris what, specifically, about the windows the applicant is proposing that concerns her if they are the same size, configurations, light pattern, and muntin detail.

**Ms. Harris** answered that the window does an excellent job in terms of the width of each

element of the exterior on the sash. She said visually she has concern with the depth of the double glazing and it is very easy to see that unless you are looking at the window perfectly straight on. While she realizes that the dark coloring and the separation of the muntins do help, she does not feel with this typical example that it is adequate.

**Dr. Williams** asked, for example, if light and space is darker; are they both to be painted Inkwell?

**Ms. Harris** explained that staff asked the petitioner to provide a sample and he did. She said they know all the other stuff.

**Mr. Howington** clarified that they are not doing a restoration, but a rehabilitation.

### PETITIONER COMMENTS

**Mr. Lominack** stated he has agreed many times with staff reports, but this is not one of those times. He believes that some of the members on this Board remember when this project initially came before them and it was enthusiastically received and was unanimously approved. He stated that this building actually was at a point where a recommendation from a number of people, including the structural engineer, was to demolish the building before it fell down. The building officials of the City obtained an emergency demolition permit because the building was in fact a hazard, but Mr. Morris chose not to demolish the building.

**Mr. Lominack** stated that at this point, a tremendous amount of reconstruction has been done. In fact, columns were installed, riveted lattice work and columns that actually reproduced pieces were spliced into the existing columns. The masonry work was done; a part of the building was sinking and deep excavation was done; the bridge across that holds the walls in place, and the building permitting has been done for the exterior skin of the building. The total cost for this project will be between \$5 million and \$6 million. However, he knows that cost is not a consideration of this Board.

**Mr. Lominack** said they do know what the original windows were in this building. He said that Ms. Harris mentioned that the two sashes are different and he said they are different. But, they do not believe that the sashes were put in at the same time. They found bits and pieces of the indication of muntins and windows pieces that were put in over a period of time. Mr. Lominack said they were poorly built and he does not believe that anybody tried to manufacture reproduction windows would want their name on it. He explained that this particular building is going to be used, among many other things, for concerts. This is a noisy part of Bay Street and General McIntosh. Single glazed windows do not keep out sound as well as double glazed windows. They would not be requesting a double glazed insulated window in normal circumstances, but they feel it is very important to take the integrity of the total building and deal with the windows or a part of that protection against further damage and/or damage again by hurricane and other things.

**Mr. Lominack** stated that he appreciates it that Ms. Harris contacted the State Preservation Office after they found out that the Winecoff Hotel used exactly the same windows; but the only difference was that it was not divided light, but one-over-one large windows. This made them feel that they were not asking for anything unreasonable on this particular project. The hotel did receive tax credit. But, actually Mr. Morris is not seeking

tax credit on this project. The profile for this window as far as the exterior profile of the mullions, frames, trim and everything else are exactly the same as the previously approved and currently approved true divided light mullions. He stated that the only difference is the insulated glass.

**Mr. Lominack** said a document was put out by Park Service which deals with some of the interpretations, recommendations and elaborations that are within the Secretary of Interior's Standards. The standard that deals with replacement windows says "that replacing in-kind an entire window that true material to repair using the same sash and pane configuration and other design detail. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible when the replacement windows are deteriorated beyond repair, the compatible substitute material may be considered." He said this is not an economical consideration, although surprisingly, the insulated windows are slightly less expensive than the true divided light in this particular window because it is a manufactured and tested unit. Mr. Lominack said it is a technical reason that they are requesting a recommendation from this Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals for approval. Mr. Lominack entertained questions from the Board.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Lomianck what he meant by "technical."

**Mr. Lominack** said he was referring to the ground problem. He said that the true divided light windows in this size, there is not a manufacturer on the market that makes the true divided light of this size that meets the wind loading and impact requirements which have to do with the protection of the total integrity of the building. Mr. Lominack said he retracts what he said as they do, but in each case they have a mullion about an one and one-half wide; and this is another problem.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said the window is not a visual request. He cannot support the petition. He was more comfortable with the metal clad true divided light.

**Mr. Merriman** said the last time, this was a unique situation with the metal building where the windows would be flush with the outside. The one thing that pushed him over the edge was having the clad windows. The ordinance needs to be followed.

**Mr. Engle** said if the if the interior is painted black, the spacer is painted and the exterior is painted black, you might be able to hide it. But if the interior is not going to be the exact same as the spacer and interior, you read it has an half inch.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Lominack what is the color of the interior.

**Mr. Lominack** said it is black through and through. It will be the same color.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** stated that she was not having a problem visualizing this as black. She

asked how would the Board feel if someone came forward and wanted to paint it white.

**Mr. Howington** answered that he believes the motion would need to be worded carefully. He said in his opinion the only thing he fears is for this to set a precedent. There is no other building in Savannah like this. He asked the Board how would they feel if the muntin profile was white.

**Mr. Engle** stated that he does not believe this is the issue here. He said he would be comfortable with the metal cladding as long as it is true divided light.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Lominack if there was a problem getting the inkwell color.

**Mr. Lominack** answered that it would probably be a cost problem, but they could probably have gotten one had they planned for it ahead. He said there are a lot of bad windows out there, but this window is not one of them. They quite frankly would prefer to use the clad window which is what they presented at the last meeting. But, the person who made the presentation on behalf of their office thought it was over. When Ms. Harris asked him about a continuance, he did not realize what happened.

**Mr. Lominack** said the clad would be their preference, but the clad presented at the last meeting was the double glazed. The clad is preferred and is a more expensive window. One of the things that he has noticed over the years with the single true divided light glazed wood window is where the window fails is primarily from the inside because of the condensation because of air conditioning. Condensation forms on the window and goes down into the wood and mullions. But, air conditioning did not exist when these windows were made. Therefore, this is a kind of built in problem.

**Dr. Henry** asked what is a "clad window?"

**Mr. Lominack** explained that the clad window is exactly the same profile as this window and the window that they are seeking approval. It is clad with a metal rather than just wood. But, it is wood base.

**Mr. Howington** explained that a clad window is a wood window that has a metal covering over the top of it.

**Dr. Williams** asked would there be the same problem with the interior condensation.

**Mr. Lominack** said if you have the insulated glass, you do not have this problem. He said he does not know if there is a window manufacturer that makes a true divided light single glazed clad window. There are times when this building is being used that the windows will be open and it will naturally be ventilated. It gets to be an operational problem when you repeatedly have to remove things and put them back. Mr. Lominack said that the building transitioned over time. This particular building was nearly lost. A new building could have been built cheaper. They feel the need to put in a better quality window. It is a big window.

**Dr. Williams** asked if a mock up with an appropriate window would make a difference.

**Mr. Engle** said he could go along with a single glazed, but double glazed makes the difference.

**Board Action:**

Denial of the request to amend the previous approval to change the approved windows to Kolbe & Kolbe Ultra Majesta, wood, simulated divided light windows because the amendment does not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation or design standards.

Recommend denial to the Zoning Board of Appeals from:

- The Secretary of the Interior’s Standard which state, “Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.” - PASS
- The design standard which states, “Historic windows, frames, sashes and glazing shall not be replaced unless it is documented and verified by the Preservation Officer that they have deteriorated beyond repair. Replacement windows on historic buildings shall replicate the original historic windows in composition, design, and material.”

Because the proposed amendment does not meet the criteria for a variance.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Reed Engle

- |                             |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Reed Engle                  | - Aye     |
| Nicholas Henry              | - Aye     |
| Keith Howington             | - Abstain |
| Zena McClain, Esq.          | - Aye     |
| Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. | - Aye     |
| Linda Ramsay                | - Aye     |

Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Nay

## IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

## X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

24. [Amended Petition of Walter Freeman | 13-005845-COA | 331 Tattnall Street | Staff Approved - Garage Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 331 Tattnall Street 13-5845-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [New Garage Door For 331 Tattnall.pdf](#)

Attachment: [New Garage Door For 331 Tattnall.pdf](#)

Attachment: [New Garage Door For 331 Tattnall.pdf](#)

Attachment: [New Garage Door For 331 Tattnall.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Amended Petition of Lat H. Purser | 14-000856-COA | 5 West Broughton Street - Ste A |Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 5 West Broughton Street Ste A 14-000856-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [2nd Submittal Packet - 5 West Broughton Street Ste A 14-000856-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Amended Petition of Gretchen West | 14-000894-COA | 341 East Broad Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 341 East Broad Street 14-000894-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [2nd Submittal Packet - 341 East Broad Street 14-000894-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Joshua Beckler for Coastal Canvas Products Co. | 14-001005-COA | 601 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Awnings](#)

Attachment: [COA - 601 East Bay Street 14-001005-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 601 East Bay Street 14-001005-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Rose Mae B. Millikan | 14-001066-COA | 31 East Broad Street | Staff Approved - Color Change/Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 31 East Broad Street 14-001066-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 31 East Broad Street 14-001066-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Metalcrafts, Inc. | 14-001098-COA | 124 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Scupper/Downspouts](#)

Attachment: [COA Decision - 14-001098-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Jerry and Mary Rooney | 14-001119-COA | 212 Houston Street | Staff Approved - Gutters](#)

Attachment: [COA - 212 Houston Street 14-001119-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 212 Houston Street 14-001119-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Charles Morgensen | 14-001120-COA | 408 & 410 Price Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 408 and 410 Price Street 14-001120-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 408 & 410 Price Street.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Patricia Mason | 14-001141-COA | 522 East Gordon Street | Staff Denial - Trellis](#)

Attachment: [COA - 522 East Gordon Street 14-001141-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 522 East Gordon Street 14-001141-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Amended Petition of Eric McManus | 14-001143-COA | 134 Houston Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 134 Houston Street 14-001143-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [2md Submittal Packet - 134 Houston Street 14-001143-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Peter Kusek for West Broughton Partners, LLC | 14-001146-COA | 217-221 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Replace and Remove Stucco](#)

Attachment: [COA - 217-221 West Broughton Street 14-001146-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [1973 sanborn.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.



35. [Petition of Eric O'Neill for Greenline Architecture | 14-001149-COA | 10 East Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Louver Screen and Gate](#)

Attachment: [COA - 10 East Taylor Street 14-001149-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [13017 Louver Gate-Drawings.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Amended Petition of T. Joe Duckworth | 14-001206-COA | 550 Nicoll Street, 552 Nicoll Street A, B, C; 554 Nicoll Street | Staff Approved - Handrails](#)

Attachment: [COA - 550 Nicoll Street 14-001206-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 550 Nicoll Street 14-001206-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Emily Dawson | 14-001251-COA | 201 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 201 West Oglethorpe Avenue 14-001251-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 West Oglethorpe Avenue 14-001251-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Gillian Wagstaff | 14-001270-COA | 19 Jefferson Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 19 Jefferson Street 14-001270-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 19 Jefferson Street 14-001270-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of Lukejohn Dickson | 14-001298-COA | 222 East Jones Street | Staff Approved - Trellis](#)

Attachment: [COA - 222 East Jones Street 14-001298-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 222 East Jones Street 14-001298-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Petition of Neil Dawson | 14-001358-COA | 125 West River Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 125 West River Street 14-001358-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 125 West River Street 14-001458-COA.pdf](#)

41. [Petition of Kevin McCarthy | 14-001359-COA | 20 West Jones Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 20 West Jones Street 14-001359-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 20 West Jones Street 14-001359-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. [Petition of Natalie Aiken | 14-001395-COA | 220 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Exhaust Ductwork](#)

Attachment: [COA - 220 West Broughton Street 14-001395-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 220 West Broughton Street.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. [Petition of Paul Labrosse | 14-001419-COA | 414 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Garage Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 414 East Oglethorpe Avenue 14-001419-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 414 East Oglethorpe Avenue 14-001419-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. [Jason Holified | 14-001458-COA | 610 Price Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 610 Price Street 14-001458-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

## XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

45. [Report on Work Performed Without a Certificate of Appropriateness](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 4-14-14.pdf](#)

**Mr. Howington** said attached to the Board's packet is a report on the work that was begun without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

## XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

46. [Report on Items Deferred to Staff](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Items Deferred to Staff 4-14-14.pdf](#)

**Mr. Howington** stated that staff has given the Board a written report on the Items Deferred to Staff.

## XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

### Notices

47. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, April 17, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

48. [Next Meeting - Wednesday, May 14, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

#### XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

##### New Business

49. [Discuss request for Special Called Meeting](#)

**Ms. Harris** explained that the New Cultural Art Center will come before the Review Board. A question has come up whether or not the petitioner might have an audience to explain the design concept in a way not responding to staff technical support and recommendation. The petitioner is open to meeting with the Board 30 minutes before the regular meeting to have a Special Called Meeting. She said she asked the Chair what was his preference and he asked that this item be added to today's agenda for discussion among the Board.

**Mr. Howington** said he attended a meeting about the New Cultural Arts Center. He does not know how the Board feels about having a Special Called Meeting.

**Note: It was the consensus of the Board that they would not have a Special Called Meeting prior to the Cultural Arts Center coming before the Board at their regular scheduled meeting.**

#### XV. ADJOURNMENT

50. [Adjourned.](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, Mr. Howington adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen I. Harris  
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem