



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 12, 2014 1:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

MARCH 12, 2014 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Keith Howington, Chair
Ebony Simpson, Vice Chair
Reed Engle
Dr. Nicholas Henry
T. Jerry Lominack
Stephen Merriman, Jr.
Linda Ramsay
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Member Not Present: Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian
Majorie Weibe-Reed

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](#)

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

2. [Petition of Jerry Williams | 13-006206-COA | 510 West Bryan Street | Signs and Fence](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval of the two principal use fascia signs and

fence at 510 West Bryan Street with the condition that the gooseneck lamps be located directly above - PASS the signs, so that the signs and light fixtures fit within the concrete cornice line.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

3. [Petition of Lizette Smith | 14-000403-COA | 318 East Jones Street | Gate](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the gate enclosure at 318 East Jones Street because it is visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

4. [Petition of Steve Crockett | 14-000623-COA | 514 East Charlton Lane | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the petition for the after-the-fact fence at

514 East Charlton Lane with the condition that the fence be painted to match the color of the primary building. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

5. [Petition of Sandra Sherrill | 14-000673-COA | 510 Hartridge Street | Ramp Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Board Action:

Approval to add an accessible ramp to the west side of the building located at 510 Hartridge Street with the following condition to be submitted to staff for - PASS final review and approval:

1. Add cap and base to the balustrade posts.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

6. [Petition of Natalie Aiken, Hansen Architects | 14-000681-COA | 110 West Broughton Street | Alteration](#)

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

Attachment: [Historic Photographs.pdf](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval to rehabilitate the building located at 110 West Broughton Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval.

Conditions:

1. Provide a specification for the proposed new wood, double-hung windows that includes details showing the muntin design and size. - PASS
2. Provide the mortar composition specification, color sample, and a four-by-four test patch for review and approval by staff prior to full execution of the repointing.
3. Provide all paint color selection and aluminum storefront finish selection.
4. Provide final locations and sizes of electrical meters on lane façade.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

7. [Petition of Becky Lynch, Lynch Associates Architects, PC | 14-000687-COA | 546 East Harris Street | New Construction Amendment](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- application.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Amended Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Original Drawings.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the proposed amendment to remove the rooftop structure, eliminate the fire-rated windows on the east façade, and change the window configuration on the south (courtyard) façade of the carriage house because the proposed project is - PASS

visually compatible and meets the design standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

8. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates | 14-000690-COA | 7 Drayton Street | Alterations/Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Aerial Map 690.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 7 Drayton Street 14-000690-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal packet- Metal panel-A.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal packet- Metal panel-B.pdf](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

- Provide color samples to staff for review and approval.
 - On the light well enclosure, ensure the storefronts are inset at least four inches from the face of the building.
- PASS

Because the project is visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye

Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

9. [Approval of Minutes of February 12, 2014](#)

Attachment: [02-12-2014 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve February 12, 2014 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Not Present

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

10. [Petition of Jeff Cramer | 14-000693-COA | 505 East Congress Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Board Action:

Continue the petition at the petitioner's request to the meeting of April 9, 2014 - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ebony Simpson

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

11. [Petition of James F. Wubbena | 13-005467-COA | 307-311 East Huntingdon Street | New Construction Townhouses: Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Photographs context.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Application.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Historic Building Map - Stephens Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Contributing building details.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Drawings and Site Plan.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- material and specs.pdf](#)

Mr. James Wubbena was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. This project has been before the Board on numerous occasions. Most recently was on February 12, 2014, when the Board approved Part I, Height and Mass with the following conditions:

1. Revise the site plan to show the correct location of the rear fence;
2. Simplify the fenestration pattern on the rear façade; and
3. Ensure the HVAC units are not visible from the public right-of-way or from the adjacent building to the east.

Ms. Harris stated that at the February meeting the Board also recommended approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the 75% lot coverage requirement to allow for 78% lot coverage for each of these three lots. At the February meeting, the petitioner requested a continuance for Part II, Design Details in order for him to restudy various aspects of the design.

Ms. Harris said the fenestration pattern on the rear façade has been simplified. The site plan showing the rear fence has been corrected. As far as changes to the design, brick quoins have been added to the corners of the building; additional brackets have been added at the edge of each building. The windows have been revised to include two-over-two windows in the central buildings. A transom has been revised and the lintel was removed. The east façade has been changed to stucco. She said as the Board will recall, it was previously Hardi-plank. There was also a discussion among the Board about an alternative brick which has been revised. The refuse and HVAC locations have been provided.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of Part II, Design Details with the following to be submitted to staff for review and approval because the project is visually compatible and meets the with the design standards:

1. Ensure the doors are inset no less than three inches from the façade:

2. Provide a window specification;
3. Ensure that the railing height does not exceed 36";
4. Add a cap and base molding to the posts on the rear deck;
5. Restudy the front entrance to ensure it is appropriately substantial; and
6. Provide electric meter location to staff for review and approval.

Dr. Henry said plaster is a step ahead of Hardi-plank. He was trying to visualize this; brick front, plastered sides and back.

Ms. Harris explained that only one side will be stucco and will be minimally visible because of the distance between it and the adjacent building.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Ed Hoffman came forward and stated that his wife, Susan Meeks, and he are the property owners. They are excited to construct homes that compliment the neighborhood and improve the existing vacant lots. He said that they have always been drawn to the traditional architecture of the Historic District. Their intention throughout this entire process has been to study the historic guidelines; study the existing architecture, and design homes that will fit within the traditional style and within their own place and time.

Mr. Hoffman said they have worked hard to listen to and incorporate the feedback from the staff and the Board. He said for example, after they learned that there was a volume of historic surveys of significant buildings in Savannah that identified the contributing buildings in each ward, they carefully walked their ward, Stephens Ward, at least 50 times and took pictures of each historically significant building so that they could take inspiration from them.

Mr. Hoffman stated that he has been drawn to the older homes in their ward that reflects the traditional or Georgian style. But, the Board suggested that since their ward is a transitional ward rich Victorian and Italianate details, their homes should include and reflect Victorian themes, elements, styles and Italianate as well. He said he is grateful for those suggestions because he believes that their homes are more attractive now as a result of that feedback. He showed the Board a photo of their design now in comparison of their first design. Mr. Hoffman stated that as the Board can see, they listened to the Board's suggestion that they create subtle distinctions between the homes; between the buildings' size to break them up with double brackets between the buildings which were made by Dr. Williams and Mr. Engle.

Mr. Hoffman said they additionally took the Board's suggestion to look into the appropriateness of transom versus lintels over the door; and found that while there may be examples of transoms without lintels and transoms with lintels, that there was no lintels without transoms. They took inspiration from homes on their street and on Gaston Street to design a transom that will fit well with their building and the neighborhood. He also noted that they took the Board's suggestion regarding height and mass and moved the entire building back two feet from the lot line and reduced the width of the porches by half. They also took inspiration from the front porticos of surrounding homes; 307 East Huntingdon particularly as it is next door; they took inspiration from 312 and 314 East Huntingdon Street that are across the street and redesigned their design details to reflect the more detailed Victorian and Italianate columns, balusters, and crown molding and also looked carefully at 204 East Hall Street to reduce the width and heavy appearance of the first floor as suggested by the Board. They carefully considered the brick lattice under the stairs and

decided that whether the brick lattice was original to the neighboring buildings or not, they thought it was visually compatible. If the Board objects to the brick lattice under the stairs, they will remove it; but they believe it adds something. They also listened and heard the feedback that the Board gave the other petitioners and them which is to select brick that is historically appropriate. Therefore, they surveyed the brick within their ward and found that Savannah Gray was actually one of the most common recurring brick styles, and while Savannah Grays are not made any longer and many of the reproductions were not consistent with the Savannah Gray bricks that were used in their ward, when they put the sample board, the Brown Sperry up against these buildings it was an incredibly close match; and while they also felt that the old Savannah bricks they chose the last time were a close match, the Board asked them to find a brick that had less variation. Consequently, they changed their selection to Brown Sperry which has less variation.

Mr. Hoffman said they did a careful study of the original architecture of the historical significant buildings in their ward verses what is visible today. They learned that many of the buildings were built in the mid to late eighteen hundreds and that Victorian and Italianate elements were added later. Their homes have been designed to be appropriate within this ward. He said that Mr. Jim Wubbena, their architect, has been very responsive of the intent, design and goals of the homes and it has been all of their efforts to listen to the staff, Historic Review Board and the community. They believe that they have been able to produce homes that compliment the neighborhood. Mr. Hoffman thanked the staff, the Board and the community for their feedback.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Hoffman if he had any objections to the two-over-two windows that the staff suggested for all three of the townhomes.

Mr. Hoffman answered no.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with staff that the windows in all of the units should be two-over-two. They also agree about making the front door more substantial and would be in favor of adding or returning a lintel above the door and/or a transom. The brackets or corbels that are indicated are shown in a sort of variation of the single and double bracket; they feel should be more substantial. They think that the individual brackets are about three inches in width currently shown. Therefore, they suggest making them either a little more wider or use a double bracket repeated all the way across as opposed to using a variation of single and double. She said there were some examples submitted that showed a continuous double bracket.

Ms. Meunier said they do not believe that the interior stair rail along the entry stair is common. There appears to be a stair rail that goes on the interior of the stoop and wraps around. The HSF believes this is an odd occurrence; they do not believe this is appropriate, but in this particular case since the stair curves, they do not know if this is required, but this could be how it turned out on the drawing, but they believe that the balusters should align when looking at it in elevation so that they are not staggered and you are basically reading a full wall of balusters.

Ms. Meunier said that while the HSF knows that enforcement of where trash cans are actually kept is not the purview of the Historic Review Board, they know that the trash cans tend to always remain in the lane and not where they are designated to be located. However, it is in the Board's purview to review the location and screening for trash cans.

The HSF suggests that, if possible, a fenced in area be created so that all of the trash cans for the units be housed there.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Lominack said some statements were made that he does not believe were correct. He does not believe that Mr. Engle suggested that the petitioner use Victorian details on the buildings nor does he believe that the Board recommended that they go to the various buildings in the neighborhood and pick pieces off of them and put them on this building. Mr. Lominack said he does not believe that this was the intent of the Board's discussion as far as drawing inspiration from the buildings in the neighborhood.

Mr. Engle said he agrees with the Historic Savannah Foundation that the brackets are thin. Italianate brackets are not that narrow. The Board wanted to see some kind of definition between the three units. He does not consider the buildings Victorian, but Italianate. However, this is up for grabs. He does not know how the balusters would be aligned because if you move six inches to the right, they will not line up. Mr. Engle said he believes the petitioner has them aligned, but it depends on one's point of view whether they are lined up or not. Mr. Engle explained that the reason the petitioner has to do it is because the stairway is not adjacent to the house. It is 15 or 18 inches away from the face of the house. If a stairway was not there, you could fall down into the space. Therefore, a set of handrails must be here.

Mr. Merriman stated that if the petitioner has the balusters at the same place and the columns are set at the same distance off of the porch, they will be at same spot until you hit that winder; but this one stops and the other keeps going. He believes the petitioner showed them this way so that they could see that there are two rails instead of one.

Mr. Engle said he was not sure about the two-over-two verses the one-over-one. It does not bother him that one is different than the other. These do not have to be identical houses.

Mr. Merriman said he agrees with Ms. Ramsay; he hates to see one-over-one. They look too plain.

Mr. Howington said he believes the petitioner agreed to do the two-over-two.

Dr. Williams said the Savannah Gray bricks were a different dimension. He said he was curious why the petitioner wants this kind of coarse rustic texture as Savannah Gray bricks were smoother and typically covered with stucco. Very rarely was the Savannah Gray bricks left exposed because they were such a coarse brick. Therefore, to try and evoke something that is very rustic and rugged looking on a building that looks so fine, he does not understand the logic of that.

Ms. Simpson asked how the Board felt about the front door and the windows.

Mr. Howington said the staff recommended a restudy of the windows. However, as the petitioner was not invited to respond to the staff's or public's recommendations, he will now allow Mr. Hoffman or Mr. Wubbena to respond.

Mr. Wubbena responded that basically they agree with the staff. He said there were a few comments that they feel are covered, but they will make them clear in the drawings. One clarification is the rail height. It is dimensional as 36 inches on the drawings and details.

The same thing is with the inset on the windows and doors. They are detailed as well; they will be windows and doors. They agree with everything else regarding the staff's recommendations and will be happy to work with the staff to ensure that any of the changes that the Board recommends get implemented. They will present them to the staff so that they will meet everybody's approval.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Wubbena how he felt about making the brackets a little larger.

Mr. Wubbena answered that he necessarily did not have a problem with this. They looked at some of the brackets in the neighborhood and went with what they could tell without actually measuring them.

Dr. Henry asked how large the brackets are now.

Mr. Wubbena answered that the brackets are three inches. If they went to four and one-half inches, they would be able to easily do this.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Wubbena if he could confirm that the balusters would align. The drawings show that the balusters are staggered.

Mr. Wubbena explained that this is basically the way the railings were setup in the software. They were staggered, but if you look at the railings dead on, they would be aligned and equally placed on the treads going up the stairs both front and back. He said it is correct that the reason there are two is because the stairs do set off the building façade because they have windows back there. Therefore, the Board needed to see the rails.

Mr. Howington thanked Mr. Wubbena for the level of drawings presented and the homework they have done on the surrounding neighborhood as their backup data.

Board Action:

Approval of Part II Design Details with the following to be submitted to staff for review and approval because the project is visually compatible and meets the design standards:

1. Ensure the doors are inset no less than three inches from the façade;
2. Provide a window specification;
3. Ensure that the railing height does not exceed 36"; - PASS
4. Add a cap and base molding to the posts on the rear deck;
5. Restudy the front entrance to ensure it is appropriately substantial;
6. Provide more substantial brackets; and

7. Provide electric meter location to staff for review and approval.

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

12. [Petition of Billy Nelson | 14-000177-COA | 427 Habersham Street | Arbor and Porch](#)

Attachment: [Application - 427 Habersham Street 14-000177-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Ortho-Zoning-Imagery.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps -00177.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Previous application - Drawings.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Previous application - Photos.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Previous application- Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

Ms. Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to add an additional arbor and replace the existing non-historic covered stoop with an open trellis porch which will be wood and will cover an existing deck. The model was passed to the Board showing what is being proposed. The Historic Savannah Foundation has an easement on this property. The Sanborn Maps show that in 1888 there were no porches indicated at the rear, but by 1916 a one-story porch was added to the southernmost property. By 1955, that one-story porch has become a two-story wooden porch. This is retained in the 1973 Sanborn Maps. There are three existing identical or nearly identical stoops with open decks on each of the three row houses. Ms. Harris said she was unable to locate an approval for this alteration, but she did locate a Historical Review Board approval dating back to 1974 which had all three houses received approval for double rear porch and steps to match the southernmost row house which the Board saw on the Sanborn Maps. It does not appear that this work was completed. In March, 2012, the Review Board approved the fence and arbor which is shown and located on the model.

Ms. Harris explained that this application was on the February 12, 2014 agenda, but was removed from the agenda in order for the petitioner to provide some additional information on the site plan. The petitioner has subsequently revised the proposal slightly

creating an open trellis porch as opposed to the February 12, 2014 proposal which was a covered porch.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the arbor and rear porch addition at 427 Habersham Street because it is visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards.

Dr. Henry asked how the 75-25 ratio is met in a structure such as this.

Ms. Harris explained that it is built on top of the existing deck and, therefore, the proposed lot coverage does not change. However, if they calculate the proposed lot coverage, the trellis, itself, would not count against this. Therefore, she feels comfortable saying that she feels confident that the lot coverage would be met.

Mr. Lominack asked if a trellis above the porch, too or does it have some sort of translucent material. It is not a covered porch. A trellis is a covered porch.

Ms. Harris answered that she would refer to it as an open trellis porch.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Nelson, the designer, came forward and stated that the model and the plan look different than what the Board last month. He said that a good thing that came from last month's meeting was that they spoke with the next door neighbors who were concerned about the mass because the sides were going to be closed in and there was going to be a roof. Mr. Nelson said they were trying to appease the neighbors and felt this was going to let light in and would not be a large mass next to their porch. However, he believes the neighbor is okay with the present design; and he personally likes this design better, too. He likes the idea of continuing what they have already and finish the back of the house that way.

Dr. Henry said this is a handsome design.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said as staff mentioned in their report, the HSF holds an easement on this property. They have had thorough discussions with the owners and designer. They have spent time on site going through the entire design and have approved the alterations for the purpose of their easement. Therefore, they agree with the staff's recommendation for approval.

Board Action:

Approval of the proposed arbor and rear porch addition at 427 Habersham Street because the project is visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: T. Jerry Lominack	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

13. [Petition of Hoffman Engineering Group, Inc. | 14-000181-COA | 522 East Gaston Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

- Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial - Facing North.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Application - 522 East Gaston Street 14-000181-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Mass Model.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

Mr. Tom Hoffman 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 duplex with attached carriage houses to be located on the vacant property at 522 East Gaston Street.

Ms. Michalak stated that the eastern side of the duplexes are proposed to be stories with a third story setback from three of the elevations and the western side is proposed to be one-story with roof top access at the rear. The carriage houses are two-stories on the eastern side and one-story on the western side. She wanted to make the Board aware of an unusual condition with this site. Ms. Michalak pointed out the vacant lot with the vehicles in it and pointed out the property line with the new construction adjacent to it. She explained that when the new construction was built [she does not know how it happened] but, clearly a 29 foot high CMU fire wall is on the property line between this and the new construction. Consequently, a lot of the design of this is driven by disguising the fire wall.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends Approval of the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass 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 the Board for review with Part II, Design Details:

- a. Provide additional voids on the west façade of the one-story portion of the main building to meet the "distance between windows" standard.

Ms. Michalak said staff also recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a third-story in a two and one-half story height zone because the proposed height is visually compatible, the third-story is set back from three facades, and the third-story will be minimally visible from the public-right of way.

Mr. Engle asked if the second floor with elevations center window meets the 3 to 5 ratio.

Ms. Michalak said a door is behind the parapet wall. This is one of the facades that staff is recommending approval of the third story because it will not be seen from the street.

Mr. Howington stated that if a third window is not added on the ground floor, would the petitioner need to go to the ZBA.

Ms. Michalak said no the petitioner would not need to go to the ZBA as it would be the Review Board's decision.

Dr. Williams asked if the ordinance defines a half-story in the case of a two and one-half story building. What constitutes a half-story and what form should it take.

Ms. Michalak answered that staff actually researched this when this came up. When they put in dictionary.com it was shown as a space under a gable roof that has dormers on the upper level.

Dr. Williams said he was wondering that since from the sidewalk the third floor is evidently not going to be visible, this is an example of a half-story that the Board can accept since the ordinance is not explicit regarding this and not send this to ZBA.

Mr. Howington stated that this is similar to a rooftop addition and rooftop additions do not have to go to ZBA.

Mr. Engle said the only situation he has seen is when it is under a gable roof; and you don't have four units. He said they are playing games with terminology and he believes it is a big mistake.

Ms. Simpson said this is an interesting design that they do not see every day. However, for the petitioner to create this kind of design and for the structures to be physically connected, is very interesting to her. Secondly, how common is this?

Ms. Michalak said this is not extremely common and when she first saw it, this is the first question she asked the petitioner. She asked the petitioner to show her where she might see something like this. There are some examples, contributing buildings as well.

Ms. Simpson as if the buildings are in the same ward.

Ms. Michalak explained that this ward stops at the south side of Jones Street and this is on the north side of Jones Street. However, she believes that this is the most similar one where they are literally, physically attached on a one story and a two story.

Mr. Lominack stated that he does not believe that they should be looking for something that is necessarily similar to something else when it is something that is on its own merit, belongs to where it is being put, and is well thought out.

Ms. Simpson said she believes that it is simply in terms of context. Does it fit contextually? She said also that staff stated in their report that typically one story structures are not in this area. However, the staff is comfortable with a one-story building here.

Ms. Michalak stated that the Beach Institute is really an unusual area. There are tons are one-stories in this area.

Ms. Simpson said yes in the area, but what about this block. In this block specifically,

one story is not common.

Ms. Michalak stated that this is an unusual situation that this entire block is two stories.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Hoffman, property owner, thanked the staff for their work on the petition. They look forward to continuing working with the staff on the next phase. They are in agreement with the staff's recommendations. The third story covers 48 and one-half percent of the footprint of the building. It is under 50 percent. He explained that one section of the ordinance compared a habitable space above a roofline with also a habitable space under the rafters of the roof. This somewhat equates the space under the rafters of a roof with a structure above the roofline.

Dr. Williams said he was curious why the petitioner decided to mass it with three stories and basically one story on the other. Why not just have two units side-by-side that are the height up to the parapet.

Mr. Hoffman said they like this and it was their preference to have basically two and one-half stories and the single story with it. Cost is also a factor. It will cost more to build a two-story structure than a single story.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the History Savannah Foundation (HSF) said the parapet roof does give them some pause because there are no examples on the street and it is not as common in this area. She said also that a parapet that sort of implied that when they look at materials it would have to be some sort of masonry material, brick or stucco as it would not be as appropriate obviously with wood; which is also not as common on this block. This why it gives them pause, but also at the same time they understand the situation with the CMU wall and this would address it much better than if there were to be a gable or something because the CMU wall would be visible. Therefore, they are more accepting of the parapet for that reason.

Ms. Meunier said the level of the ground floor appears to be a little lower than the level of the height of stoop. They question if the two should align to be more visually compatible. On the entire, it does not really matter, but she guesses more visually on the exterior of how the relationship is perceived.

Ms. Meunier said she realizes that they are not talking about Part II, but the HSF wanted to bring it to the petitioner's attention that the structure over the door, whether it is a cornice or a roof, is heavy in detailing and mass. Therefore, they suggest that this be restudied. She said otherwise, the HSF agrees with the comments staff made in their recommendation.

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

Mr. Hoffman said the blocking is the reason for the parapet. They will be working on Part II and refining all the trim details and adjusting the floor height.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Hoffman about the stoop.

Mr. Hoffman said they will take care of the stoop in Part II, Design Detail.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said parapets are not exclusively masonry.

Mr. Howington said the idea of a wooden parapet is fine. It does occur in the district.

Ms. Simpson said she is aware that several of the Board members may not agree with her, but she does not believe that the height fits into the context of this block. Perhaps the mass fits, but she does not believe that the height of either structure fits here; especially with the half-story on the two and one-half story building. Ms. Simpson said she does not believe that the one-story structure is contextually appropriate in this block.

Dr. Williams asked if Ms. Simpson's issue is with how the things appear from the street level.

Ms. Simpson answered yes, along with a lot of other issues. She said this is different because it is a new structure; she believes that someone called it a new top addition, but this is not an addition because it has not been built yet.

Mr. Engle said it will be evident from the west on Gaston Street. When you walk up the street you will see it as the property is large. The addition on the side will not block that as you will have total view when you come up Gaston Street.

Mr. Howington asked what the difference is.

Mr. Engle explained that if it was a rooftop addition, it would have to be setback so that it will not be visible from the street. This is visible from the street from the west side.

Mr. Howington stated that in the past, they have had a rooftop addition that was not a rooftop addition because it was a new building that was approved and had a rooftop structure very much like this that you could see from the west.

Dr. Williams said the alternative to the letter of the code would be a half-story as a side gable that would rise, but not block the CMU wall. Therefore, this would be equally visible than Gaston, unless the Board approves them to do a side gable with a parapet that is doing nothing but blocking the view of the CMU wall. He believes that sometimes they get handcuffed by if there isn't precedence on the block for something that somehow it all is compatible. Is this in spirit not just on that block, but in the area? As the staff mentioned, this area probably has more one-story buildings than two-story buildings.

Dr. Williams stated it is conceivable that East Gaston Street could have had a one-story at some point. Therefore, it is compatible with what could have happened and is certainly compatible with the area. He does not know if they literally have to look at this block. Are they restricted to compatibility just on the block?

Ms. Simpson said this is just her opinion and it will be interesting to see what this looks like once it is built.

Mr. Engle asked if they would feel the same way if a CMU wall was not there.

Mr. Merriman answered probably not; this is a special condition.

Mr. Engle stated that there are houses all over Savannah that have three story brick buildings and brick is on the sides that are not a part of the new construction; this situation

is all over Savannah where it abuts another building and you see the side all over the building. This is not all that different.

Mr. Merriman said on a case-by-case basis looking at this particular situation, it is going to improve on what is here now. This will make it look better than what you have now.

Mr. Lominack said if there is no obligation to hide the CMU wall, then the petitioner is doing something that will probably be a plus.

Dr. Williams pointed out that one block north, which is Gaston Street, has a little one-story cottage almost identical to this one.

Ms. Simpson asked if it is attached to the two-story next to it.

Dr. Williams answered no; it is a freestanding cottage with a two-story next door to it.

Ms. Simpson said she realizes that there are expressions in the area close by, but she is concerned with it being connected to the building.

Dr. Williams said he believes the building reads as two contiguous structures, not as one. Therefore, he believes it reads as two houses.

Dr. Williams asked the Board how they felt about the staff's recommendation regarding the windows

Mr. Howington said he likes the windows as they are.

Ms. Michalak stated that the elevation does not meet the distance between the window standards. Therefore, staff felt that because it will be highly visible from Gaston that it should meet that standard. This is the staff's recommendation.

Mr. Howington stated that on the side of other buildings in the past, they have not had to meet that standard because it is not on the primary façade.

Mr. Lominack said he believes that the petitioner agreed to do that.

Mr. Howington said he does not know how the Board feels about the window, but he likes it. However, the petitioner has stated that he will go either way.

Dr. Williams said the more windows you have; the harder it is to make the interior space usable.

Mr. Howington said that is concern is that in the past, not on primary facades, there is spacing in the windows that do not need to be.

Dr. Williams asked what is the spacing between this wall and the neighboring house to the west where the trees are shown in the drawings.

Mr. Hoffman answered 14 feet.

Mr. Engle said he agrees with the staff; they are visible. It is not like a four foot side passage, but fourteen feet and you are going to see it. This is attempting to be historic looking. If it was modern, it would be a different story, but this addition does not look modern. It is copying an historic form, and, therefore, he believes it should go by the standard.

Board Action:

1. Approve the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass 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 the Board for review with Part II, Design Details.
 - a. Provide additional voids on the west façade of the one-story portion of the main building to meet the “distance between windows” standard. - PASS

2. Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a third-story in a two and one-half story height zone because the proposed height is visually compatible, the third-story is set back from three facades, and the third-story will be minimally visible from the public-right of way.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams
Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Nay
Robin Williams	- Aye

14. [Petition of Jeff Cramer | 14-000204-COA | 509 East Congress Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Application - 509 East Congress Street 14-000204-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial - Facing North.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Site and Surrounding Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Context Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Mass Model.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Specifications.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Samples.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 II Design Details for a two and one-half story detached residence on a vacant property located at 509 East Congress Street. The Board approved the petition for Part I, Height and Mass, on February 12, 2014 with two conditions:

1. Restudy the roof shape and height of the dormers proposed on the front façade.
2. Restudy the roof shape of the two-story front porch.

Ms. Michalak said the petitioner has addressed the conditions. The dormer's roof shape is now a 2 1/2 to 12 pitched shed roof and the front porch has a four to 12 pitched shed roof. She passed the petitioner's stucco sample, roof sample, and paint color sample to the Board.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for new construction Part II Design Details with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for a final review and approval:

1. Provide detailed information on the vents proposed in the foundation walls.
2. Redesign the architrave on the second story of the front porch to be more proportionate and visually compatible.

Dr. Henry asked if two-over-two windows are being smacked together.

Ms. Michalak answered yes; they are paired windows. These windows are common historically as well as in new construction as long as the individual windows, themselves, meet the proper proportions which these windows do.

Mr. Engle asked why the elevation in the upper right meets the standards of window spacing when the project before this one did not.

Ms. Michalak said that this is the same thing with the open lot on the side. This would have been a Part I issue.

Mr. Engle said he believes two more windows should be added if they are going to be consistent.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cramer said the architrave on the second floor should not be that thick. He explained that the trim got off set above the beam. Therefore, it will be the same size as the architrave below to give it a little more detail on the top. It has a little roofline that should not be there.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Cramer if he was saying this is a drawing error.

Mr. Cramer answered yes; on the top porch it is too tall. It should be down about four inches.

Dr. Williams asked what are the dimensions of those two architraves. Are they the same?

Mr. Cramer answered that the exposure should be the same for both.

Mr. Engle said there is no window on the west kitchen wall. There is none on the east wall. This Board cannot go back now and say the petitioner has to put a window on the first

floor.

Mr. Cramer said the lots are very small and if they put a window in the kitchen, there would not be enough room for appliances.

Mr. Engle said there are no appliances on the west wall.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation stated that they had one comment. They suggest that the dormers be more evenly spaced on the roof. Presently, it appears that they are aligned with the fenestration and the bays below, but in their experience it is more typical that they do not line up with the fenestration of the rest of the house. They are centered on the roof. Ms. Meunier said, therefore, the HSF suggests that the dormers be evenly spaced. They appear to be too far on the ends.

Mr. Howington invited Mr. Cramer to respond to the public comments if he so desired.

Mr. Cramer did not wish to respond.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Lominack said the architrave generated more discussion. He believes this could be resolved with the staff.

Mr. Howington asked the Board for their opinion regarding the fan board running across the middle of the building.

Mr. Engle said he believes it breaks up the mass.

Ms. Ramsay said short of having windows on this side, it does break up the mass. But, it is unusual.

Mr. Howington said it is a very unusual detail. He asked Mr. Cramer if he would be willing to restudy the spacing between the dormers.

Mr. Cramer said he could put the dormers closer together, but they will not line up on the columns.

Mr. Howington said maybe the dormers could be put back where they were.

Mr. Cramer said the last time he had the porches inset, but the Board did not like them being inset as they liked it going all the way across. When he pulled the porch out, the dormer came out also.

Mr. Howington stated that the dormers seem more correct there in light of not seeing the shed roof.

Board Action:

Approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details the 2 1/2-story detached residence on the vacant property located at 509 East Congress Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval.

1. Provide detailed information on the vents proposed in the foundation walls. - PASS
2. Redesign the architrave on the second story of the front porch to be more proportionate and visually compatible.
3. Move the dormers on the front elevation closer to the center of the roof.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

15. [Petition of Demetrius Huddleston | 14-000436-COA | 233 Abercorn Street | Rehabilitation / Alteration / Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Historic Savannah Image.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial Photo.pdf](#)

Mr. Demetrius Huddleston was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting the following alterations at 233 Abercorn Street:

Wall - The existing 34" Savannah Grey brick wall that faces east on Abercorn Street will be razed and rebuilt to be six feet high. The existing Savannah Grey bricks will be reused and mixed with more Savannah Greys of a similar color. The existing wrought iron spreaders and granite coping will be relocated to the top of the new wall and will have an overall height of nine feet.

Security Bars - Five new oak leaf wrought iron security bars will be installed over existing windows along East Perry Street as an amendment to previously approved round picket bars.

Privacy Panels - Two new privacy panels will be installed at the parlor level on the corner of the northwest rear elevation and will match the existing panels in color and construction style.

New Pergola - An eight foot, six inch high pergola at the second floor level will be newly constructed over an existing deck. The columns will be slipped fitted onto existing steel posts and the existing railings will be re-attached. Louvered privacy panels will be installed along all three visible sides of the pergola and will match existing panels in color and construction style.

Ms. Harris said that on December 11, 2013 staff approved the installation of round picket security bars on seven ground floor windows along East Perry Lane and Abercorn Street.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the alterations at 233 Abercorn Street with the condition that the historic wall along Abercorn Street not be razed, but that the proposed new height of the fence be achieved by building over the historic fabric of the wall as it currently exists; because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Huddleston said that pergola that they wanted to add onto the third floor matches the one existing on the second floor. It is only a perimeter board pergola and is not a complete frame. This house backs up to the parking lots behind Drayton Towers. Therefore, there is quite a bit of traffic and public viewing of the back of the house. Mr. Huddleston said his client wants more privacy.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Huddleston that otherwise he agrees with the staff's report.

Mr. Huddleston answered yes; and said the reason why he was recommending taking it down is that it is a single wide brick wall and will not support six feet. He said that he will be happy to draw something and build it behind, on top, or whatever the Board likes. But, it is just that the wall will not support anymore weight.

Dr. Williams said the petitioner could build another wall behind the existing wall leaving the bricks that are already here in place.

Mr. Huddleston stated that the coping covers the wall that is here and he could build right behind that wall, fill in between so that there is not a cavity for debris, etc. He can build another Savannah Grey wall behind it and find a matching coping that is noticeably new, but appropriate to the coping on the existing wall.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he believes that the Board should not have allowed as much additions as were allowed in 2008. He believes that this will be adding more mass to the house. The

privacy screens were on the roadside and were not heavy. He believes this is too much and overwhelms the house.

Ms. Ramsay said that when you walk down the lane, you can see through the upper screen. She said she does not object as much to the bottom one.

Mr. Howington asked what if this was a mechanical unit up there and it was a mechanical screen. Would they feel the same way?

Mr. Engle said screening would not be eight feet tall and 16 feet long. This is on all three sides and it might as well be another three story addition. This is a third story; now they can call it the second story, but it is the third story. He does not believe that this is compatible with Savannah's architecture. It is compatible with Charleston's architecture. Mr. Engle said everything that the Board is getting now is bigger.

Mr. Engle said he would not approve the third floor; he can accept the privacy panel on the second floor; they don't look at it from the alley side; they do not see Drayton Street. They approved the deck up there with some reluctance six years ago. But, this is just making it too massive. Mr. Engle said he can approve everything else, but not this.

Mr. Howington said he will be willing to follow the staff's recommendation. He believes it is a good recommendation.

Mr. Huddleston, after the Board cast its vote, said he just wanted to get clarification from the Board of what they approved for him to do. His understanding is he is to keep the coping, keep the wall as is; build a new wall behind the existing wall keeping it structurally separate and maintain the front wall. The wrought iron spreader will be moved to the top of the new wall.

Mr. Howington stated Mr. Huddleston was correct in his understanding, but if he had other questions, get with the staff for a review.

Board Action:

Approval for the security bars, privacy panels, and fence at 233 Abercorn Street with the condition that the existing wall not be raised and that the new fence be built up behind the existing wall; because the work meets the standards and is visually compatible. The Board denies approval for the proposed construction of the third story pergola because it is not visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

16. Petition of Lott + Barber | 14-000634-COA | 540 Selma Street | New Construction Part I Height and Mass

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial Map 000634.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Letter.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Application.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Choctaw Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [O'Neil Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Walton Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Model photographs.pdf](#)

Mr. Todd Naugle 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, and four stories of residences above. The total project size is 232,556 gross square feet with a ground floor footprint of 43,416 square feet. The project is located outside of the Savannah National Historic Landmark District but within the Savannah Historic District. Garrison Elementary School is located to the northwest of the subject site.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends to continue the petition for New Construction, Part I: Height and Mass, for the petitioner to study 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 façades except Selma Street, and on all floors on the north façade (facing Purse Street);
4. Restudy the footprint in order to meet the 75% lot coverage requirement (variance requested - see below);
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 (variance requested - see below);
9. Increase the linear footage ground floor active uses along Selma Street (if the HDBR finds the

bonus story visually compatible); and
10. Increase the number of primary entrances to seven.

Ms. Harris additionally reported that staff recommends approval of the variance request for the structured parking setback, but staff recommends to continue the variance requests for the access structure to not be contained with the additional (bonus) story; 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.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Harris if the standard simply says "active use" or "retail use"

Ms. Harris quoted the following from the ordinance and as written in the staff's report that: "Multiple ground floor active uses permitted in the base zoning district (including but not limited to retail, office, lobby, restaurant) span the length of the façade on all street fronting elevations (not including lanes) and maintain individual primary exterior entrances."

Mr. Engle asked that if the flyover is removed, how would this impact the site and the requested variances as there may not be a dead-end road there. Do we know what is going to happen with circulation?

Ms. Harris answered that a specific master plan has been developed for the area which has assumed that the flyover will be removed. This master plan has been endorsed by City Council. However, it is subject to change with the preliminary engineering documents, etc. These documents are currently underway, but the present general concept is that Purse Street will not extend through this parcel. They have limited the alterations to the infrastructure to the land that is currently underneath the right-of-way of I-16 ramp. They did not predict infrastructure alterations specifically to run through private property.

Mr. Engle said looking at what will be on the first floor level, there are a multiple room, fitness center, and a cycle center. This sounds as these are things only for members or apartment owners. He said he does not see how this meets the intent of the extra story that these would be open to the public. No doors are shown in the hallway, but it is hard for him to believe that the multipurpose room will be open to the neighborhood.

Ms. Harris stated that she has similar concerns, but the petitioner has assured her that the areas will be open to the public.

Dr. Henry stated that Country Inn and Suites put in exercise rooms. The Board gave them special treatment, but they did not do it. He said that he does not remember a submission that violates more technical criteria than this application. He said it is evident that the staff had to spend a great deal of time on this request.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Naugle said it is understandable that a lot needs to be absorbed with this petition request. He said that in addition to his comments, the property owner, Mr. Noble Boykin, would like to make a response as well.

Mr. Naugle stated that he believes from the staff's presentation, that this is a very unique

site. He said he knows that Mr. Lominack is very familiar with this site as he has done a project in Frogtown. Lott Barber believes that they made every effort to try to accommodate all of the Historic Review Board guidelines. They need to take in account that this property is very unique. There are 412 linear feet of frontage on a piece of property he would argue that there is very few properties in the Historic District that has this linear feet of frontage. It can be developed other ways, but they and their client feel that they have a use, be it student housing which is appropriate for this location. It is in close proximity to SCAD, academic buildings, support spaces, and close to SCAD's transportation.

Mr. Naugle said they are meeting all the parking requirements for the site. In terms to the other responses related to giving back, some criteria related to this West Boundary character area where this parcel is located, they are introducing density which is a request that he understands from MPC is to create density to grow the downtown. He said they are related to and context to buildings that unfortunately are low in scale. As Ms. Harris pointed out, many of the buildings have been demolished tremendously throughout the years and, therefore, there is no historic fabric other than immediately Savannah Station.

Mr. Naugle stated he wanted to illustrate what they feel is a good argument for the massing that they propose. It is the future master plan of the West Boundary Interstate I-16 flyover. They took the master plan that the MPC and the City of Savannah generated and overlaid their building on it. They feel the context needs to be beyond what the Board sees today and what will be in the future. He said that they believe that this project has every bit the catalyst to help spur the future removal of the I-16 flyover and I-16 ramp and help extend the density for Historic Savannah to create the Selma Boulevard that is being proposed. Mr. Naugle said they cannot look at Selma Street as just what it is today; it will eventually be removed and what is seen today just might be seen as the view of what would be seen from I-16, this will not always be that situation.

Mr. Naugle said in regards to the height that Ms. Harris spoke of, Frogtown has four and five stories. Five story elements are here; they are 8'-6" taller than the fifth floor tower element of Frogtown on the corner. He said that all of their stories are not five stories, but they are creating three building masses that are similar in size to what you might see in the Landmark District. They are roughly 98 feet by 96 feet; the first one is separated by a stair tower; then it repeats again; and then they breakdown the massing considerably by creating a pool courtyard space which is buffered by the active uses below it; and then another one-story level element of an arbor-awning feature; then repeating that massing block again; and then terminating with another stair tower element feature.

Mr. Naugle said he knows that Ms. Harris and Ms. Michalak have seen this on repeated occasions related to this project. They requested tremendous feedback and sent letters to all the adjacent property owners requesting that they meet with them at Lott Barber along with the property owner on February 28, 2014 to have an informal discussion and talk about their concerns. Representatives were present from Savannah Station, Frogtown; Baptist Church; and they have held private meetings with the School Board on their concerns related to traffic as the Board has a playground where the students cross Cohen Street. They have been working through those issues with the Board. He wanted to tell the Board that from the informal meeting they had with the adjacent property owners, there was no concern whatsoever related to the height or massing of the building. The only

concern expressed to Lott Barber and their client was about parking. Mr. Naugle said they reassured the adjacent property owners [this is student housing] that they are meeting all the parking requirements for multipurpose and/or multifamily; and the parking requirements for retail use. Any parking presently occurring along Selma Street is simply by will of that person as there is no defined parking there and this will continue to occur.

Mr. Naugle said the things that they want to reinforce related to this project is the density, the connectivity. It is student housing that will create a lot of connectivity, a lot of traffic which will be bicycle traffic; these are students and will not drive their cars to class everyday; half of the students will not bring a car, but that does not matter related to the parking requirements. They have created active uses related to the additional story. He said to the Board's concern about it being opened to the public, there are no doors internally to the building for those active uses. They will all be open to the public; related to the fitness their client's campus works will allow for any person that lives via in Frogtown or the neighboring area who wants to come and workout at the fitness area, if they pay a monthly fee, they can come and work out. There will be multiple uses. There will be the fitness area; the bicycle and the multipurpose space will likely be studio space. This is geared towards SCAD students and they want them to have a space where they can express their art and collaborate with other people.

Mr. Naugle said the other things that he believes are important or positive related to the project and partly reference was made to giving back as you create this density, this project and their client will restore the brick wall on Selma Street; reinstall a granite cap along that wall and are also planning to relocate all the overhead power lines along Selma Street in front of their property site to be below ground which will help to beautify Selma Street and of course, the future boulevard.

Mr. Naugle said Ms. Harris mentioned the rezoning. He explained that the only reason they are rezoning this property is because under the B-C zoning, it allows for dormitory, but did not allow multifamily. This project is every bit like a dormitory, but because they are not associated with SCAD, it cannot be called a dormitory. They are seeking a variance from 75% lot coverage and he thinks they all understand that in the Historic District, there are many sites that have 100% lot coverage. Mr. Naugle said he believes that what they are requesting is not unique. Additionally, the comment that was made about adding more windows along the lower level opposite Selma Street, the Board members who are architects may understand this, but as close as they are to the property line, they are limited by code on how many percentage openings they can have in the exterior wall. They have chosen to maximize their percent openings that meet the ordinance at the living levels and not put windows at the parking level. Mr. Naugle said they believe this helps or argue the point that just like they need the buffers and structured parking at right-of-ways, they are not letting any of the parking be visible from Garrison; Purse Street; or the Baptist Church as no one will see any parked cars from within this building. He said he notice for example, that SCAD's Turner House is not far from here. It is six-stories and he is sure that no active uses are here, therefore, this building will assist in generating connectivity along Selma Street and future development. There is a precedence for this size student housing in Savannah. They believe this is a great use and their clients are committed to owning this property and they will not sell it. They have been in this business since 1999 and have built more than 13,000 student housing beds on more than 18 university campuses or markets. They will have an on-staff management company that will

be there to operate it on a daily basis and maintain it.

Mr. Naugle said aside from the activity uses that he has mentioned along Selma Street, of course there will be the pool, the pool deck, club house space, Wi-Fi and breakout seating spaces throughout the building. He said as the Board sees on the five story height limit along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard in this future master plan, there is the potential to have five story buildings directly across from Frogtown and if they were to also achieve the "bonus story," they could be six stories. Just as there are four stories within the block that they are in, they could just as well be five stories with the "bonus story." He knows that maybe all of this could come back to economics [he is aware that economic is not a concern of the Review Board], but this is a facet to the project. It takes tremendous effort and cost to build what is being proposed to be built here.

Mr. Lominack said he wanted to make a comment as he was cited in a part of this presentation as he was the architect for a project that is adjacent to this proposed project. He said noticed that the context photographs of the Frogtown project were missing. Mr. Lominack said Frogtown is four stories, not five stories and it covers 75% of the site and received unanimous approval from the Historic District Review Board.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Naugle that when he called the project a five-story building, one tower is five-stories, but otherwise there will be three or four stories.

Mr. Lominack injected by saying that there is a monitor that goes up another floor that was deemed by the Review Board to fit within the requirements. No variance was sought at all. Mr. Lominack said he just wanted to clarify this.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Naugle how many stories tall is his tower.

Mr. Naugle answered five and one-half stories.

Dr. Williams stated for clarification, Turner House is five stories tall at the west end and four stories tall at the east end. A comparison was made with Turner and this proposed building, but it is not a good comparison because this is a sloping site going down towards the canal; the east end is four stories tall. Dr. Williams told Mr. Naugle to be careful when citing comparable examples be it Frogtown or Turner House. He said he is not convinced that the uses on the ground floor will meet the standards. The Board has seen too many projects gain the extra story, but do not deliver the uses.

Dr. Williams said what is needed is retail; they do not need a lease office, active street uses. This Board is very frustrated about this as hotels and all sort of buildings have promised the use, but they have blinds and doors that are never open.

Mr. Engle said this is the fourth project in the past 12 months that is geared towards SCAD students. This project is for 248 beds. SCAD is not getting that much bigger. What is the market? It is not like there is a lack of apartments in Savannah. He said that as a resident, it concerns him of how many people's carriage houses are now going to sit empty; they are advocating more and more private dormitories for students which are in direct competition with the historic persons carriage houses and everything else. Mr. Engle said they have to be aware of what is happening.

Mr. Howington said Mr. Naugle does not need to reply as this is out of the Board's purview. What's presented is the design of the building and this is what the Board is reviewing.

Mr. Naugle said he wanted to respond to the staff's recommendation regarding reducing the height to be visually compatible. He said their argument is subjective. They understand that it is a large building, but they feel they need to look beyond just the current context and understand that there will be other future developments that will help to substantiate what they are proposing. Mr. Naugle said, therefore, they are open to adjusting the upper floor to some extent, but they want to have additional dialogue with the staff to see if this is an option that will win them favor. If not, then this is a different situation.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Naugle if he said that height is subjective.

Mr. Naugle explained that they feel that where their particular site is located, the context of the historic has been lost throughout the years. This is an opportunity for them to do some modern and different that respects the past, but at the same time embraces what will be modern Savannah. He said that there will be future developments throughout Savannah and it all does not have to be something that meets every bit of the criteria of a historic building. Mr. Naugle said he knows that a lot of the comments are related to that, but they feel that as architects there should be some freedom of expression.

Dr. Henry said that he could not speak for the Board, but he has no objection of modern whatsoever.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board is looking at height and mass today. She asked Mr. Naugle that in terms of mass, what would he say this project is compatible to in the Historic District?

Mr. Naugle said they took the approach of a minimalist sort of modern approach on a housing development; in some ways relates to Frogtown, but maybe not to the extent of some of the materials that they used; but, the approach is it will have a different material base and what they are thinking in the recess will be yet another material.

Ms. Ramsay said she was asking about mass not materials.

Mr. Naugle said they are not trying to make the building be exactly like a certain building in Savannah. He would say, however, close to Avia, the hotel that is on Bryan Street. This is a modern adaptation of a hotel that is in the Historic District. Mr. Naugle said the Avia is the closest building that he would compare their building to.

Mr. Engle said the Avia is in a six story district.

Mr. Noble Boykin came forward and stated that Henry Morgan and he own this property. He has sat on many boards and, therefore, is aware of what the Board needs to hear in terms of what their function is. Mr. Boykin said in terms of the background on this property is really a function of the history in this area. He said in his opinion, has been disrespected for years. This is the Frogtown area and it was obliterated with no protection from the Review Board and City Council. Mr. Boykin said that he went to every flyover meeting and Christian Sotille showed how residential structures in this area went to nothing basically

after Union Station was allowed to be demolished. Henry Morgan and he invested in this area as they believe it has a log of potential. Mr. Boykin said when they found out the property was in the Historic District, they were surprised it is not in the Landmark District, but at some point the Historic District extended here. Their property is right on the edge; they are a stone throw away from I-16.

Mr. Boykin said Mr. Morgan and he did not buy a large tract, but a small tract which is on the right hand corner next to the Frogtown lofts. It was about one-half acre. He talked with the school board and they sold them the remainder of the property as they did not need it for the back of Garrison School. Mr. Boykin said they believed it made sense; they are on the edge of the Historic District and it seems like the MPC and everybody else are asking for density and asking for feed on the streets. Where you would want density would be just outside the Landmark District and not a sore thumb in the Landmark District. He said usually what you do in the countryside is to buy a big piece of property and subdivide into small pieces and make money. Mr. Boykin said generally he does not do this as he does not like it. However, in town where you have a small piece of property, the value sometimes in making a bigger piece of property so somebody can do a project. This was their idea. This is not the Board's problem, but their problem. They bought the property just before the downturn. Therefore, in retrospect they paid a little bit for it; but they have held it through the downturn; paid taxes during the downturn based on development values and now the fish have started biting again. This developer has told them that the area looks like a perfect place for a SCAD dormitory or any college dormitory.

Mr. Boykin said unfortunately not for them to go in the poor house for this and go negative, you have to ask for density. A few years ago, no height limit was here, even though it was in the Historic District. At some point without any notice, a four-story district was put in there and he believes that in 2009, the Height Map was repasted as they knew that it had not been properly advertised in certain areas, including their area. Mr. Boykin said they went to the meetings and told them that they were not subject to a height map at all. He said they explained to them that they were on the edge and believe they should be given more height here. If you look at this property, and the reason it is so long, these were old garden lots that Oglethorpe laid out. They were laid out diagonally. When Union Station came in, they laid the railroad tracts that way. Therefore, the property that is here is long and not deep. On one hand they don't want something that looks like a three-story Walmart; but with the zoning as it is now, they can have 100% lot coverage, but they have asked that the zoning be changed so they can look into doing what they proposed. They have 100% now, but want to go to 89%. A three-story Red Roof Inn could be put on the property now. But, they are not saying that they will put a Red Roof Inn here. Now, if they don't want something look this way, you are going to have to have height; but they have the four story height map.

Mr. Boykin said they knew this could potentially be a problem. They went ahead and tried to make the Height Map proper by trying to properly advertise it in 2009, they went to City Council and spoke on this issue. He said he had a copy of City Council's meeting minutes with him. Mr. Boykin said they need density here. It either has to be some low and flat with 100% and as he has said they can put a hotel there now under the present zoning or you must have height. Mr. Boykin said they showed this to Mr. Sotille who drew a diagram of two floors of parking and two towers. This went beyond four stories, but Mr. Sotille said that this would be a beautiful spot and you could have the shared green space between them, etc. This site is not like anything else in the Historic District; but is a strange long

piece of property that fronts the Interstate. They are asking for variance is because apparently you cannot do a dormitory unless you connect it to a college dormitory. This goes down to 75% so they are asking that it goes to what is need to make the request feasible. Why is it so long? It is because the property is shaped long. Why so high? One reason is because they are putting parking on the site.

Mr. Boykin said this is a function of history in a lot of regards. In terms of its incompatibility with everything around the, he wanted to tell them that everything around them is not flat. If you want to make it compatible with everything else, it would almost have to remain a vacant lot. What is left is Garrison School, which is a 1980's type building; no windows; flat, and in fact it is lower than the bluff on their property. Frogtown Lofts are on the left, which is modern architecture, and the Interstate is on the front with a chain link fence. Frankly, they tried to sell the property, but they want something that will enhance the city; want something that they will be proud of; don't want anything that somebody would think is a four-story Wal-Mart building [nothing is wrong with Wal-Mart], but they do not think that it would be good there.

Mr. Boykin said that he really does not like height in the Landmark District. He is a history major, he likes history; he likes old buildings; his office is an old building and he believes that Bay Street is ruined. He believes that this Board has approved all of the buildings there. The hotel that is behind Parker's overlooking the Round House was a three story site, but they gave them an extra floor. The intersection of Oglethorpe Avenue and MLK Jr. Boulevard huge hotels are there in the Landmark District. This is much more significant than them being out there by the Interstate behind the Enmark Station.

Mr. Boykin stated that as a lawyer, he has to get this in; he thinks to deny the extra story here would be capricious and would be taking of the property.

Mr. Howington told Mr. Boykin that if he meets the criteria, he will get the extra story.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Boykin if he said the hotel next to the Round House is four stories.

Mr. Boykin answered that he believes it was three stories. He said he cannot remember the stories, but they got an extra story. A penthouse is there. The hotel that they are putting up at Oglethorpe Avenue and MLK Jr. Boulevard is five stories and they were approved for six stories.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Henry Morgan came forward and said he is one of the owners of the property. They have been to every flyover hearing and meeting; they completely support removing the flyover. They believe that the removal will highly benefit downtown. They have attended every Unified Zoning Ordinance (UZO) meeting; every NewZO meeting and have attended the Historic District Review Board meetings. He said the best people get the hardest project.

Mr. Morgan said he attended a meeting yesterday on zoning. The consent agenda was passé. he was reared in Savannah, but did not know anything about Frogtown until Mr.

Boykin talked with him one day about the area. He liked the place and believed it had some promises. The Lofts are here, which is a great looking project. The Savannah Station is here; the Garrison School is behind them, but based on the massing, it looks like pentagon to him.

Mr. Morgan said that when Mr. Boykin and he look at the wall, they see people parking on their lot and have not raised any issues; they have been good neighbors with the school; got rid of the fence; and cleaned up their property.

Mr. Morgan said that they did not come circumventing the Historic Review Board, but meeting them straight up. They did not go asking for five stories because its proximity to the Interstate. He does not know what happened to the Country Inn and Suites, this was not his deal. But, he and Mr. Boykin support the flyover removal as they believe it will be a great thing for this city. One thing he remembers from the talk about the flyover removal is that it was said that the persons when they get in town will not know how to get back out. He said that will be great, we want to keep the people here for a few extra days so they will spend some more money. Maybe they will rent one of the garage apartments that he heard about.

Mr. Howington said he wanted to clarify that the petition yesterday did not pass. Staff made a recommendation and the owner did not accept the recommendation and the petition was continued.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Savannah Historic Foundation (HSF) stated that they were invited by the applicant to view the project at earlier stages in its development. Changes have been made through the course of that development that they feel have improved the design, however, they agree with staff recommendations; particularly, about the visual compatibility of the overall height. Ms. Meunier said based on some of the conversations that are coming up about yesterday's meeting and the MPC meeting, and other height issues, HSF has been consistent that they believe in staying true to the Height Map and acknowledging those height restrictions.

Ms. Meunier said the HSF believes that there are a lot of variations in the pattern of the windows between bays as proposed. There appears to be a mixture of paired and single windows, but in the pattern they are not consistent on each of those three structures. She said this was brought up with the petitioner and they have said that they would restudy this. Ms. Meunier said overall, they agree with staff's recommendation for a continuance so that the petitioner can further study this project.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Meunier if the HSF's concern is essentially parallel to what the staff has recommended regarding the windows.

Ms. Meunier said their concern goes a little beyond the staff's concern about the windows. It more than just the alignment; there are a mixture of paired windows and single windows. The way the pattern is used is not consistent.

Mr. Howington invited Mr. Naugle to make comments on the public comments, if he so desired.

Mr. Naugle said overall they are seeking a continuance. They want to reach some level of

agreement on this project. However, related to the comments of the Historic Review Board staff, they are willing to find resolution to most everything that was mentioned such as adding more primary entrances; but, they cannot add windows at the lower levels because it is a code requirement. The biggest condition could be the lot coverage; and he believes it goes back to their current zoning and what can be done. They are somewhere in-between. Mr. Naugle said again that they are seeking a continuance.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he wanted to clarify a point. The Historic District Review Board went against waiving the height limit on the Georgia Power project on East Bay Street for the two hotels and parking garage. The Board voted against this, but the MPC overrode them.

Mr. Engle said the Historic District Review Board has no choice if someone meets the criteria for an extra story, this Board cannot say no. Therefore, they do their best, but it has to meet the criteria and the Historic District Review Board is getting tougher as things quite frankly have been abused. At some point they have to say "enough." They have an ordinance; they are stuck with it and do not have the liberty unlike under NewZO where they will have the right to grant variances, but they cannot do so. They must follow the law.

Mr. Lominack stated that he feels it is important to make the following statement because he was accused of impropriety by one member of the Review Board for talking with one of the owners/sellers of the property. He wanted to assure everyone that the owner/seller is a personal friend and they never mentioned this project nor application not even on a social occasions or otherwise. Mr. Lominack said he does not believe that it was right that he was accused of having a conflict of interest in talking with a friend that had nothing to do with this application.

Dr. Williams said that in putting aside the height issue for a moment, he would like to applaud that this is taking a long view that likely the flyover will be removed and will be a designing eye to the future and perhaps seeing Selma Street as Oglethorpe Avenue with a median and a broader than average avenue. In this case, if they think later on that Selma will be a street that is not 75 feet wide, he does not know the timeline on this. This is clearly a generous corridor. Dr. Williams said just as the DeRenne Apartment and Drayton Towers are taller and more in scale with Liberty Street. He said one think they need to look at is not the current width of Selma, but down the road as there is nothing on the south side of Selma Street.

Dr. Williams stated that one thing he likes about the building is that it maintains the street line along Selma and will establish a precedent. This will set a nice precedent for having all the buildings to forward and not bring the suburban mentality of pushing it back off the street line. This aspect is laudable. He wishes that on the west side, the elevation sort of like a saw tooth where different massing are kept in and out. He has some concern about how all of this will look because it is on a street where the backside should not be visible, but green space will be there and a historic Jewish cemetery is near there. It is unlikely that the west side will be screened from view or developed with any buildings. Therefore, he guesses that what they can call the southeast elevation fronting Selma Street looks resolved, he feels that some of the other massing is less resolved.

Mr. Engle said in a way, he sees where Mr. Christian Sottile was coming from. He was wondering in this case would two, six or seven story towers be better if 40 percent of the site could be open space. This is 89% and when the driveway is added and everything else, basically you are 100 percent lot coverage if they get the variance anyway. Therefore, is it better to have everything paved or have open space and a higher building. Mr. Engle said he wishes that the Board had seen some sketch plans.

Mr. Howington said they need to be considering the petition that is before them, and nothing else that is not related to it.

Ms. Simpson said as much as they would love to see the flyover removed, this Board cannot base its decision on what may happen.

Mr. Lominack stated that he believes everyone is absolutely right. He has lived in Savannah 50 years and even before he moved here, there was talk about what was in the Casey Canal Parkway that later became the Truman Parkway and they still do not have the last thing open. Therefore, he does not expect that he will live long enough to see the flyover removed.

Board Action:

Continue the petition for New Construction, Part 1: Height and Mass, for the petitioner to study the following:

- Reduce the height to be visually compatible;
- Reduce the massing and scale to be more visually compatible;
- Increase the fenestration on the ground floor of all facades except Selma Street, and on all floors on the north façade (facing Purse Street);
- Restudy the footprint in order to meet the 75% lot coverage requirement (variance requested- see below);
- Ensure that the curb cut does not exceed 20 feet in width;
- Redesign the bay pattern to meet the standard of not less than 15 feet nor more than 20 feet in width;
- Along Selma Street, where paired windows in a single column are utilized, align the windows and doors vertically; - PASS
- 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 (variance requested- see below);

- Increase the linear footage ground floor active uses along Selma Street (if the HDBR finds the bonus story is visually compatible); and
- Increase the number of primary entrances to seven.

Continue 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.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

17. [Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects | 14-000672-COA | 660 East Broughton Street | Rehabilitation Amendment](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Application, description and details.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Previously approved drawings.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Previous Board Approval 13-004878-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Lominack recused from participation in this petition. He is a member of the firm of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects.

Mr. Kevin Rose of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects as 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 Board on October 10, 2012. On October 9, 2013, the Board approved an amendment to the scope of work which included an addition. The petitioner is requesting approval and a variance 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. She said additionally, the petitioner is requesting approval to change the color of the windows and storefront from the previously approved SW7742, Agate Green and Kawneer Atlantic Gray to SW6992 Inkwell. This will match the storefront in the new construction.

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, metal clad, simulated divided light windows because the amendment does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation or design standards. Staff also recommends denial to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) from:

1. The Secretary of 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.*"
2. 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 windows in composition, design, and material.*"

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

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the color change of the windows and storefront from the previously approved SW7742, Agate Green and Kawneer Atlantic Gray to SW6992 Inkwell.

Dr. Williams asked what happens if the petitioner follows staff guidelines and put in 4'x10' true divided light windows and they don't meet impact wind resistant standards. He explained that in other words they satisfy one set of regulations, but not another.

Ms. Harris stated that the petitioner is not required to meet the other set of regulations because the building is historic.

Mr. Merriman asked if the second case trumps the other stuff.

Ms. Harris answered that the building officials have the authority to be lenient when dealing with historic structures in terms of enforcement of the codes.

Mr. Engle commented that if any of the Board members wanted to review the Georgia Historical Society website, there was a hurricane that hit in 1940. He said in fact, the entire cupola was blown off and was on top of the brick building. The windows were still there and they survived that.

Ms. Simpson asked if Inwell was another color for Black. Staff passed around the color sample.

Dr. Williams asked staff if the request is motivated out of the desire to meet current

impact windows standard and water infiltration.

Ms. Harris said it is a desire, but it is not a requirement.

Mr. Engle said the Review Board does not have the authority to give a variance for either of these.

Mr. Howington said the Review Board makes a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) on a case-by-case basis and does not set any future variance request.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Rose said the simple answer to the “why” is that they want to do the right thing to the building. He said that this is the first time in 23 years that he has disagreed with the staff. This is the first time that he thought that aluminum clad windows were the right thing. He said this building is unique; it is not a one kind of cookie cutter style, 1890’s building. All windows basically have to be out on the front because of the way this building is designed and the way the steel work is. He said that they are not afforded the masonry kind setback with these windows. Therefore, they have 10’4” x 4’ windows sitting in the middle.

Mr. Rose said there is a change even with the Park Service and a lot of other organizations now where they they are going towards protecting the building rather than going with just merely using single pane window, true divided light. He said that he can give examples of the Park Service and the Department of Interior moving in this direction. Mr. Rose said he feels as if they are on the cusp of some further dialogue. This building is not a row-house; it is an industrial building with huge windows with newly insulated walls; these windows in many ways are like a storefront system and they have seen over the years storefronts at ground level be aluminum rather than wood windows because it is not practical at grade and it works better. He stated with that being said, this facility is going to have events in it, sound, and energy protection. It is practically a reconstruction. Mr. Rose said they have gone back to the brick foundation and the steel frame. They are putting in complete new walls, complete new wall panels, roof and everything else.

Mr. Rose explained that the difference between the original windows and the ones that were previously recommended by the Review Board for replacement is one hundred fold more than the difference between what they are asking for today. He further explained that the original windows that the Board sees now and the windows that were previously approved are much different than the difference they are asking for today between the single panes. The profiles are exactly the same. Obviously, they have double pane; they have a simulated divided light. They are going to a darker window which hides the white shadow line which is probably the biggest detractor for this. These are not cheap windows.

They do not look like the stick-on; they are the real deal and actually there are some examples of them downtown. This window has been approved to be used in a number of cases. Mr. Rose said they have aluminum clad windows at the Morris Center that have been approved because of the size of the window openings and also the United Way building. These are two historic buildings that have been retrofitted with this style window. Mr. Rose said if the Board wanted to see these he had photographs that he could show them.

Dr. Williams asked what color was previously proposed.

Mr. Rose answered that they found two colors here. One color was a Hunter Green that

faded over time. It is really hard to tell; there is no evidence of it. Therefore, they went with all of fenestrations kind of matching in that kind of grey-black green. He showed the remaining windows. All of the rest of the openings were completely blown out, falling down and there are only about 80 percent of both of these windows left. Mr. Rose showed the Board a photograph of the United Way building which has aluminum clad windows. He also showed the Board a picture of the Morrison Center windows. He stated that as the Board sees, the darker color lends itself much better to this approach. He said to add to that, here is the National Park Service Preservation job that they found this morning that is a replacement to replace historic windows in this quarter.

Mr. Rose said he was not asking the Board to consider precedent; what he is asking for is the consideration of this being a kind of one all scenario. These windows are huge; they have to come in two pieces. They weigh 1200 pounds. When you look at how much wood can move, especially new growth pine, it will be crumbling in less than five years.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Rose if he said that the windows in the Morrison Center are simulated divided light windows.

Mr. Rose answered that he knows that the windows are aluminum clad.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Rose if the Board has been given a profile of the original window so that they can compare it with what he is proposing to use. The question that he has is not the aluminum clad; you can still make a true divided light window and clad the exterior and make the mullion identical to what the original was. But, the original mullion is not shown; therefore, they have no idea whether this is close to it or totally different. Looking at the profile, he would say that it is totally different.

Mr. Rose explained that the windows that they selected, they went through ten different manufacturers and looked at different windows. The Kolbe is approved for a reason by the Board. It is because it does in profile most likely match. The reason for the simulated divided light is so that it does not get huge. He said that this is going to be a space that they don't want the neighbors complaining; they want to be a good neighbor and want it to look good for a number of years. The Kehoe Building is a completely different building and the brick building is a completely different animal. Those windows are smaller; they are inset into the brick wall; they are protected; and they are going to be wood windows. This was a tough decision and it took a lot of study.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Rose if his short answer is he does not have a profile of the original windows.

Mr. Rose answered that every window was different. They were mostly deteriorated. He said if the Board wants the profile of that, he would be using conjecture. He said that mullions that they see, no one makes windows like that anymore, not even the replications.

Mr. Howington said to clarify, the windows are not being restored; they are requested to be replaced. Therefore, the new mullions will meet the ordinance in profile and in depth.

Dr. Williams stated that he is a member of the Window Subcommittee of the Review Board along with Mr. Merriman and along the issue of the darker color he is glad that Mr. Rose is going that route because this was a major concern of the these kind of simulated divided windows. Do you know how much the simulated mullions will project? Will it be a

half inch?

Mr. Rose answered that the simulated mullions on the exterior windows is the same profile as the approved windows that are in wood. It just has metal cladding. They are using a smaller spacer between the panes. This is the only difference. Technically, they are the same window, the difference is the skin and the spacer.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said that they believe in following the standards. Therefore, they agree with the staff recommendation.

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

Mr. Rose said this is a very different scenario and he encouraged the Board to think about this. A lot of thought was put into this.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Rose if the entire outside of the building is metal.

Mr. Rose answered yes; it is metal. The windows have to be on the outside. They cannot be inset. The beautiful structure that is inside, originally that wall was set on the edge of the brick and it is a different condition. These windows are huge and are half way up the soffit and are exposed. They are trying to do the right thing and as he has said, they have seen a change with the replacement windows.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said by ordinance, they are required to go by the Secretary of Interior's Standards. This does not meet the Secretary's standards. How many churches in this town have 4 x 10 windows and could make the same argument, we want to replace them because they are wood and are rotten.

Dr. Henry asked how you explain the photo of the house with the metal windows that was shown by Mr. Rose.

Ms. Harris explained that this is the United Way building.

Mr. Engle asked when these windows were put in. The Secretary of Interior's Standards were added by the ordinance about six years ago.

Dr. Henry said he believes the staff's conclusion had to be difficult. He has always been proud of the staff and he is proud of them now.

Mr. Howington stated that he feels this is a very unique property. It is not like the Board would be setting a precedent. It is a metal clad building with metal clad window seams. He said he is familiar with the Kolbe – Kolbe window. It is a fantastic looking window. Some of the windows downtown you cannot tell if they are wood or if they are metal. He believes property is unique and does not feel that they would be setting any precedence.

Mr. Merriman said it seems that everybody who comes before the Board will say that their project is unique. He said that when he was looking at this project at home he saw that the Secretary of Interior's Standards are clearly against this. However, this project is unique. It is a metal building and this would make a better building. Mr. Merriman said if he owned this building, he would be pushing hard for it, but as a Board member it comes

down to upholding the ordinance and try to stick to the spirit of the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Mr. Howington said that any recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals is done on a case-by-case basis.

Dr. Williams stated that earlier he believes that Mr. Engle had an issue with metal cladding.

Mr. Engle said he did not have an issue with metal cladding as long as the profile is correct. He does not accept the fact that this profile is replicating the original window.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Engle if it is because the window is double pane.

Mr. Engle answered no, the Secretary of Interior's Standards allow double pane. But, they would prefer interior storm. You can accomplish the same purpose with interior storm that you would with double pane. But, to say that if we did a real muntin, it would be two inches thick. However, that is what it was.

Dr. Williams said he was confused. He heard Mr. Engle saying that he is okay with metal cladding and the Park Service allows double panes. Therefore, he is at a loss in terms of where this falls short.

Mr. Engle clarified that the Park Service recommends interior storms, but these are new windows.

Mr. Howington said the windows will be replaced and he could almost guarantee that the Kolbe and Kolbe muntin profile is very historically accurate.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Engle what makes him okay with metal cladding.

Mr. Engle answered that he can accept metal cladding; this Board has approved metal cladding all over the district.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Engle to be specific about where the profile is wrong.

Mr. Engle stated that this is not historic.

Mr. Rose came forward and stated that this window in its configuration was approved to be a replacement window. He said that profile is approved. It is the best they have.

Mr. Howington stated that the Kolbe and Kolbe profile was approved by the Review Board.

Mr. Engle said the simple thing to do is to go by the standards and be done with it. If this Board thinks that going against the Standards will not be a precedent, they are kidding themselves. He does not know of any cases that this Board has approved in five and one-half years going against the Secretary's Standards.

Mr. Howington said he does not believe that they have had a building such as this one.

Dr. Williams made a motion for approval as requested by the petitioner; and approval of the color change as recommended by the staff. This was seconded by Mr. Merriman.

The Board held discussion on the motion.

Mr. Engle asked if this Board has ever approved this window for an historic building.

Mr. Howington stated that it has been approved; maybe not this Board, but a previous Board has.

Mr. Engle said he does not remember the Board approving such window during the five and one-half years that he has been a member of the Board. They have approved it for new construction, but not historic structure.

Ms. Michalak explained that after the subcommittee meeting, she went and checked how the United Way building ended up with double pane windows as she was aware it is a contributing building. The request was originally denied and approved to do single pane wood. They came back to the Board and the Board voted again and they were approved.

Mr. Engle asked what year was this.

Ms. Michalak answered she believes this was in 2001.

Mr. Engle said this was before the existing ordinance.

Mr. Merriman said the ZBA has the power to exceed the Secretary of Interior's Standards whenever they deem that it is acceptable.

Mr. Engle made a motion to change the color and denial of the selected windows and denial to ZBA. This was seconded by **Ms. Ramsay**.

Board Action:

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

Recommend denial of a variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals from:

1. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards 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

2. 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.

Approve of the color change of the windows and storefront from the previously approved SW7742, Agate green and Kawneer Atlantic Gray to SW6992 Inkwel because the color is visually compatible.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Nay
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Nay

18. [Petition of John Deering, Greenline Architecture | 14-000675-COA | 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue | New Construction Part I: Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Attachment: [Previously Approved Main House and Garage.pdf](#)

Mr. Merriman left the meeting at approximately 5:45 p.m.

NOTE: Mr. Howington relinquished the chair and recused himself from this petition as he is an employee of Greenline Architecture. The Vice-Chair, Ms. Simpson, served as chair during the hearing of this petition.

Mr. John Deering 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 two-story carriage house for the property

located at 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue. The accessory structure is proposed at the rear of the property and will provide two garage door openings off of East York Lane. She said that the two-story detached main residence at 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue was approved by the historic District Board of Review on March 13, 2013. A one-story garage was approved by the Board on October 9, 2013, but the garage was not built. Neighboring properties on both sides are contributing structures within the local district; however, none have carriage houses along the lane.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of the proposed two-story carriage house at 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board for review and approval with Part II, Design Details:

1. Add a base molding to the stoop newel posts.
2. Reduce the stoop height from 9 feet-8 inches to meet the standard.
3. Ensure that the sloped apron occurs in within the garage and not in the lane (public right-of-way).

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Deering said he wanted to disagree with staff on one point. They are willing to put the apron slope in the garage and lower the stoop height to inches. Mr. Deering said that newel posts on buildings such as this do not have bases typically. He believes the ordinance reads columns and stoop structures would have a cap and a base. He said that this is actually a newel post.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Deering if he considered trying to give a soffit on either end instead of a roof, three stories straight, flat and no overhang at all.

Mr. Deering answered that they did. But, it is adjacent to the property line on the east and removed the soffit on that side; therefore, they moved it to the other side to balance it. There were historic structures that were similar in form, style and design that did not have any overhang on the gable end.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of the proposed two-story carriage at 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board for review and approval with Part II, Design Details: - PASS

1. Reduce the stoop height from 9 feet-8 inches to meet the standard.
2. Ensure that the sloped apron occurs in within the garage and not in the lane (public right-of-way).

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry	
Second: T. Jerry Lominack	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

19. [Petition of Patrick Phelps, Hansen Architects | 14-000680-COA | 25 East Broughton Street | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Historic Photographs.pdf](#)

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

Mr. Patrick Phelps was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting alterations to the commercial building located at 25 East Broughton Street. A COA was approved by the Board on December 11, 2013 to remove the non-historic concrete panel façade, stucco façade, tile façade, and metal canopy for this property. A COA was approved by staff on November 25, 2013 for exploratory demolition on the stucco façade. She said that neither of these projects has 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. She said that according to historic building map, this is a non-contributing building. This building was substantially altered twice in the 1960's and then altered again in 1975. Ms. Michalak said that it is staff's guess that it is a non-contributing building due to lost historic integrity. It appears that what would mostly be the storefront is substantially altered.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for alterations to the commercial building at 25 East Broughton Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Retain 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. Use a smaller ceramic tile on the storefront base;
3. Inset the storefront glazing a minimum of four inches from the face of the building; and
4. Redesign the two, double-door Broughton Street entrances to be recessed from the remainder of the storefront.

Dr. Williams asked how far recessed is staff asking. He said that recessed is open-ended.

Ms. Michalak answered that there are a variety of different recessed entrances on Broughton Street. Therefore, she believes that this should be left to the petitioner to provide what they think is a design that is visually compatible.

Mr. Howington said that since the pilasters are in the front and in the same plain, he assumes that the top of this would constitute as recessed.

Ms. Michalak said that staff does not believe that this meets the standards. For example, on a historic building, she said pointing to an area, this would be here and the entrance would always be extended back further, whether it had slanted sidewalls and the door was in the center or whether the entire section came back; whatever it was. She said just to look at even how the building currently is; all three of these have three different types of recessed entries.

Ms. Michalak said she believes that a specific standard was added to this ordinance because they were losing some of those very distinctive Broughton Street entrances.

Dr. Henry asked who makes the decision of buildings being non-contributing or contributing status.

Ms. Michalak answered that City Council adopts the contributing building map.

Dr. Williams said his guess is this building was never added to the height map, but it is up to City Council to approve or deny it. Therefore, the next time that there is a revision to the height map, this Board can make a recommendation to City Council that this building be considered for a revision.

Ms. Michalak said the information that City Council adopts is based on work done by preservation staff, surveys, etc.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Phelps stated that he would go through the staff's recommendations and make comments. Then he will answer questions from the Board.

Mr. Phelps said item number one of the staff's report concerns removing the door opening. He said to keep it in place is located on the plan. Mr. Phelps pointed out that on the plan there is an existing door opening that they are proposing to infill primarily because it does not meet the program for retail. They want to have one secured entrance front the front. There is a secondary means of egress for residential in the back. Other buildings along Drayton and Whitaker Streets do not have that much street life that other streets north/south streets along Broughton Street have. Therefore, they would like to remove this and not put an entrance. However, they are willing to put a window here if this will please the staff as far as keeping the rhythm of voids. On number two, they are fine with changing the size of the proposed ceramic tile to a one-by-one inch mosaic versus the six-by-six. They will keep the same color and material that is available. On number three, inset the storefront glazing a minimum of four inches on the face of ceramic tile storefront base, the ordinance reads that "continuously glazed storefronts maybe flush with the face of the building." He wants to propose that they are in fact showing this section would be considered as a continuously glazed storefront so that in the section it is allowable flushed by the ordinance and that the storefront system is setback from the face of the building approximately 18 inches.

Mr. Phelps said he is also agrees with the idea of the entrance being defined as setback because it is setback from the front of the building. He sees this as two parts from the way it reads. "Entrances on Broughton Street shall be recessed and centered within the storefront." He said that they are recessed from the face of the building. The ordinance does not give them any guidance on what the recess should be. They have also centered it within that storefront system where the entrance is located. Therefore, he feels that they are in compliance with that.

Dr. Williams said he was trying to understand the spirit of the project using the historic photo as a guide. He said the Broughton façade and a part of Drayton façade is going back in spirit to the brick building with piers and bay rhythm. These are the current configurations of the three stories. Also, the articulation piers in fact are more pronounced than even what was historically. He said for the rest of the building, the petitioner wants to keep that stucco and the canopy in some parts as it is a part of the leader character of the building.

Mr. Phelps answered correct.

Dr. Williams said he had a couple of concerns. First, they do not see any justification for the removal of the canopy along Drayton Street Street which given the job of the canopy does is actually more interesting things on a relatively simple building. Therefore, the petitioner is removing an historic feature regardless of whether it is on a historic map. He said he agrees with staff about the flatness of the storefront in that it is not compatible with the spirit of Broughton Street even the original storefront at recess if they go back to the original brick version of this building.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, it seems that the petitioner is trying to have it both ways. He is trying to capture in one little area along the ground floor on Broughton the spirit of the original structure and then on most to west of it, keep the stucco, the moldings and structure; also closing up the side door when it is a historic opening because they do not want egress.

Mr. Phelps said if this is a historic opening they have not been able to get in there. He knows that openings were along the façade, but he does not whether this was a historic opening.

Dr. Williams said they could go to the comparable current site condition photo since it is basically under between the third and fourth window.

Mr. Phelps pointed out that between the second and third window, the opening is actually recessed back into the building about three feet, and it is new framing and was probably added in the 1960s. Maybe this is where an opening was but all of this has been modified, changed, demolished and is not there.

Dr. Williams said the rationale for closing or obliterating it is to make it disappear.

Mr. Phelps said he is willing to put a window there, but he does not want to have an entry that is not used.

Dr. Williams said there is a plan view of Broughton Street shops. He asked Mr. Phelps why he has the window wall plane in line with the rear of the piers when historical; they were almost flush with the piers. Does the glass need to be two inches back from the edge of the pier.

Mr. Phelps explained that there is an expression that the masonry is pull back from the piers. He said that he sees that they can make both sides happy if they move the storefront forward to recreate the back towards what was historic and leave this as a recess.

Dr. Williams said it appears that a part of the plan is trying to go back to the brick building and a part is wanting to hold onto the modernistic stucco building, although they are moving a part of the building in terms of removing a part of the canopy.

Mr. Phelps said the canopy on a streetscape is very confining. It is a very low canopy and is very shallow and from a pedestrian standpoint this is why they are proposing to remove it. It is only for a use and they can certainly keep it. If this is what the Board wishes, it is not an issue.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Phelps if he has investigated the possibility of retaining any of these entrances configurations.

Mr. Phelps explained that the column was removed in one of the renovations in the 1940s or 1950s. Therefore, they are no longer there. He said they are trying to keep the base system of the original building which is four partitions rather than having a single and a double. The storefront systems that are there are fairly chopped up and they eat up a lot of the front space.

Mr. Engle said what bothers him is the doors are opening onto the sidewalk because they are not recessed in the building.

Mr. Phelps explained that the sidewalk line starts here. Staff has mentioned that there are numerous doors that open onto the sidewalk.

Mr. Engle explained that the reason that they typically had recesses is that you could open the door without smacking into someone's face, which would be done here.

Mr. Howington said he believes the doors were recessed to entice you to come into the rear and buy something.

Mr. Engle said he believes the doors should be recessed at least to the point that they open to the front elevation.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Phelps why he does not want to recess the doors.

Mr. Phelps stated that in a retail environment these days it is all about rental square footage. This is interior space and display. Therefore, he has to find that happy medium. Mr. Phelps said he would be happy to work with staff so that they could continue to develop as far as what is going to be more compatible. They will also work on maintaining the existing canopy as a rafter on the building, understanding that there needs to be a lot of repairs on it as some bad roofing has been done on it.

Dr. Williams said he believes that this will be two stores. The store on the east appears to be the full depth of the pier.

Mr. Phelps said it is about 18 inches. He explained that four piers are two feet, but if they take the storefront out of the equation.

Dr. Williams asked if the panes of glass that are now aligned with the inside of the pier,

they would gain roughly 14 feet on the bigger and maybe 12 feet, maybe they will gain some of the rental space.

Mr. Phelps stated that he agrees. Maybe if they can push some out and some in as he wants to make his client happy and he is also thinking about pleasing the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with all of the staff's recommendations. They agree with setting back the doors in the storefront and as has been amenable discussed about moving the window walls out a little further on the columns. Ms. Meunier said she is glad the canopy was brought up. They are in favor of keeping the canopy.

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

Mr. Phelps said the canopy drops now to this section where they are putting in the new storefront. They are removing it so they can restore the original opening for the storefront.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said they had the issue about buildings that evolve and then the story of the building gets edited and features. He said frankly the canopies are the most interesting things left on this building.

Mr. Howington said he guesses this is a question for Mr. Phelps, but would the window not be there if they get the canopy.

Mr. Phelps said he would have to do another design to show a shorter window or if they don't put the window there.

Dr. Williams said he believes that if they are going to be sticklers about windows, such as on the previous submission, he does not want them to say that the building is not conducive to its rehabilitation. He said he applauds the opening of the windows on the second floor. The sockets of the windows are clearly legible and he thinks this is a great thing. however, he feels that selecting which parts of the building you want to take to one period and selecting other parts to another period is not okay. They often hear that one does not want to falsify history. He respects the evolution of the shop on Broughton to a two-bay wide where they will remove the structural column and take it back to a four-bay unit. He said he understands the desire to bring some unity back to the Broughton Street front, but just one or two windows on the Drayton Street side does not seem to him to be a deal breaker.

Mr. Lominack said they need to ask themselves that if the philosophy when that canopy was put up that if it was like it is now, that canopy would not be there to protect. If this Board does not allow some modifications to take care of current conditions and in sort of cases improve the building, then are they preventing future generations from having something of our generation that they can preserve.

Mr. Lominack clarified that he was saying that sometimes buildings have changed in the past and there is no reason why they should be prevented from changing currently for better.

Mr. Howington said he agrees with Mr. Lominack. He said he see what Mr. Lominack is

talking about in trying to take the best of two worlds; he sees it as a contemporary modification because they are not going back to history and are not going back to a certain time. It is a new interpretation of a non-contributing building; it has contemporary colors and they are opening up windows. He said personally the canopy to him is a bad canopy with all due respect to the members who like the canopy.

Dr. Williams said he believes the canopy is an interesting feature and frankly it is about the only thing left on the building that has any historic merit. The shop fronts evidently had no historic merit. The stucco seems to have historic merit. He said to update a building, he asked Mr. Lominack if he was advocating that those features be selected that have come down through the history of the building and add others.

Mr. Lominack said he guesses what he is advocating is that why should they prevent a building to change over time when it was allowed to do so previously. What right do they have to stop that evolution from taking place?

Mr. Howington said to clarify one thing that he said, going back to the four-bay rhythm on the ground floor even though they have the historic photograph which he can see where the inspiration came from, but more importantly than that, they know an ordinance was setup for that.

Dr. Williams said he was not saying that they reinstate the original cornice or anything like that, but he was saying that they have a feature; he said to give an example of another building where they had a petition about three years ago for an old working class row-house that was adapted into a store on Price Street. It had a chamfered corner. Someone wanted to take this store back to being a house. This Board voted to retain the historic features that were commercial even though it was no longer a commercial property. Therefore, this is along those lines. This is a historic feature; now it might not be a great canopy but it is an historic feature. Consequently, on the basic principle, he felt that they were getting very principle on the last petition, but now suddenly they are getting very liberal and flexible. It appears that they are saying let's edit the building and chose which parts they want to keep and which parts of the building they want to continue to live.

Dr. Williams said the side door is not a significant feature to him, but the canopy is a survivor of a moment in its part of the history.

Mr. Lominack said he was just noticing the current configuration of that first floor hates those first two-bays on coming from Drayton Street naturally opens it up and this where the recess occurs in that middle support moves back and does not exist there now. Therefore, this was a transition that took place as well in the elimination of what was supporting the bay.

Mr. Engle said the Secretary of Interior's Standards mentions creating a false sense of history. He said in line with what Dr. Williams is saying, he believes that when they pick and choose, I like that piece or I don't like that piece, they are creating a false sense of history that nothing ever coincided with what they are creating. If they are going to put back the cornice and get rid of the canopy, he believes it would probably be truer to what was there at one point, but they are not doing either. Mr. Engle said he tends to agree with Dr. Williams that if they are going to keep the canopy and not the cornice above the windows and, yet, they are creating two storefronts that did not exist when the canopy existed. He said, therefore, this is a false sense of history. If they are going to put two storefronts on the Drayton Street side, then they ought to get rid of the canopy and put the

cornice back as this existed when the two storefronts were there. They can just have one storefront and leave the canopy the way it is.

Ms. Michalak said the standards say a minimum of four inches, but the petitioner has it at three inches. The dimension was from the face of the tile wall to the facing.

Mr. Engle said historically, it was not this way. He said looking at both periods of history, the windows were three or four inches behind the face of the column, not 18 inches behind the face of the column.

Mr. Howington said Mr. Phelps said that he would work with staff on this.

Dr. Williams said they should keep the canopy the way it is now whether or not the petitioner decides to put in the second bay window in a shortened versions or leave it blank. If the canopy is removed, the building would become a little more generic and to him the building continues to evolve, but certain features are kept; certain features are being extended; and some features are being brought in new that have never existed before.

Dr. Williams said one thing he thinks they are off are whether it is townhouses, commercial buildings are anything, is that the proposals are becoming increasingly boring and generic. For him, retaining the canopy helps this building retain some character. This makes it more interesting.

Ms. Simpson said maybe the Board needs to say that petitioner study the windows with the staff.

Dr. Williams said he was talking about the canopy.

Ms. Simpson said she was aware that Dr. Williams was talking about the canopy, but Mr. Phelps stated that if they keep the canopy this changes the window.

Mr. Howington said this would be a lot of change.

Mr. Lominack said he does not believe that the burden should be put on the staff.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Phelps if he was in favor of keeping the canopy.

Mr. Phelps asked for a continuance.

Board Action:

Continue the petition for alterations to the commercial building located at 25 East Broughton Street for the petitioner to consider the following:

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. - PASS
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.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

20. [Petition of Jeff Cramer | 14-000696-COA | 507 East Congress Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

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](#)

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 3-story detached residence on the vacant property located at 507 East Congress Street.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval of the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass or a 3-story detached residence on the vacant property located at 507 East Congress Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II, Design Details for Board Review:

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.
5. Align the facades of this building with the proposed adjacent building at 509 East Congress

Street.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Michalak if she said that there are three story porches on a small building of this scale in this ward.

Ms. Michalak answered no; not in this ward.

Mr. Engle asked if this is a 3-story porch or 2-story porch.

Ms. Michalak answered that it is an uncovered third-story. There are many of these all over the district. The porch is full width on those. There are some examples in the submittal packet of these. She said that nine times out of ten, they are also masonry. But this is something she wanted to mention next time.

Mr. Engle asked if the 3-story porches are deeper.

Ms. Michalak said there are other porches on the contributing buildings that are not 3-story porches.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Michalak if the lot line is parallel to the curb. He believes the Board wants the facades to be parallel to the façade at 519 Congress Street.

Ms. Michalak answered that they are parallel to each other and to the street. She is recommending that the one on the right move back.

Mr. Howington asked, therefore, they will align with each other.

Dr. Williams said they align with each other and maybe they are aligning with 519 down the street. Will they be aligning with the street?

Ms. Michalak answered that they will be aligned with the street. She was not sure that it matters which way they are done as long as they align with each other.

Mr. Lominack explained that he has worked on a continuation of this street and exactly the same condition existed. He said the street property line is not perpendicular to the property line that divides the pieces of property. All the other buildings seem to relate to the north/south property line and the variation is taken up. It amounts to less than 3/10 of a foot or something such as this between one side and the other typically.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cramer said with regards to the staff recommendation to redesign the three-bay curved-header windows on the front façade, he has been trying to design the buildings differently on these three lots. He wants this to be a masonry building, but the Board keeps mentioning brick. He said he does not know if he could talk his client into brick; but masonry is definitely what they want. Mr. Cramer said, therefore, he said the windows were not curved, but above the windows were curved and stuck out a little. To get three forms there sort of brings out some rhythm to the street. One of staff's other recommendation is lowering the cornice line down on the parapet wall that is similar to some more historic buildings. He will definitely look at this in the next submittal.

Mr. Cramer said the front porches he looked at in the next district over shows that the columns are thicker and the porches extend across the entire porch. They are talking about possibly doing that. They are trying to get some residential buildings in these small houses because they need all the the room they can get, get some light, and away to go outside. Therefore, they are really pushing to get the porches. Mr. Cramer said they also think that it adds to the life of the street. Therefore, he was thinking about making the columns thicker.

Mr. Cramer said he likes this building a lot. They talked about lining up the windows and doors on the middle façade. He has two doors on the bottom floor. He will take care of this with the staff.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Cramer if he said that he would redesign the cornices.

Mr. Cramer said yes, they will change the windows bringing the cornices down. He said that he will definitely look at the property lines again.

Dr. Henry congratulated Mr. Cramer with trying to have three different houses. But, he is not clear on what Mr. Cramer is saying about the staff's recommendation.

Mr. Howington stated that Mr. Cramer said he will look at all of them.

Mr. Cramer explained that he will address all the recommendations. He said he will bring the cornice lines down and make the windows flatten out at the top so that there will be an arch as the cornice line will automatically drive the arched windows down to not being arched any longer.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Cramer if he was saying that he will rethink all five of the recommendations.

Mr. Cramer answered yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with all of the staff's recommendations. Initially, they were going to suggest that the petitioner restudy the stylistic imprints on the building, but she believes that based on the discussion that the petitioner stated regarding what he will be restudying, will hopefully meet the HSF concerns.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said they are talking about some very major changes to the buildings. He was wondering if Mr. Cramer might want to ask for a continuance.

Ms. Ramsay said this is Part I of Height and Mass. The Board will see this the next time along with the design details.

Mr. Howington asked Ms. Ramsay if she was saying that Part I and II could be combined at the next meeting.

Mr. Engle said the height of the cornices will be lowered; all the windows will be changed. Maybe the Board needs to say that they will deal with Part I and II together at the

next meeting.

Mr. Lominack said maybe the Board needs to offer some opinions to Mr. Cramer if they are going to look at Part I and II at the same time. Therefore, when he comes back, he will have addressed the concerns. He said he believes that Mr. Cramer is very close to clearly distinguishing this building from a copy of an older building. He said that taking the arches off the top of the windows is good. Mr. Lominack said also that he thinks Mr. Cramer can simplify the way the building stops at the top and not do as much cornices. He does not believe that there is a two-story porch for that roof deck over the porch in this particular ward is necessarily a bad thing to do here. This ward has such a variety of architectural styles in it, probably more so than most of the wards in the Historic District. Mr. Lominack said therefore you cannot pick out something to take guidance from because of there is so much variety in this ward. This is really a nice thing about this ward.

Mr. Howington informed Mr. Cramer that it appears that the Board is interested in seeing whether he would be interested in a continuance. The Board is willing to vote, but if he was to request a continuance, they would review Part I and II at the next meeting.

Mr. Cramer asked for a continuance.

Dr. Williams said that Mr. Lominack mentioned simplifying the cornices. They have so few buildings that come close to being a modern expression of an older form. Mr. Cramer is getting there, they are speculating maybe having no cornices or very minimal cornices. He said there is an opportunity here for Mr. Cramer to be very simple as he flanking buildings which are more complex.

Mr. Cramer said he wanted something to go over the windows to protect them and the doors.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Cramer if he thought a little molding might be sufficient.

Mr. Lominack said he was not sure if a change in the pattern might suffice. He said all three of the houses seem to have a unique flare that they do not see often.

Mr. Engle said that every floor does not need shutters. He said that historically, shutters probably would not have been on the third floor anyway. He said that by simplifying this, some money could be saved. Mr. Engle said Mr. Cramer might want to eliminate the shutters on the second floor.

Board Action:

Continue 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. Part I and Part II will be heard at the April 9, 2014 Board Meeting. The petitioner is to consider the following:

1. Redesign the three-bay curved-header windows on the front façade.
 2. Redesign the offsetting pattern of doors to
- PASS

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.
5. Align the facades of this building with the proposed adjacent building at 509 East Congress Street.

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

21. [Petition of Malcolm O'Connell | 14-000588-COA | 42 Drayton Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 42 Drayton Street 14-000588-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 42 Drayton Street 14-000588-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of Eric McManus | 14-000591-COA | 134 Houston Street | Staff Approved - Color Change, Windows, Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 134 Houston Street 14-000591-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 134 Houston Street 14-000591-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Hallie Mobley | 14-000614-COA | 220 East Gaston Street | Staff Denial - Lights](#)

Attachment: [COA - 220 East Gaston Street 14-000614-COA Denied.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 220 East Gaston Street 14-000614-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of John Hughes for Dawson Architects | 14-000624-COA | 350 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Windows, Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 350 Bull Street 14-000624-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 350 Bull Street 14-000624-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of Minnie Poole for Coastal Canvas Products | 14-000677-COA | 201 East Charlton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 201 East Charlton Street 14-000677-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 East Charlton Street 14-000677-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Natalie Aiken for Hansen Architects, PC | 14-000684-COA | 201 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Alteration](#)

Attachment: [COA - 201 West Broughton Street 14-000684-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 West Broughton Street 14-000684-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Lou Thomann for Newfield Construction | 14-000699-COA | 205 East Charlton Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 205 East Charlton Street 14-000699-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 205 East Charlton Street 14-000699-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Frank J. Mendelson | 14-000700-COA | 424 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Porch](#)

Attachment: [COA - 424 Habersham Street 14-000700-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 424 Habersham Street 14-000700-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Douglas Roberts for Greenline Architecture | 14-000702-COA | 17 West McDonough Street | Staff Approved - Mechanical Screening](#)

Attachment: [COA - 17 West McDonough Street 14-000702-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 17 West McDonough Street 14-000702-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Amended Petition of Jason Summers | 14-000747-COA | 225 East Huntingdon Street | Staff Approved - Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 225 East Huntingdon Street 14-000747-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 225 East Huntingdon Street 14-000747-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Amended Petition of Neil Dawson | 14-000762-COA | 115 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Light Fixtures](#)

Attachment: [COA - 115 East Bay Street 14-000762-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 115 East Bay Street 14-000762-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Amended Petition of Josh Bull for Greenline Architecture | 14-000763-COA | 466 MLK Jr. Blvd | Staff Approved - Sidelites](#)

Attachment: [COA - 466 MLK Jr. Blvd 14-000763-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 466 MLK Jr. Blvd 14-000763-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of John C. Lusk | 14-000853-COA | 516 East Gordon Street | Staff Approved - Handrail](#)

Attachment: [COA - 516 East Gordon Street 14-000853-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 516 East Gordon Street 14-000853-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

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

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

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

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Charles Angell | 14-000857-COA | 427-429 East York Street | Staff Approved - Stucco Repairs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 427 and 429 East York Street 14-000857-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 427 and 429 East York Street 14-000857-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of William Sokolis | 14-000859-COA | 225 West Hall Street | Staff Approved - Color Changes](#)

Attachment: [COA - 225 West Hall Street 14-000859-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 225 West Hall Street 14-000859-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Dr. Jerry Williams for Tybee Animal Care, LLC | 14-000867-COA | 510 West Bryan Street | Staff Approved - Light Fixtures](#)

Attachment: [COA - 510 West Bryan Street 14-000867-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 510 West Bryan Street 14-000867-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Linda Ramsay | 14-000888-COA | 122 East Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 122 East Taylor Street 14-000888-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 122 East Taylor Street 14-000888-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of Stephanie Wilson-Evans | 14-000892-COA | 18 East Jones Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 18 East Jones Street 000892-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 18 East Jones Street 14-000892-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

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

No action required. Staff approved.

41. [Petition of Rives E. Worrell Company | 14-000990-COA | 207 Bull Street / 25 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Roof Repair, Stone Repointing](#)

Attachment: [COA - 207 Bull Street - 25 W. Oglethorpe Avenue 14-000990-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 207 Bull Street - 25 W. Oglethorpe Avenue.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. [Petition of Edie Hockspeier | 14-001011-COA | 518 East Gordon Street | Staff Approved - Handrail](#)

Attachment: [COA - 518 East Gordon Street 14-001011-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 518 East Gordon Street 04-001011-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 3-12-14.pdf](#)

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Items Deferred to Staff 3-12-14.pdf](#)

Ms. Michalak reported that the fence at 554 East Taylor Street has not been removed.

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

45. [GA Historic Preservation Commission Training- April 11-12, Athens, GA](#)

Attachment: [Athens_HPC_Training_Registration.pdf](#)

Ms. Harris reported that MPC will be able to reimburse the Board members for mileage and hotel accommodations. The registration fees are on a first come, first serve basis. Two members from the Review Board may attend. Mr. Lominack has expressed an interest in this training.

Ms. Harris asked the Board members to please let her know by Friday if anyone else is interested in attending the training.

* * *

Ms. Harris said that before Ms. Simpson left the meeting today, she asked her to ask the Board how they feel about asking the petitioner how they feel about the staff comments and the public comments.

Mr. Howington said after the Board hears from the public, they have to ask the petitioner if he/she wants to respond. They must be given this opportunity.

Dr. Williams asked is the problem asking petitioners how they feel or giving them the opportunity to respond.

Mr. Howington said the petitioners are not asked how they feel about the comments, but they do get an opportunity to respond to the public comments.

Mr. Howington asked the Board members that when the petitioner is making their presentation that the Board members do not keep a conversation between themselves as sometimes they talk among themselves while something is being presented. This is viewed inappropriately, the reason he says this is because at their last meeting a petitioner stopped in midstream and asked if someone on

the Board had a question.

Mr. Howington said he saw the individual the next day and he was very upset that some Board members were talking among themselves while he was trying to give his presentation.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the microphones are very sensitive. She said the public can request a copy of the tapes at anytime.

46. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, March 13, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

47. [Next Meeting - Wednesday, April 9, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

XV. ADJOURNMENT

48. [Adjourned.](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, Mr. Howington adjourned the meeting at 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen Harris
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem