



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

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

**MAY 14, 2014 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING**

**HDRB Members Present:** Keith Howington, Chair  
Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian  
Debra Caldwell  
Reed Engle  
Justin Gunther  
Dr. Nicholas Henry  
Stephen Merriman, Jr.  
Tess Scheer  
Robin Williams, Ph.D

**HDRB Members Not Present:** Ebony Simpson, Vice-Chair  
Marjorie 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](#)

**Mr. Howington** called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. He explained that they have a very long agenda today and, therefore, laid out the ground rules for hearing the petitions. The petitioners will be limited to 15 minutes to make their presentations and the public will have 15 to voice their comments.

**Mr. Howington** welcomed the new Board members, Ms. Debra Caldwell, Ms. Tess Sheer, and Mr. Justin Gunther. The new Board members introduced themselves.

**II. SIGN POSTING**

**III. CONSENT AGENDA**

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

- Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Weiner Howington Bay Street Enforcement 042214.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

1. Approval of the two directory signs as requested because they are visually compatible. - PASS
2. Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a location variance.

**Vote Results**

- Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: Robin Williams
- |                             |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Debra Caldwell              | - Aye     |
| Reed Engle                  | - Aye     |
| Justin Gunther              | - Aye     |
| Nicholas Henry              | - Aye     |
| Keith Howington             | - Abstain |
| Zena McClain, Esq.          | - Aye     |
| Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. | - Aye     |
| Tess Scheer                 | - Aye     |
| Robin Williams              | - Aye     |

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

- Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Weiner Howington Bay Street Enforcement 042214.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

1. Approval of the directory sign as requested because it is visually compatible. - PASS
2. Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a location variance.

**Vote Results**

- Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: Robin Williams
- |                |       |
|----------------|-------|
| Debra Caldwell | - Aye |
| Reed Engle     | - Aye |
| Justin Gunther | - Aye |

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

4. [Petition of Leah Bailey | 14-001511-COA | 107 West Liberty Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for a projecting principal use sign at 107 West Liberty Street, because the proposed sign is visually compatible and meets the sign standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

5. [Petition of Peter Paolucci | 14-001685-COA | 222 East Harris Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 222 East Harris Street 14-001685-COA.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for a freestanding handicapped access sign for the Cathedral of St. John the Baptist at 222 East Harris Street with the condition that the sign clearance be raised from eight feet six inches (8'6") to ten feet (10') to meet pedestrian way standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

6. [Petition of Natalie Aiken | 14-001690-COA | 201 West Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Historic Photos- 201 West Broughton Street.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for exterior alterations, a projecting sign, and two principal use fascia signs at 201 West Broughton Street because the work is visually compatible and meets the preservation and sign standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

7. [Petition of Katie Dean, Greenline Architecture | 14-001732-COA | 611 Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for the projecting principal use sign as requested at 611 Whitaker because it meets the design standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

8. [Petition of Gordon Hitt | 14-001819-COA | 151 Bull Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for a projecting principal use sign at 151 Bull Street, because the sign is visually - PASS compatible and meets the sign standards.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye

9. [Petition of Sasha Mastro | 14-001850-COA | 23 West Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 222 East Harris Street 14-001685-COA.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for a principal projecting sign at 23 West Broughton Street because it meets the - PASS visual compatibility and signage standards.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: Robin Williams  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Abstain  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye  
Tess Scheer - Aye  
Robin Williams - Aye

10. [Petition of Clegg Ivey | 14-001853-COA | 615 Montgomery Street | Awnings, Signs](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for a building identification sign, free standing principal use sign, and the projecting principal use signs at 615 Montgomery Street, because the signs are visually compatible and meet the sign standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: Robin Williams  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Abstain  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye  
Tess Scheer - Aye  
Robin Williams - Aye

11. [Petition of Tripp Turner for the Rotary Club of Savannah | 14-001854-COA | Forsyth Park Playground | Awnings, Fence, Color Change](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for the construction of the playground equipment, awnings, and fence at

Forsyth Park with the condition that the material and color of the fence be submitted to staff for approval, along with a dimensioned elevation/section of the fence prior to its construction, because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the design standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: Robin Williams  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Abstain  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye  
Tess Scheer - Aye  
Robin Williams - Aye

12. [Petition of Adam Obert, TPG Architecture | 14-001881-COA | 5 West Broughton Street | Signs and Alteration](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for new awnings, a new principal projecting sign, and paint color change for the new business, "LOFT" at 5 and 15 West Broughton Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: Robin Williams  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Abstain  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye  
Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

13. [Petition of Clinton Dunn, Seamon Whiteside & Associates Inc. | 14-001882-COA | 606 Turner Boulevard | Railings](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Photographs.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Application - 606 Turner Boulevard 14-001882-COA.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for the proposed railing along Fahm Street because it is visually compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: Robin Williams  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Abstain  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye  
Tess Scheer - Aye  
Robin Williams - Aye

**IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

14. [Adopt May 14, 2014 Agenda](#)

**Board Action:**

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

**Vote Results**

Motion: Justin Gunther  
Second: Zena McClain, Esq.  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Abstain  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye



Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

## V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### 15. [Approval of April 14, 2014 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [04-14-2014 Minutes.pdf](#)

#### **Board Action:**

Approve April 14, 2014 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

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

## VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

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

#### **Board Action:**

Approval to continue the petition as requested. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Justin Gunther

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

## VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

### 17. [Petition of Patrick Phelps for Hansen Architects | 14-000193-COA | 240 West Broughton Street | Demolition](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Supplementary Information.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Selective Demo Results.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [1973 Sanborn.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Decker Ward.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Ortho-Zoning-Imagery.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Application and Supplementary information - 240 West Broughton Street 14-000193-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- presentation.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the presentation. The petitioner is requesting approval to demolish the structure at 240 West Broughton Street. In February 2014, the petitioner requested demolition of this building. At that time, staff recommended a continuance in order to allow some exploration demolition to take place so that some of the stucco could be removed to see what was left beneath. The petitioner requested a continuance at that meeting. She explained that the exploratory demolition has been completed and the results were forwarded to the Board in their packets. The building is listed as noncontributing on the Historic Building Map. However, staff feels that was an oversight as 240 and 246 are one building, regardless of ownership.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends denial of the request to demolish the building because the overall retains historic significance and the demolition would conflict with the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Staff recommends further that should the Board decide to approve the demolition, that the Board request that a structural engineer licensed in the State of Georgia verify that the demolition would not compromise or damage the historic integrity of the adjacent building.

**Mr. Engle** asked staff that if the Board approves the demolition of 240 West Broughton Street, would they not feel that 246 West Broughton would lose a major element of integrity.

**Ms. Harris** answered that 246 would lose about 50 percent of its integrity.

**Mr. Engle** asked that in this case, this building would be opened for demolition as well.

**Ms. Harris** answered that the building would still be listed on the contributing building map; but she believes that a case could be made of the demolition, but it would be conjectural at this point. Therefore, it would still have to come before the Historic Board of Review.

**Mr. Merriman** asked that as it is now, if the owner of the MacDonald's building wanted to demolish it now, there is no way that this building could be demolished because all of this building's integrity is intact. He explained that staff has stated that they believe that both buildings should be considered one building and he agrees with staff. However, he asked is this just staff's opinion or is there something to

base this on?

**Ms. Harris** explained that it was designed as one building and was built as one building. If they look at the Sanborn Maps, the demising wall in between the two buildings is not a structural wall, but a partition wall which indicates to her that it is one building.

**Dr. Williams** asked staff to clarify the date of the slip cover alterations at first generation and the current.

**Ms. Harris** explained that they do not know for certain as they were unable to find a record of the alterations. Therefore, they guesstimated by the dates of the cars. She explained that during the meeting when this petition was heard, an interesting discussion was held about the automobiles that were shown in the pictures. She said her recollection is that the photographs indicate that one alteration was done in the early 1970s and the other alteration was done in late 1970s. But, they do not have a record of the approval.

**Mr. Howington** asked if the shell of 240 West Broughton Street was to remain, but the inside was removed, then they would go above and leave in the exterior walls, could this constitute in some people's opinion as some integrity, location in place and part of the building to remain? He asked, theoretically, what if the guts were removed and a petition was submitted with an indoor/outdoor space, but the façade of the building was still there?

**Ms. Harris** answered that she believes this would be a determination for the Board to make.

#### PETITIONER COMMENTS

**Mr. Phelps** stated that he is aware that there are new members on the Board and he wanted to go through since this is a continued project of what they presented prior in order to give the background information on their explorations. He also wanted to go through their specific site where they took some samples off the building to see what was left of some of the detailing.

**Mr. Howington** reminded Mr. Phelps that he had 15 minutes to make his presentation.

**Mr. Phelps** said that as staff has stated, this is one building. It is classified separately as two properties in the classification map as being noncontributing to the historic district; and this is the National Landmark District. Therefore, he wanted to reiterate that the portion that they are dealing with is the noncontributing structure. He believes that the map designation started in 1973 and he is not sure whether there was a change due to the modifications that were made to the building during this time period. This was last submitted in 2011. Therefore, if they look at that time period from 1983 from the last modifications that were made to the structure, it would be about 20 or 30 years being on this map as a noncontributing structure to the Historic District. He pointed out the building with its original conditions shown in a photo taken in the 1930s and 1940s. He stated that yes it was built as a single building; two separate tenants and two separate addresses at the time.

**Mr. Phelps** explained that in the 1960s and 1970s, the original storefront including the column was removed. A window was added which removed a section of the masonry brick. Then a stucco façade and a canopy were applied. Consequently, some structural modifications were made for the canopy and the building. In 1983, more openings were punched into the second floor. The ground floor was reconfigured to enclose some of the openings. He said that they actually found some of the columns were partially removed. Mr. Phelps stated, therefore, over the years, they can see that some extensive modifications were made to the front façade. They believe that the front façade is really a character defining element of this building. It faces an empty lot which was a shared tenant wall. Therefore, the only other exposed wall would be along the lane. Modifications have been done to the parapet based

on brick repointing. They also found that a mezzanine was built within the building between the second and third floor. Mr. Phelps, therefore, pointed out that the Board could see the brick colors that show the structure repair and there are also some enclosed openings. Over the years, modifications were done to the lane for façade as well. Nevertheless, he still understands that it was in keeping with its original configuration.

**Mr. Phelps** said that the current plan since 1983 build-out is mostly interior commercial space which is used currently for an attorney's office. Therefore, a stair was introduced, new elevator, new restrooms, a stair in the back and the mezzanine that he has already spoken about. He said regarding the second floor, the stairs are here; file rooms and offices. Interior of these appears in the 1980s; new drywalls, new drop ceilings and new mechanical systems. Consequently, whatever was here previously has been gutted. Mr. Phelps said on the mezzanine level, they found new framing. There is a portion of the back third of the building has been reframed. The original floor framing has been removed. In the 1930s and 1940s, the storefront was removed on the ground floor, the window was removed; a large section of the component was removed from the center to get the façade which was modified by opening up four new window openings; the ground floor was modified. Now, they know that this area of space is non-historic and in accordance with their continuance, they know that the interiors are non-historic as they all are new. Therefore, they know that what is remaining of about 90 to 100 percent of historic fabric would be the lane wall and the wall that separates the space between what was the building.

**Mr. Phelps** stated that as they started doing their selective demolition, they noticed that in this corner that originally the yellow column would have come out to about this line, but it has been cut back and showed up with the red brick. He said the Board can see the condition of the brick where it was chipped away. When they did their demolition, they found wood framing which confirms that the center column pilaster that was there in the original construction is gone. On the edge of this corner, they can see a distinct line of the original pilaster that shares between the center pilaster of the building, but wood framing has been applied to that and two layers of stucco. One layer was applied in the 1940s and the other in the 1980s. Mr. Phelps pointed out that as they moved up to try to find areas of where the details would have fitted, they could see that it was chipped away. They also found that because of the sloppy means of construction that they removed sections by cutting holes in the existing façade, there are a lot of structure failures where the joints have significantly sized cracks. Over the window lintel, a header course has been chipped back. He said brick coping on the parapet was chipped back and then red brick was put on top of that to get the square façade at the top. Mr. Phelps said that the 1940 window header masonry was removed. A new wood header was put in and there is a considerable amount of water damage and rotten wood back here.

**Mr. Phelps** said as they go to the corner, more of the detailing has been chipped back and removed. They found that the side wall was just red brick. Therefore, the construction type of this wall was very basic and was meant as a shared tenant wall. He said the Board can see that there is some structural damage going through all the masonry. He said in looking at the façade, all of the red has been removed, all the historic detailing, the majority of the openings and because of the lack of care that was taken, structural damage is throughout.

**Mr. Phelps** said at this point, they talked about what do they do; preservation, restoration, recreation, and what is available. He said in terms of restoration – there is not much historic material left on the front façade that they can actually restore. It has been removed; has been damaged and is irreplaceable. Preservation is more severe, therefore, they can not even think about preserving material that is not there. Other strategies would be replacement strategies, which would mean going in and replacing the façade with something that would mimic the building next door and try to make it a more contributing structure to the district of Broughton Street. He said that the replacement would involve

almost the removal of all the masonry and rebuild it. Mr. Phelps said they can see the three tasks they are looking at – the restoration, preservation of that façade and ensuring that it is still contributing which he believes has already been deemed not contributing. Therefore, what they would be looking at is new construction.

**Mr. Phelps** said that Mr. Howington mentioned trying to preserve the interior which is keeping the elements of the outside and trying to work with them while doing the entire interior. But, as he has said, they will have to do something with the front façade whether it remains the same or it gets a new treatment; it will be a new façade. They understand that change is inevitable with historic buildings, it happens and this means that it is a good thing because they will have development going on in historic districts and without change, they do not have growth; and without growth, they don't have successful historic districts. Change can be bad; notice the modifications of this building. It is unfortunate that these things happened over the years.

**Mr. Phelps** said that he does not know the history of why this building is considered non-contributing, but those changes are certainly severe enough to say for someone reviewing this to determine that the building is a non-contributing structure. This might help the building next to it because it took a section of the building to say that it is noncontributing and not the whole building. He said that this allows them to treat this building differently and come up with different solutions than having it as a combined building. Mr. Phelps said, therefore, they have to be thoughtful with what they preserve, they have to be mindful of their past and think about the future. Without the change in the Historic District, they are not growing anymore.

**Mr. Phelps** said that staff has suggested that the demolition of the remnants of the altered side building would adversely affect the integrity of the remaining building. He stated that the front façade is the primary architectural feature of this building. The front façades of Broughton Street are the important parts of Broughton Street. He said that through their investigation, they have shown that the historic character of the defining elements of the altered side have already been removed; they are non-existing and unable to be successfully restored or preserved. He said this corresponds with the classification that was made that it is a non-historic structure and non-contributing. If it is deemed non-contributing in the district, it should also be deemed non-contributing in relation to the building adjacent to it. Mr. Phelps said demolition of this non-contributing section of the building will not affect the classification of the remaining building. It will still be classified as a historic structure because it has been separated. If the owner next door decides to demolish that side to Mr. Engle's point, he would have to go through the process as a contributing historic structure and follow those qualifications. He said it was the previous modifications made that jeopardized this building, not the demolition that they are proposing. Demolition of this building will allow for replacement of a non-conforming, non-contextual building with a new building that is in compliance with the ordinance, contextual on Broughton Street and complies with the City ordinance. The new building will be step forward into a new era of Broughton Street that will show growth and will also preserve and provide a contextual building on this street.

**Dr. Williams** wanted to know how this differs from the Barring House where the ground floor area integrity was almost gone. One-third of this building is lost.

**Mr. Phelps** said if they look at that building as a whole, he would say that two-third of this building was in place and to demolish and replace the first floor preserves the upper floors.

**Dr. Williams** said relative to that, this building needs to be looked at holistically. One could look at it and say that with the Berrien House, they did not say that they should tear down the Berrien House because it has lost a third of its integrity.

**Mr. Phelps** stated that he understood, but the basement was removed and replaced. This building

could be removed and replaced and still preserve the remaining part of the building.

**Dr. Williams** said they could replace the parts that are missing rather than recreating the lost character defining features.

**Mr. Phelps** said this is not what is being proposed today.

**Dr. Williams** said he was aware of this.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** stated that their Architecture Review Committee reviewed this petition. They agree with staff recommendation. They feel that this is one-half of a whole building. Therefore, they do not support demolition.

**Mr. Ryan Arvay** came forward and stated that he want to get up so that there would be some citizen representation. He said that he, too, along with the Historic Savannah Foundation endorses the staff's recommendations.

**Dr. Williams** said when they look at one resource, the existing façade on the left along with what exists underneath; the test patches show a decent amount of original fabric although it is compromised. It more than warrants an appropriate treatment; restoration and rehabilitation as they know involves repairing and replacing in-kind. Mr. Arvay said there are provisions for this in the Secretary Standards. He said, therefore, as a single resource, notwithstanding the structural integrity of the building should they take one-half of it down. He believes this would set a bad precedent for the property owners and certainly sets a bad precedent as they stand at the beginning of an aggressive revitalization attempt with Mr. Carter.

**Mr. Arvay** stated that he ultimately stands unmoved by the presentation simply because he has seen too many projects that with a little creativity can really put something back as it should be.

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

**Mr. Phelps** had no comments.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said at some extent they all have been influenced by what the owner presented originally that he wants to demolish this building so that he can get the square footage he needs to put up a restoration of a furniture store that burned down in the 1980s, but it was only two bays wide and not three bays wide. Therefore, the proposal that has been presented was to put up a three bay restoration that never existed, which would be 100 percent fake.

**Mr. Engle** said he is concerned because probably one-half of Broughton Street was built as duplexes and triplexes. Originally, they were all owned by one person and then they were subdivided. He explained that the three buildings shown on the screen on the left, 109 thru 113 West Broughton Street were all built the same time, 1872. Sears radically changed the two buildings on the left in the 1930s. They gutted basically the first and second floors, but he noticed that 113 West Broughton Street that the first floor level was altered, while the second and third floors were not changed. Therefore, when they look at the two buildings on the left, the only thing that has integrity at all is the cornice and the third floor. By the rationale that they are now presenting, they could rip down 109 and 113 West Broughton Street because they do not have enough integrity left. They would have to keep the building on the right because it is still not too mangled up. Mr. Engle said that he does not buy this. They can look at 24E and for those who remembered what it looked like before Ruel restored it or

reconstructed it depending on what language you are using. This building had no integrity until he worked on it and he did a phenomenal job of bringing it back.

**Mr. Engle** said he does not believe that they have an original storefront on the first floor level on Broughton Street. Most of them have been changed at least two, three or four times. What they have is Savannah's tradition. The law office is 44 years old which is only one year away from almost being potentially eligible in its own right as ongoing history. Mr. Engle said he was not advocating this, but what is left of that building and saying all the decorative details, is a rowlock course of brick which can easily be replaced and it is being replaced all the time. Mr. Engle said that when they consider the overall building, they are probably looking at 15 percent of the original fabric of that overall structure is changed. What is missing is not cut limestone nor cut sandstone, but yellow brick which could easily be put back without any conjecture because they got the matching half right next to it.

**Mr. Merriman** stated that he agrees with staff that the building has to be treated as one building. He does not care whether it was sold and one person owns one side and another owns the other side. This building was built as one building. If as the petitioner has said that the front façade is the most character defining feature, why not restore it. Just as Mr. Engle has stated, there is enough evidence for you to know exactly what was there and it can be put back. Half of the façade is in place and the rest of it could be replaced. The ordinance says that "demolition in the Historic District could be deemed detrimental to the public's interest and shall only be permitted pursuant to the prescriptions of the section." He said that the ordinance further states that "the demolition is required to alleviate a threat to public health or safety." He said there is no threat. "The demolition is required to avoid exceptional practical difficulty or undue hardship upon any owner of any specific property. If the difficulty of hardship claimed is economic, the applicant shall be required to submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the application of the standards and regulations of this section deprives the applicant of a positive economic use or return of the subject property." Mr. Merriman said he did not see that either one of these things have been presented. Therefore, he could not see how the Board could possibly approve the demolition of this building.

**Mr. Merriman** stated although the building is listed as non-contributing, it is historical as this Board has argued many times as it is more than 50 years old.

**Dr. Williams** said they are working with a survey that they do not know the criteria by which were deemed contributing or non-contributing. He said evidently they did not walk around the back or look at the building holistically, but just used the presence of stucco to say that they could not see the historic structure; therefore, they erred on the side of non-contributing. Now, because it is classified as non-contributing does not mean that it is not contributing. He said he is willing to bet that if the stucco was removed and they asked the surveyor who did that what he thinks now, he is sure the building would be classified as contributing. Dr. Williams said he believes that the Board needs to be careful about what they do with this non-contributing status.

**Ms. McClain** stated she recalls that the last time this petition was presented that the Board asked for additional studies.

**Dr. Williams** stated that no one evaluated the building in terms of being contributing. He explained that this would need to go to City Council for a status change. However, the exploratory work confirmed that there is historic fabric beneath the stucco.

**Mr. Gunther** stated that he was in agreement with the comments. The most recent revision of the Historic Building Map was 2011. Buildings become contributing, history changes, reevaluations should occur, and new evidence surfaces. When that new evidence does surface, the Historic Building Map needs to be reevaluated.

**Mr. Engle** said that when the original survey was done in 1972, the Secretary Standards did not exist. The standards were not formulated until 1984. The Building Map was made without Secretary Standards. He explained that the Secretary Standards were not incorporated in the Historic District Ordinance until the last revision five years ago. Therefore, until that time, they did not even look at the Secretary Standards as having anything to do with the Historic District Ordinance. Mr. Engle said they went through this with Kehoe Iron Works. The building that they spent so much time on was not listed as contributing on the Building Map. Everything east of East Broad Street is a “kind of nowhere land.” Mr. Engle said, however, things change; and because this building was not included does not mean that it is not significant.

**Board Action:**

Denial of the petition for demolition of 240 West Broughton Street because the overall building retains historic significance and its demolition would be in conflict with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.  
Second: Reed Engle  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Abstain  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye  
Tess Scheer - Aye  
Robin Williams - Aye

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

- Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet- cover letter \(2014-04-23\).pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Floor plans and elevations \(2014-04-23\).pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Lot coverage and photographs.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet- 3d view, site plan, context photos \(2014-04-23\).pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet- variance justification- lot coverage and structured parking.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet- variance justification.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Aerial Map 000634.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Choctaw Ward.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Walton Ward.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [O'Neil Ward.pdf](#)



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

**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. One story parking will be underground and one story of parking on the first floor. She said that retail will be on the street level. Four floors of residences will be above. Variances are being requested.

**Ms. Harris** explained that as the Board recalls, this project has been before them on two occasions. The model that is on display dates from the original submission of March 12, 2014. This will give a reference point as how the project has evolved since that time. She said at the request of the petitioner, the petition was continued to restudy different elements and a revised design was brought before the Board on April 14, 2014 and was continued at this time for the petitioner to look at additional ways to look at the height and mass. During this meeting, the conversation focused on different strategies to break up the mass along Selma Street and reinforce the uniqueness of the site along this street due to the fact that it has a long continuous frontage, which is an unusual condition.

**Ms. Harris** said that the petitioner has significantly redesigned the proposed building. The building footprint has been reduced from 43,416 square feet to 42,505 square feet. The lot coverage has been reduced from 89 percent to 87 percent. The overall height has been reduced from 70 feet to 58 feet. The exterior expression is primarily horizontal. There are recessed openings and balcony projection on the upper floors. Along Selma Street, the building is set back approximately three feet on floors three-to-five and cantilever canopies have been added. The building drops from five stories to four stories at the western end of the building adjacent to Savannah Station. The building is located outside of the Landmark Historic District; however, it is still within the local Historic District. Therefore, the standards of the ordinance are applicable. The historic integrity and character of this area have been severely eroded over the last 60 years. There is little historic fabric left. Savannah Station is an adjacent historic building; two cemeteries are here as well as a masonry building from the 1940s. Ms. Harris stated that the petitioner is requesting a bonus floor based on the inclusion of ground floor retail at Selma Street.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the petition for New Construction, Part 1 Height and Mass, with the following conditions to be submitted with Part 2: Design Details:

1. Increase the fenestration on the west, Cohen Street, façade;
2. Incorporate an architectural differentiation on the upper floor;
3. Align the windows and doors vertically along Selma Street; and
4. Incorporate a roofline variation into the eastern portion of the building.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the standard requires that if it is over three stories, the top story needs to be differentiated.

**Ms. Harris** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** said he was thinking about SCAD's museum that it ends without any differentiation. There is a concrete wall that rises straight up. Is this allowed because it is deemed three stories or less?

**Ms. Harris** asked if this is the new portion of the structure of the SCAD's museum.

**Dr. Williams** answered yes. The new portion concrete wall just goes up without any kind of articulation at the cornice. Is this because it is three stories or less?

**Ms. Harris** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** said there is an element above the 5th floor. He guesses staff is deeming this not to be a cornice. He asked staff to go to an elevation view of the Selma Street façade. He said the 5th Street is crowned by the white band of concrete and the canopies. Above this, is what he believes is a parapet. He asked Ms. Harris if the parapet does not meet the standard because it has to be differentiated.

**Ms. Harris** answered that if the Board wants to interpret a parapet as an architectural feature that differentiates the top story from the stories below, she believes that this would be within the Board's discretion. However, all she was saying is that the top story does not appear to be visually distinct from the stories below.

**Dr. Williams** said, therefore, it is not that it needs a cornice, but the entire 5th floor needs to be distinct from the two stories below.

**Ms. Harris** said there are a variety of ways to achieve this. It could be a cornice or something radically different such as on the Cay Building. Here, they used an entirely change of material.

**Dr. Williams** said, however, a cornice could achieve it.

**Ms. Harris** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** stated, therefore, the 5th floor could be as it is now, but one option would be if the Board decides that the parapet in its present configuration might meet that standard.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the petitioner only has to select one of the various options to get an extra story.

**Ms. Harris** said one of the options has two parts to it.

**Dr. Henry** said he knows that another option is upgrade of materials.

**Ms. Harris** explained that this option has two parts. If the materials are chosen, then a green roof has to be provided.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Harris to please give a brief list of this.

**Ms. Harris** explained that in this case, the petitioner has chosen to meet retail along 100 percent of the street fronting façade; they also have the opportunity to provide affordable housing that has to be certified by the City Manager. She said to her knowledge, this has never been utilized on a project. Ms. Harris said then there is the higher grade masonry materials combined with a green roof and restoring a lost street or lane.

**Dr. Henry** said it seems strange that someone would elect to use retail shops where there are no customers.

**Mr. Howington** explained that he believes the intent of this is that maybe this will be a draw for some retail stores for pedestrians. Maybe the intent of the ordinance is to put shops on the ground floor so that it will create retail in order to get more traffic here.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Lott** thanked the Board for their patience and the input they provided at the last meeting. He realized that some of the Board members are new, but this is a challenging site. This is a building use that is not prevalent and is not like the shops that they see on a typical downtown Oglethorpe planned area pattern.

**Mr. Howington** reminded Mr. Lott that he has 15 minutes maximum to present his project.

**Mr. Lott** thanked the staff for doing an excellent job working with them and providing assistance that has helped them tremendously. He said he would be brief in his presentation, but wanted to give the Board their thoughts regarding the staff's recommendations. He stated that since the last Board meeting, they met with staff and studied the fenestration on the Cohen Street façade. He said that they can fix this. A small element is currently shown that comes up to the 5th floor which houses a stair. Mr. Lott said they have looked at the internal configuration and they are able to move the stair inboard. Therefore, they can increase the fenestration on both the Cohen Street façade and where it turns back facing the school. He said they fully understand what is being said about the incorporated architectural differentiation of the upper floors such as the inclusion of a cornice and also the distinction of the top floor. This is in the ordinance and they know that there are many successful buildings; and certainly the Cay Building is one of these buildings. Mr. Lott said typically tends to be applied to commercial buildings within the business district. It tends to be applied to buildings that are vertically arranged fairly slender. Mr. Lott said that he believes at one time Dr. Williams talked about them considering a horizontally expression or a more an egregious aesthetic.

**Mr. Lott** said they conceptually looked at a base of materials; brick that really recalls a sort of pattern in detailing for the Central of Georgia shops and look at a structurally expression that is fairly simplified that really more reflects the industrial heritage of this part of Savannah. He said he has been a fan and a student of the Historic District since he did his college thesis on this area along time ago, even before the Secretary of Interior's Standards were developed. Mr. Lott said he realized that every ward has its own unique character; even one end of Broughton Street has a different character than the other end. Mr. Lott said this particular spot is not like the rest of the Historic District. It is different; it is a diagonal lot; it is a larger lot; it has a longer frontage; and to him it requires and calls for a different approach.

**Mr. Lott** stated that they believe this is a much better building than either of the two that they have previously showed and they believe a lot of it is due to the input that they got from the Board and giving them a few more weeks to work on it. He explained that the alignment of the doors and windows are vertical; and he will briefly talk about this. One of the ways they look to reduce the mass in addition to reducing the floor heights from those that are typically required in the downtown business district was to setback the upper floors; but when you do this, you setback the floors of both corners and this creates that differentiation of alignment between the upper floors that are in the sort of graded expressions and those that are in the brick. He said that they believe this is okay. They do not think that this will be viewed in elevation. The recessed from the upper floors to the front makes the differentiation vertical alignment between the upper portions clearly a different portion of the building and lower. Mr. Lott said they are asking that this be allowed.

**Mr. Lott** said the roofline variation is hard to see in the views that they have on providing a lot of detail on the brick portion; and to treat this as a fairly highly articulated area and in the upper stories where it is setback to treat this in a much simpler fashion, they looked at treating the top floor differently, and they looked at putting a more dimensional cornice there. Quite frankly, it did not look like good architecture to them. He said they like the contemporary simplicity of the upper portion in contrast to the articulated base. Mr. Lott said they would like to hear the Board's thoughts on this. He said they are not to be more than 120 feet long without a change in the roofline. He said this building has a sort of balance between its roofline changes with a four story portion starting at Savannah Station and then the little tower element as well as the recesses. He said they looked at putting a sort of secondary tower or other element to break up the link. However, this did not look like good architecture to them; they believe that the longer portion which is 156 feet is okay as is. They believe that it is a good balance to the composition. They believe it would be a more successful building than putting some other roofline element change here. Mr. Lott said they are asking that the Board consider giving them a

variance on this.

**Mr. Lott** thanked the Board again for their input at the last meeting. He said they tried to listen intently and have tried to bring back to the Board a much better building.

**Mr. Engle** said he had problems with this at the last meeting; however, the petitioner has come a long way with this project. He said that the only thing that gives him pause now is the funny looking flying nun hat on the top of the tower. It is the only diagonal that is on the building and the "V" shape roof. Is there a reason for this?

**Mr. Lott** explained that they believe that the building needs some sort of vertical accent there.

**Mr. Engle** clarified that he had no problem with the vertical accent.

**Mr. Lott** stated that in other words, Mr. Engle just does not like their hat.

**Mr. Engle** said yes; he does not like the hat.

**Mr. Lott** said if they can get to the point where they only have a hat to worry about, they will be happy to restudy this. He said they looked at a number of options and maybe the simple flat plate would look better. It is a fairly low angle and they want to get the after off of it. He stated that they are happy to continue to evaluate this as a part of Part II if this is agreeable. Mr. Lott said he likes the overhang and likes stopping the visual verticality with something. He does not believe that it wants a pitched roof on it like the little house up there. Mr. Lott said there maybe something better.

**Dr. Williams** said he just looked at the Frogtown lofts and they have four stories straight up, very minimal band above the top floor windows and there is just minute coping. He believes this would be a good reference point. This is similar to what Mr. Lott has essentially without the change of color.

**Mr. Lott** said they can certainly look at this and he will add it to his list along with the "hat." They believe that they can look at modifications to that.

**Dr. Henry** said the petitioner has done a great improvement with this project.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they believe that this project has improved every time that it has come back. Ms. Meunier said the HSF agrees with most all of staff's recommendations as stated in their report, particularly, incorporating the roofline variation on the eastern portion of the Selma Street façade. The HSF likes the setbacks of the upper floors and really like the southern end of the Savannah Station where it drops down a little. Ms. Meunier said they believe this is a good end and anchor to the building. They would love to see this on the opposite side of the Selma Street façade. She said this might be a way to incorporate the roofline variation. Now, of course, she knows that the petitioner is working very hard to keep all of the room possible.

**Ms. Meunier** said the HSF appreciates that the lot coverage has been reduced; however, they still believe that there is a reason that a lesser amount of lot coverage is allowed for residential; and ultimately that is what this is. Therefore, they still feel that the lot coverage needs to be decreased a little more. She also believes that there is an opportunity to better activate the Purse Street façade. Ms. Meunier said she is aware that she said this at the last meeting, but she will say it again, there is an opportunity to connect Purse Street as it originally did to Selma Street even if it is only on the first floor. She stated that the petitioner does not need to break the entire building into; even if it is just for pedestrian traffic so that they are creating some circulation on that site. Ms. Meunier said they have are talking about this area potentially developing and, therefore, they want to keep an eye on having

full circulation and activity on this site and not just solely concentrate on the Selma Street façade. She said the HSF feels this would be a positive thing.

**Ms. Meunier** pointed out on the plan that Purse Street currently dead-ends and makes a loop. At point it connected; therefore, they are only talking about the first level possibly of the building actually being opened all the way through from Purse Street to Selma Street. They are not saying open for vehicular traffic, but at least for pedestrian traffic.

**Ms. Meunier** said lastly, the HSF does not have strong feelings about incorporating some sort of top or cornice. They believe that because of the contemporary style of these upper floors that they continue in that direction and even the context that she believes Dr. Williams pointed out about Frogtown. They do not believe it is important to have a cornice or something.

**Mr. Howington** invited Mr. Lott to respond to the public comment.

**Mr. Lott** said he wanted to make sure that Historic Savannah Foundation was aware that they made some changes on the Purse Street side since their last submission. He said some people tell him to reopen Purse Street and then someone tells him that Purse Street never went through. He said that he does not know, but what they did is that one of their secondary courtyard spaces align with Purse Street. Therefore, if you are coming down the dead-end that leads to the Board of Education's parking lot, it aligns with that. On the upper floors they recognize Purse Street. Mr. Lott explained that the other thing that they have done was to put one of the large arched openings like they use on Selma Street there, even though there is parking garage space behind it, they glazed that so at night there is light and activity there. He said that it is functionally difficult to have a parking garage where they are carrying that through there. Therefore, they do not want to do that. As far as sort of bookending another four-story element that was suggested, they looked at it and found it to be less successful. It weakened the horizontal nature and in his review, it, like the previous submissions, was confusing at the point where they started stacking these things up. He said their opinion is that they think this part is right and they want it to be reviewed as is. However, they appreciate the HSF's comment about the upper floor and the edge and they agree with them on that.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** said the 120 foot length requiring a half story modification is predicated on the premises of 300 foot long block of the Oglethorpe Plan Tithing Block and if he understands correctly, this building is 380 feet long and the section in question is 159 feet. However, if they took the 40 percent of a 300 block to get 120; 40 percent of the current site would be 152 feet. Therefore, they are within a few feet of being the 40 percent of a block. Dr. Williams said a part of the Board's concern at the last meeting was that this project is being broken up into too many different ways. But, he would advocate given the extreme length of this building that it seems proportionately and not apply the standard from the district to a unique site. Dr. Williams said that he just wanted to reiterate that in his opinion, the top floor with what he will call a parapet is sufficiently distinguished. As a fact, he said, it is more distinguished or at least it is just as distinguished from the top floor as the four-story Frogtown lofts. He said since this project is in close proximity to Frogtown, yet, having a variation with those continuous vertical white elements [he assumes this is concrete] extending up to this parapet gives it a little variation from what they see at Frogtown. Dr. Williams said the only place where he is a little concern is as they see on left where it goes from looking like an articulation of structure to some kind of weird stripping that carries under the canopy as it extends out uniquely into an overhang. He believes this area could use some change. Otherwise, he believes that the parapet is successful.

**Dr. Henry** said he saw the drawings for this project yesterday and they have improved vastly. He said he likes the distinctness of the railroad industrial look which he believes gives it a nice touch.

**Mr. Engle** said looking at the staff's recommendations, the two denials are subdivide the façade horizontally and basement on top, and the top story of the building articulation. He said he believes just as Dr. Williams has shown that Frogtown as just a simple coping at the top and not a cornice. It is just a simple coping which throws a little shadow. This works the way it is at 159 feet or 160 feet. The last time they asked the petitioner to get away from the bay, but now he does not believe that they can come back and say that they did not want them to get away from it that much. He thinks that the Board should go with something simple as a coping and maybe look at the flying nun hat to see if something could be done.

**Mr. Gunther** said he agrees with the petitioner that there is sufficient variation between the top floors and the floors below; as a distinction he will say the "parapet wall."

**Mr. Howington** said for the record, he wanted to make a comment about the variances. He stated that he has said before that anytime a petition comes to the Board with more than two or three variances it should raise a red flag that something is not right. However, in this case it actually works. This is outside the Landmark District and it is a unique site and the Downtown Historic Ordinance does not actually work for this site as well as it does in other places. Mr. Howington said that he would never advocate for this many variances, but in this case, they work very well due to context and sometimes this happens. However, it is very rarely that it does.

**Mr. Howington** said he also agrees with the comments about the bookending as he believes the building would look like a bookend building. Therefore, he likes the smaller portion on the west end that really defines the end of that building and sets the others in a string line. He said that he somewhat likes the roof slant, but this is just his personal opinion. He said the Board keeps talking about the I-16 Flyover maybe removed, may not be removed, but this is not what's before the Board today. This may never happen; therefore, they cannot let that dictate to this project.

**Dr. Williams** suggested that the element on the tower, even though it is a height and mass element, can the Board isolate that element and allow the architect to restudy it and maybe come back with some alternate proposals.

**Mr. Howington** stated that he believes the Board could do that. He said he likes the large projections.

**Dr. Williams** said the petitioners are integrating commercial on the ground floor and the comment was made by the Historic Savannah Foundation about the pedestrian flow from the two main streets in the area; from Purse Street to Selma Street. For discussion by the Board, he asked if there a way to facilitate the pedestrian flow between the two streets.

**Mr. Howington** stated that Purse Street dead-ends into the back. He could not imagine a lot of pedestrians traveling back here. However, this is not to say in the future that could not be the architect has allowed for an arch and an upper courtyard. Maybe in the future this entire end could become retail or a pedestrian walkthrough could be here. But, this may not be the best and highest use for that space now.

**Mr. Engle** said with the school being here, you could get into all kinds of issues. An eight foot chain link fence is around the school. So, there really isn't any traffic. Occasionally, traffic is on Cohen Street, but no will be coming down Purse because of the school's fence. Mr. Engle said he does not believe that they want the students walking through an archway and do not want the residents walking through here either. The security issues are not a concern of this Board. Visually, the petitioner deals with it as an arch is here.

**Dr. Williams** stated that as Mr. Howington said, the arch at least creates a potential for opening this up in the future.

**Board Action:**

**Approval** of the petition for New Construction, Part 1: Height and Mass, with the following conditions to be submitted with Part 2: Design Details:

- Increase the fenestration on the west, Cohen Street, façade;
- Study incorporating coping;
- Restudy the roof shape of the proposed butterfly roof;
- Study the alignment of the windows and doors vertically along Selma Street.

**The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals from the following variances**

- 75% lot coverage standard (87% is proposed);
- Structured parking setback;
- Minimum ground floor height of 14'6" (13'6" is proposed);
- Minimum second floor height of 12' (10'8" - PASS is proposed);
- Window groupings, columns, and/or pilasters to create multiple bays not less than 15 feet nor more than 20 feet in width (various bays widths are proposed).
- Subdivide the façade horizontally into base, middle, and top (only base and middle are proposed);
- The exterior visual expression of the top story of buildings over three stories shall be distinctive from the stories below the top story; and
- Maximum frontage of 120 linear feet of continuous height shall be permitted before a minimum one-half story variation is required. This variation shall be expressed in the roofline [See Definitions (a)]. (There are variations in height, but there is a 159 foot

stretch  
on the eastern portion of the front façade  
without a variation).

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

19. [Petition of Jeff Cramer | 14-000693-COA | 505 East Congress Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction Part II Design Details for 2 ½ story detached residence on a vacant property located at 505 East Congress Street. At last month's meeting, the Board approved Part I Height and Mass with the following conditions:

Revise the paired window in the gabled peak on the rear façade.

Restudy and simplify the dormer design

**Ms. Michalak** stated that the petitioner has addressed the conditions by redesigning and simplifying the drawings and has removed one window from the peak. She said, therefore, the Board's conditions for Part I Height and Mass are met.

**Ms. Michalak** said with regards to Part II Design Details, the roof materials are to be standing seam in a white finish. The windows will be painted white; all trim will be snowbound; the house body will be hearty with a six inch exposure and the clapboard pattern in a smooth finish. All of the porch columns are proposed to be 6 inch diameter, HB&G Architectural Wood Columns with Tuscan capital and base. The capitals extend outward of the



architrave.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that the columns appear too slender; staff recommends increasing the diameter of the columns to be more visually compatible.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Cramer** stated that as Ms. Michalak reported, they have redesigned and simplified the drawing and removed one window from the peak. He thanked the Board for what they do. He entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Cramer if he was saying that they are in agreement with the staff's recommendations.

**Mr. Cramer** answered yes.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Howington** thanked Mr. Cramer for making the changes from the previous meeting. He wanted to repeat that the dormer is a little overbearing for him, but he is aware that some of the Board members feel differently.

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for New Construction: Part II, Design Details for a 2 1/2-story detached residence on the vacant property located at 505 East Congress Street with the following condition - PASS to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Increase the diameter of the porch columns.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

Rehabilitation, Alterations, and Additions

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings and Photographs.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Specifications.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [1954 and 1973 Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Staff Research Photographs.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Applicant Computer Renderings.pdf](#)

**Mr. Neil Dawson** was present on behalf of the petitioner.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations for the commercial property at 302 Williamson Street. The project scope pertains only to the 3rd and 4th floors of building where a new hostel and restaurant will be constructed. She said the majority of the petition remains the same from the April 14, Review Board meeting.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that at last month's meeting centered around the concern of the reconfiguration of the Factors Walk bridges. The last proposal covered all of Factors Walk with the exception of the existing stair. The Board requested that the redesign cover less of the upper Factors Walk area. The upper elevation is the existing condition and the lower is proposed. Currently, there are two bridges, which span over Factors Walk between the building and Williamson Street. She explained that as the Board sees, this bridge is not in its original location. It is approximately four feet down from the doors and clearly covers some of the windows. The petitioner is proposing to remove this bridge entirely and rebuild it at approximately the same width, which is 28 feet – 6 inches at the current height and extend a new portion of a bridge across from one bridge to the other. A handicap ramp is proposed with two stairs coming down to the Williamson Street sidewalk. A masonry planter will be in front. A guardrail will be around the area. The guardrail will match the existing adjacent guardrail in design and height. All the guardrails will be painted black.

**Ms. Michalak** said another item that was incomplete at the last meeting was additional information on the awnings. The petitioner is proposing five new awnings across the front of the façade. The awnings are three feet tall and project six feet from the face of the building and they are eight feet – five inches clear above to the underside. The fabric will either be Sunbrella, Black or Sunbrella, Slate, which the staff will review at staff level.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that the staff did more research on this area after the last meeting to see if they could find any more evidence of previous configurations of these bridges. She said that the bridges have changed, rebuilt and moved and removed many, many times going all the back to the 1800s. Staff also found a photo from the first edition of the Historic Savannah book. The photo revealed that where the canopies are now, the tiered canopies show just what the Sanborn Map told staff, which is that it had a sort of pavilion structure over that bridge. She showed the Board a photo from the early 1990s that was in the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) approval for the canopies that were installed. Ms. Michalak said as the Board sees, that bridge was already built and at that point a handicap ramp was added and is still there now. A 1997 photo shows that the bridges were still in their current configuration. Upon further research by the staff, several photos illustrate that it is likely that Factors Walk in this area was never completely covered by bridging and that only the center is essentially missing. She said, therefore, staff recommends that the bridging be redesigned to reinstate the center bridge and create a narrower bridge along the façade of the building to preserve the historic and current spatial relationships.

**Ms. Michalak** said the petitioner has submitted some renderings that they have done. She was not

presenting the renderings, but just wanted to inform the Board of this as the petitioner is interested in presenting the renderings when they make their presentation to the Board.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for proposed alterations with the exception of the Factors Walk bridging at the Williamson Street level with the following conditions:

1. Provide the final awning fabric selections and provide any and all proposed awning signage;
2. Continue the proposed alterations and additions to the Factors Walk bridging at the Williamson Street level in order for the petitioner to consider redesigning the area including reinstating the missing center bridge and create a narrower bridge along the façade of the building.

**Dr. Williams** said there are so many bridges. He said it would be helpful if the staff showed the Board either the existing conditions or what is being proposed. Maybe it would be better if both were shown to the Board and explain what the center bridge is.

**Ms. Michalak** said the best way to show this is from the elevation. She explained that as the Board sees, this is the existing condition. Historically, there was just a narrow straight bridge from this door to the Williamson Street sidewalk. She said the Sanborn Map shows this. Ms. Michalak said [pointing to an area] this is the missing bridge that she was talking about. It is narrow and went over to that door.

**Dr. Williams** stated that Ms. Michalak said reduce the width of one of the proposed bridges.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that what the ordinance calls for in the Factors Walk bridging is for pedestrian use. In this situation it would not be very friendly for pedestrian and public use. She pointed out that the bridging is public property. Therefore, in this situation it would not necessarily be a comfortable situation for the public to come through here. Therefore, staff felt that if the bridge was actually narrowed up, allowing potentially seating on one side that it would be a more comfortable situation for the public to use the space as it was intended.

**Dr. Williams** asked that where it says "open below" is this where the center bridge will be located.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes and that the center bridge would also cross through that as well. She said [pointing to a section] that the original center bridge would come in here; and this would be narrower here. This is what staff is recommending.

**Dr. Williams** asked, therefore, what might be lost would be the openness below in terms of the bridge that will be gained by pushing it back.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that this is the idea.

**Dr. Williams** asked that the staff is not recommending narrowing the width of the two.

**Ms. Michalak** answered no. The petitioner is not recommending to change that one. The other bridge is being reinstated at the same width that it is currently.

**Dr. Williams** asked staff if they have a recommendation to how much narrower the bridge should be.

**Ms. Michalak** answered no, but reduced enough to still allow seating on one side and people on the other. She believes it would be more desirable for a designer to determine what the comfortable width would be.

**Dr. Williams** said as Ms. Michalak has stated, the bridges are in a steady state of flux throughout history. What would be gained by having the central third bridge?

**Ms. Michalak** answered it would provide more pedestrian and public interaction; more use of the area by the public.

**Dr. Henry** said he does not believe they are talking about a bridge, but a deck.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that it is a bridge because it goes over two stories and open space is below.

**Mr. Howington** said that the bridge on the right is 17 feet x 20 inches. Therefore, some bridges are wider than others. It could be a deck or a bridge, but here it is considered a bridge. He said that Ms. Michalak mentioned that the ordinance says that the bridge should not be covered by awnings, etc. He wanted them to look at the Sanborn Map and look at it historically as it shows clearly that an awning is covering the entire bridge.

**Mr. Engle** said all the historic photographs show awnings on all of them.

### PETITIONER COMMENTS

**Mr. Dawson** said this is an area that they have worked on for many years. In fact, a previous Review Board approved the full covering of this area similar to what they proposed the last time. However, they went back and restudied this and frankly he believes that the recommendations from this Board makes for a better proposal than what they initially submitted.

**Mr. Dawson** said in terms of the overall character of Factors Walk, not just historically, but now, there are many bridges that had coverings and decks, whatever they want to call them, that had different types of character for parking. He said that factually, their present deck is being used for parking. He said the East Factors Walk row is actually a bit of an anomaly because it has historically a walkway adjacent to the building with smaller bridges that go across Upper Factors Walk. Mr. Dawson said he believes that this is a more successful plan than West Bay Street which has just a conglomeration of bridges, ramps, and pavilions.

**Mr. Dawson** pointed out their building and said that there is a full cover awning. But, it looks like it has bridges that are perpendicular building as indicated on the Sanborn Maps. He said these are the adjacent buildings and factually one building to the right is antique. It is a one-story building that is built on what would have been presumably a bridge that crosses Factors Walk. This was indicated in the early Sanborn Map as a cotton shed built over Factors Walk. Mr. Dawson said, therefore, he believes this building is on the public right-of-way; and over time it evolved from a shed to a building and now it is an occupied structure that is probably built on public right-of-way.

**Mr. Dawson** said one of the Board's comment was will this block too much of the sunlight. Therefore, they did some perspective studies. He showed the Board the submittal that they now have before them. He pointed out the existing bridge with the three tier awning that they will remove. Mr. Dawson explained that here is where staff has proposed that the center bridge comes across and on the other side they want to rebuild which is that current wood trestle piece that is used for parking.

**Mr. Dawson** showed the Board a view looking from underneath. He said looking at their building, this is a lower walkway that gives access to some of the other bays. He pointed out the trestle with the three awnings and the wood trestle. Mr. Dawson said they rendered their proposal at different times of day based on the same day that this picture was taken.

**Mr. Dawson** said when they got the staff's report and looked at the idea of putting an eight or nine feet wide bridge across here and reducing the width from what they are showing to something more narrower that would allow seating on one side somewhat like the skinny part of East Factors Walk on the East Bay Street side, they actually ended up with a lot less area that is open below as this bridge comes across, you really would have 42 feet between the two bridges. Consequently, the hole becomes much smaller than what they are showing now. Mr. Dawson said there is really no utility to have a bridge in the middle because they are so close on each side.

**Mr. Dawson** said they felt that the proposal that they had before the Board was the best option. They are meeting the intent of standard by closing what is currently a vehicular parking area and raising it up so that it becomes pedestrian only. He said his client is spending money to improve what is good for the public; although, he is certainly benefitting by having waiter service out there as Mr. Engle pointed out. Mr. Dawson stated that unfortunately they have had to add the ramp because the existing ramp and walkway do not meet the ADA requirements. Frankly, he said he would like those off, but he believes this would probably go beyond the purview of what this Board looks at. This is why they restudied it and have increased the open area to what they think is an appropriate size and does not block much light compared to what they have now. Mr. Dawson said they believe this is a superior option as to putting in a center bridge. They could entertain reducing the width of the walkway in the middle. His concern is that they would lose some utility and they base this with East Bay as Mr. Howington pointed out that at Vic's where they have tables seating adjacent to the building. They feel the 12'-6" is a comfortable width and that people would still circulate and not feel that they were walking through somebody's dinner. He believes that if it was narrower, it would not change that affect. They can push it back, but he does not believe that much would be gained. If the pushed it back, he believes they would be losing tables; however, if they did so, they would probably move it back about four or five feet.

**Dr. Williams** said this would be that there would not be two sets of tables to clean as there would only be one set of tables. Then, they would gain a lot more light.

**Mr. Engle** asked staff to explain why this did not meet the Secretary of Interior's standards.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that she said that all the alterations except the bridging met the standards and for the bridging, itself, is that although the existing bridging materials themselves are not historic, the spatial relationships that the bridges create are distinctive and part of the historic character of Factors Walk. Upon further staff research, several photograph were located that illustrate that it is like that Factors Walk, in this area, was never completely covered by bridging and that only the center bridge is missing.

**Mr. Engle** stated that nothing was said about the east/west connector. He asked did it ever exist.

**Ms. Michalak** said that after further research, they found something a little different than last month. She explained that it appears that the only piece that is missing from what was originally there is the center bridge.

**Mr. Dawson** said they will modify the bridge's width to nine feet. He believes this would be more in keeping with the existing bridges on East Bay Street and also as Ms. Michalak pointed out, it will line up with the wall that is below that is Lower Factors Walk.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Henry** said initially he was going to vote against this, but after Mr. Dawson has agreed to narrow the bridge he will vote favorably for it.

**Dr. Williams** said he was thinking positive that reducing the east/west bridge down to nine feet will open up more space below. He said although he appreciates the staff's recommendation of a third bridge because there is a possibility that one was here, but his guess is that it was narrow just as some of the bridges near City Hall are only four feet wide. However, as he explained at last month's meeting, he has great concern for over bridging the site because of the two existing bridges. Dr. Williams said if the existing bridges were narrow, he would be in agreement about the third bridge. He believes the more open the spatial area the better as some day the Lower Factors Walk lanes might be used for something other than holding up the air conditioning. Consequently, he believes they need to proceed with caution.

**Mr. Howington** asked, therefore, would it be fair to say that this is possibly something that may come along in the future. But, it is not a part of this petition and is not presented as such. Therefore, this is not something that the Board can require the petitioner to do.

**Dr. Williams** said he is in agreement of accepting this proposal as is with the amended reduction in the width of the west portions. He does not believe that the Board should be encouraging the petitioner to add the bridge.

**Mr. Howington** said another thought on this is it is sort of what was said earlier. They are in a constant state of flux and are almost like storefronts. Over time bridges have come and gone and changes have been made.

**Ms. Scheer** stated that a part of the appeal of Factors Walk and the entire history of its function is looking down and being able to see that. If the third bridge comes in there, it will diminish the visibility of below and this is a part of the appeal of this. She said, therefore, she is in favor of the two bridges and not the third bridge.

**Mr. Gunther** added that accepting losses is right in line with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for rehab, so just because other historic features are now missing does not mean that there is any necessary need to reinstall that feature. Therefore, they are conforming to the standards.

**Mr. Engle** agreed; he does not believe that the third bridge should be done. They are adding more than ever existed. But, they do not have to add more bridging than necessary. He does not believe that they need to leave the door open to say next year you can do it.

**Mr. Howington** said the Board is not leaving the door open. If someone wants to do so, a petition would have to come to the Board.

**Dr. Henry** said he appreciates the petitioner's goodwill gesture.

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for all proposed alterations for the commercial property located at 302 Williamson Street with the followings conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Reduce the depth of the new east-west bridge to a maximum of 9 feet deep (reduced from the 12 foot-6 inch proposed depth). - PASS
2. Provide the final color selection for the awning fabric.
3. Provide any/all proposed awning signage.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Robin Williams

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

21. [Petition of Brett and Kim Turner | 14-001805-COA | 509 Whitaker Street | New Construction: Part I Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

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

**Ms. Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a one-story, two car garage and trellis structure for the property located at 509 Whitaker Street. The petitioner is also requesting a variance from the structured parking standard to allow for the proposed garage along Howard Street. Although Howard is a Street, it functions as a lane.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for new construction Part I Height and Mass and the trellis structure with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board with Part II:

- a. Change the trellis brick bases to stucco to match the house and the proposed garage.
- b. Clarify the projection and the height above the sidewalk for the awning above the glass door.

- c. Redesign the trellis to not to extend forward of the façade of the garage.

**Ms. Michalak** said that staff also recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the structured parking standard because the variance criteria are met.

**Dr. Henry** said he appreciates that Ms. Michalak clarified the situation pertaining to Howard Street.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that staff spent some time on Howard Street to really ensure that the area functioned as a lane; and it definitely does.

**Mr. Gunther** asked Ms. Michalak if staff feels that the awning is visually compatible.

**Ms. Michalak** stated staff needs more clarification on the heights to ensure that the height standards are met. If the standards are not met, then some adjustments would be made. She said an awning above garage doors over a public sidewalk is a little unusual, but this is Howard Street and functions as a lane. Therefore, in a lane situation this is not uncommon.

**Dr. Henry** said he does not remember seeing an awning anywhere over a garage door.

**Mr. Howington** stated that there are awnings over garage doors with the same brackets.

**Mr. Engle** asked staff to explain the trellis. He does not understand what it does; it appears to be opened at the lane. It shows a grid on the west/east side, but the model shows a wall on the house side interior of the trellis.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that it is an existing wall.

**Mr. Engle** asked why a variance is not being required for the trellis which by ordinance 11 feet is the maximum height. This is one reads at 12' - 4". He does not understand what it is and does not know why it is being allowed at 12'- 4". They have required that other people decrease it and required that a variance be gotten. The Review Board can recommend a variance, but they cannot give a variance.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that this is another one that staff was a little grey. The trellis is structurally integrated into the building and its location is appropriate based on the design of the garage. It is not a freestanding trellis, but this is at the Board's discretion if they feel that a variance is warranted.

**Dr. Williams** stated that a post is near the proposed garage; a column which is existing and below it is the proposed center post of the trellis He said it would be great if they had an inside elevation because it is obvious that all of this will be visible from the public right-of-way.

**Ms. Michalak** said a recommendation could be made that the columns line up there instead of being offset from it.

**Ms. Caldwell** asked if the petitioner gets permission for this, can they alter the fence later on that is already there.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that if the petitioner wanted to make any changes, it would be another review.



**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Turner** said the logic behind the "awning" as they call it over the garage doors is shown as metal. If they look at the photograph of the home it has a mansard metal roof. Therefore, the idea is this deal would tie-in the roof of the home and make it look more plausible with the home. He said regarding the trellis, they are not necessarily wedged to going this high. He believes the designer felt that there was logic to tying the trellis into the eve of the home. But, it is possible that it could be dropped within the typical height variance and to the fascia board or a little lower and still tie it into the garage. Mr. Turner said he feels this would work if the Board prefers to see that it maintains the height variance.

**Mr. Turner** said that you cannot see these in the photos very well, but the fence on the back is black and it has almost a raised trellis structure out from the fence. They planted it and it has confederate jasmine that covers it which continues throughout the garden in the back of the home. Therefore, they wanted to continue this and this is the reason for the trellises. He said he does not know if there is any necessary logic to the post in the middle as it relates to the fence behind. He said they did not think about this, but they will look at this, which could be modified. They could possibly modify the rear fence to read more logically with the post. Now, of course, the post is centered, therefore, a car will be on each side of it. This the reason for the post on the new trellis.

**Mr. Howington** asked for clarification whether the trellis actually sits in front of the rear fence and not in the same plain.

**Mr. Turner** answered correct. He said several questions were asked about the lattice wall to the north of the trellis. He explained that post from the trellis contains a boxed in lattice on the other side. They intend to plant here and let the confederate jasmine cover it. Mr. Turner said the property owner to the north is SCAD's Magnolia Hall Inn. Therefore, frequently, a lot of cars are here. He said from a privacy standpoint, they wanted to create something from their driveway between them and the Inn to give them some privacy.

**Mr. Turner** said they did not want to do a garage all the way across the back as they frequently have visitors that come to the back of the house, UPS and FedEx, because on they are on Whitaker, they do not deliver on Whitaker Street, but they deliver on the lane. Consequently, whenever they have deliveries, they come through their back courtyard and deliver the items to the back door. If they had a garage there, then they would have to do a lot of coordination with letting people in and out. This is the reason they want to do a two car garage and a covered lattice area over the other two parking spaces.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Turner to make comments on the staff's recommendation regarding changing the trellis structured brick bases to stucco.

**Mr. Turner** said they have no problems with the stucco recommendation.

**Mr. Howington** said the projection dimension and the height could be dealt with in Part II: Design Detail. He asked Mr. Turner if he had concerns regarding redesigning the trellis to no extend forward of the front of the façade of the garage.

**Mr. Turner** answered that he has concerns about the redesigning of the trellis. He explained that with a typical trellis structure, you have that horizontal member and then the trellis goes over the edge to create the look of the trellis. Mr. Turner said right now if the

post stays where it is and they were not to have the a protrusion, to him it would be strange looking. It would end right at the horizontal member. Therefore, they might want to look at bumping this post back so that they can get some extension, but not extended into the right-of-way. However, from an architecture standpoint, it will not look much like a trellis if they bring the board all the way to the edge and stop it. He said this is something that they can look at before design details and talk with Ms. Harris and staff to see if there is a way to make this visually have the look they need, but not protrude into the public right-of-way.

**Mr. Engle** suggested that the post be bumped back 18 inches. He said also he is somewhat an expert on confederate jasmine and if Mr. Turner does not lower the trellis, his shingles will be ripped off the roof. Therefore, he might want to bring it down 16 inches anyway so that it could be maintained. Mr. Engle asked Mr. Turner if he would be willing to eliminate the pent roof. He believes it is a bit much.

**Mr. Turner** asked Mr. Engle if he was talking about the metal awning roof, as they call it, over the garage doors. He said in an answer to Mr. Engle's question, they would rather not, but if the Board requires this, he will not object. They and the designer felt that it helped tie-in the look of the home. He said if the Board looks at the picture of the rear of the house, they will see the big metal mansard roof and they were trying to bring a little of that in to tie it in to the garage structure.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Turner if he would be demolishing the fence roughly where the car is shown in the photo.

**Mr. Turner** answered correct.

**Dr. Williams** asked that three piers would be left. Is there a pier or wall beyond the gate to the left?

**Mr. Turner** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** said his concern is about the proposed pergola. He said that Mr. Turner will demolish more than half of the fence. He was wondering if there is an opportunity here to integrate that wall with the pergola. Is the fence six or seven feet?

**Mr. Turner** answered that the fence is about seven feet.

**Dr. Williams** said this does not seem as if it is a completely resolved situation. The one brick pier that will be visible is going to be just a few inches away from the center post. He said the center post could possibly be modified, but the petitioner is not in the middle of the pergola. Therefore, he does not know if modifying fence is an option. Dr. Williams asked what will hold up the fence, the black painted part, on the right hand side.

**Mr. Turner** said he saw Dr. Williams point. He said he does not believe that they put a lot of thought into how the trellis would read as it relates to the fence behind. He believes they can take a look at this before design details and talk with staff to see if they can come up with another way to do it. Mr. Turner asked if they need the center post for the new trellis structure. Or could it expand all the way across without a center post. However, he saw what Dr. Williams said. The logic of where the center post is as it relates to the existing columns behind will look like an after thought. He said, therefore, he agrees that they need to take a look at this; or they can rebuild the rear fence to be more consistent with the entire structure. He said that they will look at this as well.

**Dr. Henry** asked what is the width of the garage area and the width of the trellis area.

**Mr. Turner** said he believes the garage is roughly 21 feet and the trellis area is 18 or 19 feet.

**Mr. Gunther** asked Mr. Turner if there was any logic to the trellis being at the north and the garage at the south versus the other way around.

**Mr. Turner** answered yes. However, they actually considered doing it the other way. But, one must understand the interior of the garden to understand the decision. The southern side of the garden has a number of large trees there. This is where they spend most of their time.

**Mr. Gunther** said because Howard is a city street, although it functions as a lane, the wall of continuity could be improved as there is parking to the north. There is a curb cut all the way across the back of the neighboring property to the north. If it was split, the rhythm of the solid and void would be a little stronger to create a stronger wall of continuity along that corridor.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** welcomed the new Board members. Mr. Carey complimented Mr. Turner on his willingness to be open to modifications, ideas, and comments. He said as a frequent walker of Howard Street where he was a resident for five years, while it may function as a lane, it is a street. Therefore, he would caution about dismissing it as a lane. In his opinion, it serves more as a street. Mr. Carey said the HSF agrees with all of the staff's recommendations. He also agrees with Mr. Engle's comments and concerns about the height of the trellis. If the trellis was a foot lower, it would seem like it would actually tie-in better with the garage and honor the standard that is required.

**Mr. Carey** said he had questions as well about the roofing material. Is it standing seam, sheet metal and the relationship to that with the main building? Is the main house pressed tin or is it standing seam?

**Dr. Williams** said based on the photo, he believes it is standing seam.

**Mr. Carey** said there main concern is the lowering of the trellis to know more than what would be allowed at its maximum height.

**Mr. Howington** advised Mr. Turner that he may respond to the public comments, but he believes that he has already responded and agreed to do that.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Merriman** said Dr. Williams picked out some things that he was a little unclear about. He asked Dr. Williams what was he saying regarding the review of the fence.

**Dr. Williams** explained [pointing to a section] that the garage comes right there. The center post of the pergola will be right there. Then you will have wall, two feet of fence, and a post. The center post is about two-thirds the diameter width of this; wood versus brick and it will be about six inches to the south of that, then you have the two brick piers and the other post and pergola will be about there. Therefore, it seems like it will be

a new pergola post, a new pergola post. What is expressing is that this does not seem to have any relationship to the pergola. But, there is an opportunity here since they are using the pergola to define a wall on the north side, but using pre-existing fence to define the wall on the east side. Yet, there is no relationship between that and the previous fence.

**Mr. Merriman** asked if the fence is historic to where it cannot be changed.

**Mr. Howington** reminded the Board that the petitioner said that he will look at this and restudy this.

**Mr. Merriman** asked Mr. Engle that his concern was the little shed roof over the garage doors and the trellis should be lowered to meet the standards and push it back.

**Mr. Engle** said the out-looking rafters on the end of the trellis should not come beyond the face of the garage.

**Mr. Merriman** said this is one of the staff's recommendations.

**Mr. Engle** said that apples and oranges are being mixed as there is a bracket next door, but it is very simple. It is a four-by-four diagonal coming out of the building and holding up a pent roof. The main building has a standing seam, but there are no brackets on it at all.

**Mr. Howington** said they need to be careful with the roof because if they take the room away, it will certainly accentuate the height.

**Mr. Merriman** stated that he was not saying take the roof away, but simply it. They can still keep the roof. He likes it and it is a nice feature.

**Mr. Howington** said the discussion is to possibly simplify the bracket. The trellis will become a little narrower to bring the horizontal boards in so that the overhang does not extend beyond the house. The trellis is to be lowered also.

**Mr. Engle** said this will come back to the Board. This is Part I today.

**Mr. Howington** said the Board is dealing with the height and mass of the garage with some modifications to the trellis. He clarified that the height and mass of the garage is not changing. The roof design will be simplified and the trellis will be modified. But, the overall height and mass are not affected that much. Mr. Howington said if the Board chooses, this could be motioned as a condition or the petitioner could ask the Board for a continuance and bring both of these back as Part I and II. He said he believes it will be acceptable either way because the petitioner has agreed to look at all of those options and bring them back to the Board.

**Dr. Henry** said there are many lacking portions of this petition.

**Mr. Merriman** said if the petitioner asks for a continuance, he does not see why the Board could not hear Part I and Part II at the next meeting.

**Mr. Howington** informed Mr. Turner that the Board could not ask for the continuance, but, he, as the petitioner can request a continuance. However, if he wants, the Board can vote on his petition, but it maybe denied or approved. It seems that some changes are needed. Since this is a Part I and II, they Board is willing to review the changes of Part I during Part II at the next time.

Mr. Turner asked for a continuance.

**Board Action:**

1. Approve to continue the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 1-story, two-car garage and trellis structure for the property located at 509 Whitaker Street in order for the petitioner to consider the following:
  - a. Restudy the relationship between the existing fence and the new trellis.
  - b. Lower the height of the trellis to meet the 11 foot maximum height standard.
  - c. Change the trellis structure's brick bases to stucco to match the house and the proposed garage.
  - d. Redesign the trellis to not extend forward of the front façade of the garage.
  - e. Restudy/simplify the design of the roof/awning over the garage doors. - PASS

2. Approve to continue the request for a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the following standard:

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

Per the Board's discussion, the applicant may submit Parts I and II for review at the next HDBR meeting.

**Vote Results**

- Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.  
Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.
- |                             |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Debra Caldwell              | - Aye     |
| Reed Engle                  | - Aye     |
| Justin Gunther              | - Aye     |
| Nicholas Henry              | - Aye     |
| Keith Howington             | - Abstain |
| Zena McClain, Esq.          | - Aye     |
| Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. | - Aye     |
| Tess Scheer                 | - Aye     |
| Robin Williams              | - Aye     |

Tattnall Street | New Construction: Part 1 Height and Mass

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Application.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Mass Model.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

**Mr. Shedrick** Coleman was present on behalf of the petitioner.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction Part I, Height and Mass of three attached, 2-story townhouses on the vacant properties at 703, 705, and 707 Tattnall Street. The townhouses front Tattnall Street with access to parking from Jefferson Street.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends to continue the petition for new construction Part I, Height and Mass, in order for the petitioner to consider the following:

1. Reduce the width of each building and/or increase the height of the front stoops and foundations walls to improve the verticality of the buildings.
2. Increase the quantity of the openings on the rear façade and possibly change the four bay rhythm as this façade will be highly visible from Jefferson Street.
3. Add openings to both the north and south facades.
4. Redesign the parapet wall at the box window on the front façade so that it does not cover the windows above.
5. Redesign the rear porches.
6. Remove the gates at the former lane, but keep the walls to screen the parking in order to restore the look and functionality of the original lane.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Coleman** said since they have submitted their initial petition, they have communicated with staff on a number of the items that they have informed them about. They have made most of the changes and got to the point where they are in compliance with most of what is in the ordinance. They still believe that there is some validity to the issues that the staff brought forth.

**Mr. Coleman** said, therefore, his client and he looked at the front and the rear elevations relative to the openings on the rear and going to a four bay rhythm. Consequently, they are proposing that they will change the rear elevation from what they see as a three bay situation to create the look that the Board see now with the four windows along the rear and create the four bay rhythm that is a part of it. He explained that on the front elevation because it is not a balcony and they did not want to create confusion that was going on, they looked to reduce the height of the parapet to just at the base of the windows.

**Mr. Coleman** said on the matter of the stoop height, they are open to studying this probably to raising the building up rather than trying to raise additional height. He believes that when they look at all the buildings in the neighborhood they are really at that height. There is really not a raised stoop in the area and their building is in the same consistent

height. Mr. Coleman said he believes that one of the things that adds to a little of the look is that the windows are a little wider than normal. The windows are 3' -6" wide windows and if they were narrower, they would appear a little taller. Maybe this is something that they can look at also. However, the 29 foot height is consistent in the taller buildings in the neighborhood around them are actually three stories in lieu of two stories.

**Mr. Coleman** said on the north and south elevations and reducing the width of the buildings, they studied this and to really get substantial openings, they would have to reduce the width of the units by five feet. He said there are 24 feet wide now and reducing them would take them down to 19 feet to get the windows. The lots are not deep enough to offset that width reduction, which will seriously impact his client because they can barely get the parking in the rear now as they are at the maximum depth of the lots while allowing 21 feet of depth from their wall to the face of their rear unit. Mr. Coleman stated, therefore, to offset any reduction in width, they would really be compromised with providing the necessary parking on the lot. He explained that what they have done is that where the original north and south elevation had no articulation, they responded by creating false openings that are recessed two inches in so that they actually look like they have been infilled which is to try to articulate those elevations so that they would not look as plain and also took the staggered effect out thereby allowing them to have a consistent parapet height all the way around.

**Mr. Coleman** said they listened to what the staff stated and made responses where they felt were in keeping with the spirit of the intent and also work with some of the constraints of his client's physical needs while making these units work.

**Mr. Coleman** said regarding the matter of the fourth lot, his client anticipated that four units would be here. What was discovered with the fact that a lane is here, a Georgia Power power line runs through here with an easement that never was established. Consequently, they lost the use of this property because of the need to establish an easement for Georgia Power. The discussions originally were to create on that third unit a private garden that would utilize the space, but in doing more study of the neighborhood they found that because of the divided street that Tattnall becomes in their block, there is no on street parking available. Therefore, they felt that rather than create a private garden, maybe what they should do is to try to deal with the parking issue that they would create by creating three new units with no parking. So, they decided to use the lot to provide three guest parking spaces on the fourth lot. Because the area is being used by persons now that having security and having a gate for the parking their owners are paramount to their safety and their concerns and be able to ensure that they are the only ones who had access to that parking. Therefore, this is the reason for the gates. The lane is no longer here and the visual portion is there, but they really need to use this and be able to secure it for the use of their patrons and still give something back to the neighborhood by taking some parking pressure off of the adjacent street.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Coleman to talk more about the Hall Lane easement issue regarding not being able to put here as it is on the property line. This is just an easement. Will it ever be used as another property? Will there be an opportunity to windows on that side?

**Mr. Coleman** explained that because it is the property line and they would still have to maintain that the lot become a common lot, the property line is still there. Therefore, he does not believe that they can look at putting windows here as the property line would still

be established by the rules of the code. He said that this is why they did not put the windows there.

**Mr. Engle** said that the Board could not review the submittal today as they were not submitted to the Board in time. It appears that the petitioner is willing to make most of the changes that the staff has asked for, but the Board cannot accept the changes now.

**Mr. Coleman** stated that he understood what Mr. Engle was saying, but they definitely wanted to come to the meeting and show the Board their willingness to respond.

**Dr. Henry** said he understood that Mr. Coleman will be coming back to the Board. He asked Mr. Coleman if he did not agree with number 1 of the staff's recommendations.

**Mr. Coleman** said he responded that they will be willing to raise the stoop height with recommendation number 1; reducing the the width of units would not be an option for them. But, even though they felt that neighborhood stoop heights are consistent with were they are, they will raise it as a respond.

**Mr. Howington** said to clarify that in an answer to Dr. Henry's question, Mr. Coleman has agreed with a part of the staff's recommendation by increasing the stoop height, but he does not want to reduce the width of the building as he does not feel that it is necessary for that area.

**Dr. Henry** stated that he believes Mr. Coleman agreed with number 2 of the staff's recommendations.

**Mr. Coleman** answered yes and this is what their drawings show.

**Dr. Henry** pointed out that Mr. Coleman does not agree with number 3 of the staff's recommendations.

**Mr. Coleman** explained that they disagree with number 3 only because of the technical difficulties of being able to do it.

**Dr. Henry** said he believes that Mr. Coleman agrees with number 4.

**Mr. Coleman** answered yes, they agree with number 4.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Coleman what he thinks about number 5.

**Mr. Coleman** stated that their redesign portion is really a low slop roof and he believes it looks like there is more slope to it than there is. It is only two percent slop on that roof which will really is not read much. But if they need to do something to make it flat, they can do this.

**Mr. Coleman** said it appears by what Mr. Coleman has shown the Board today that some of this has been cleaned up.

**Mr. Coleman** explained that due to the nature of the downspouts, you have to get away from the corners to get the water off. Therefore, it was really hard to jam them right up into the corners on the rear elevation.

**Mr. Howington** said some of this has already been addressed, not officially, but the petitioner is willing to do so.



**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Coleman if he disagreed with number 6.

**Mr. Coleman** answered “yes” from the standpoint of security for their property owners to be able to maintain the privacy of their secure parking; they would not like to remove the gates.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Coleman why he could not narrow the buildings and make them a little higher.

**Mr. Coleman** answered that if they made the buildings higher, they would have to add another floor, which is not conducive as his client does not want to go to a third floor. They cannot make it any deeper because of the depth constraints of the lot only being 70 feet deep.

**Dr. Henry** said his main concern is the verticality and he was not saying add a third floor, but just use higher ceilings.

**Mr. Coleman** explained that if they are narrowing the buildings, then it becomes a square footage issue in the units to get the space. This is why they have a problem with narrowing the units.

**Dr. Henry** said if the ceilings are raised, the units would not need to be narrowed.

**Mr. Howington** explained that by raising the stoop, they are also raising the building.

**Mr. Merriman** said that five feet is a lot to lose from a building.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said they agree with all of the staff’s recommendations. However, they have a few more recommendations they want to make. She said in relation to lowering the parapet of the boxed windows so that the windows could be seen on the second level, they were actually thinking possibly extending the box all the way up to the second floor to create a bay so that the box would stand proud and be raised the full two stories. They believe this will help with the verticality as well because the buildings are little squatter. She said she realizes that this is a part of Part II, but just for consideration, include casement windows instead of double hung as they find the casement windows tend to mesh better with more contemporary designs.

**Ms. Meunier** said they believe the portions of the front doors appear to be too skinny. Therefore, they believe that the openings need to widen more. It looks like the three bay rhythm is not equal; while she thinks they are on center, but because the doors are so skinny, it seems like the distance is smaller than this distance. They suggest that the doors be restudied.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Coleman if he wanted to respond to the public comment.

**Mr. Coleman** said everything that Ms. Meunier said was considered by them. He explained that the reason the brick bay does not go up the full two floors is that the design aesthetic was to have the stucco box with the brick bay as an accent piece that was a contrast to it. Therefore, to ensure that their building did not look the same as everything else by doing the bay, they felt that the stucco box with the neighborhood aesthetic of mainly being stucco buildings in the neighborhood, the brick was the accent that is

important to them. Therefore, they want to maintain that. He said that the door and window relationship is different because the windows are all 3 ½ feet wide and the door is 3 feet wide. He said they can go in either direction with that; they can narrow the window to three feet wide or make the door oversized to 3 ½ feet wide. Mr. Coleman said if this is a consideration that sensitivity to the Board, they can easily handle and address this. It would probably be better going in the direction of making the door wider as opposed to going the other direction.

**Mr. Coleman** said the issues of going to casement windows, the size openings they are trying to do casement windows that size are always problematic. The windows do not hold up and if he tried to get a 3 ½ feet by 7/8 foot casement and opened it up, they are talking about over time that it will cause problems for the owners. Therefore, they feel that in order to get as much light, openness and being consistent with what is in the neighborhood [double hung windows], the casement windows do not fit what is in the area.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said staff has made six recommendations and the Historic Savannah Foundation has brought up three more. He believes, therefore, that these are too many issues to deal with at this point.

**Mr. Howington** said there were some other comments, but the petitioner has responded to those comments; therefore, he believes the Board needs to comment on what was presented.

**Mr. Engle** stated that Mr. Coleman said he agrees with some of the things, but he want to see the drawings. They cannot accept something verbal. He said, however, he disagrees with staff as he thinks it is refreshing to see a townhouse 24 feet wide instead of 19 feet. To ask the petitioner to reduce the building by five feet is wrong, but he agrees that the verticality needs work. The boxes made it squat. The change in materials [even though they are not dealing with materials], they are weighting the whole thing down. He said he does not know if expansion joints are in the stucco as there are so many lines. Are expansion joints necessary on CMU?

**Mr. Howington** said he was not speaking for the petitioner, but they are probably control joints in the stucco. This keeps it from cracking.

**Mr. Engle** said the windows and doors should be consistent; rather they drop back to a 3 foot door instead of 3' - 6" or go with a bigger door. However, the balance is missing. It is not a 3 bay, but if they go to a 4 bay, he does not know how they will deal with that. Mr. Engle said this needs a lot of work.

**Mr. Howington** said the petitioner has agreed to restudy the windows.

**Dr. Henry** said the verticality is the most important thing that he is concerned about. He was not recommending that five feet be taken away.

**Mr. Merriman** said the 42 inch doors are nice. They are nice to have when moving stuff in and out. With a contemporary design, a lot of times you see wider doors on things such as that. He was wondering why staff recommended removing the gates from the parking. Is this because of an ordinance or is it visual compatibility?

**Ms. Michalak** said staff was looking to restore more of the look and functionality of the

original lane without them having to actually physically give the lane back.

**Mr. Merriman** asked if this will meet the ordinance with the gate.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes.

**Mr. Howington** said the petitioner has said that he wants to leave the gates. He was a little confused on this, too, as they would be moving the gates, keeping the wall and then keeping it open like the lane. But, the petitioner wants to keep the gate as presented.

**Mr. Merriman** said he remembers that another gate issue was discussed by the Board, but he could not remember why.

**Mr. Howington** explained that he believes the gate issue before was about no gate. It did not have a wall of continuity, but in this case, they have a gate that continues the wall of continuity. Therefore, by ordinance, it meets the wall of continuity and meets the standards.

**Ms. Caldwell** said if the Board asks the petitioner to incorporate a stoop, would this give enough height.

**Mr. Howington** answered that he believes they would have to review this in the next submission. The petitioner has agreed to raise the stoop. The Board would not want on this today, but would possibly look at this in the next round.

**Ms. Caldwell** asked if the Board felt that the raising of the stoop would help the verticality.

**Mr. Howington** answered that he could not speak for everyone, but he believes the consensus is that raising the stoop would help some of that verticality.

**Dr. Williams** asked if they are talking about on the rear elevations. He said he was not sure what they are talking about when they say stoop because covered stoops are on the back on the Jefferson Street side. The only stoops on this side are the two steps; therefore, he does not know what is being raised.

**Dr. Williams** said there are plenty stucco buildings without control joints. He would defer to Mr. Gunther who knows more about the materiality of stucco.

**Mr. Gunther** said the only way to raise the stoop is to raise the baseline of the building. He said regarding the stucco, there is an opportunity to reduce some of the control joints, but on most buildings that you see, they have control joints, but there may be not that many.

**Mr. Howington** said that he did not want the Board to get into the technicality of stucco. If the petitioner was presented with control joints, then as a discussion the Board could have talked with the petitioner about may be lessening some of the control joints if he chooses to, but the technicality of the control joints is a different subject.

**Mr. Howington** informed Mr. Coleman that it appears that the Board is looking for a continuance. He told him that the Board could vote on the petition today. He is willing to ask the Board if they would be willing to review Part I and Part II in the same submittal at the next meeting.

**Mr. Engle** said he has a problem with today's submittal. There are too many issues.

Therefore, he would not like to see Part I along with Part II.

**Mr. Merriman** agreed with Mr. Engle. There are a lot of issues to go over in Part I. Therefore, Part I needs to be seen by itself.

**Mr. Howington** informed Mr. Coleman that the Board cannot ask for a continuance, but if he is willing to ask for a continuance on Part I only and bring it back to the Board, he may do so.

**Mr. Coleman** asked for the continuance for Part I only at the next meeting.

#### **Board Action:**

Approve to continue the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of 3 attached, 2-story townhouses on the vacant properties located at 703, 705, and 707 Tattnall Street in order for the petitioner to consider the following:

1. Increase the width of the front door opening and opening above to match the width of the adjacent windows.
2. Restudy the height of foundation walls to improve the verticality of the buildings.
3. Increase the quantity of openings on the rear façade, possibly change to a 4-bay rhythm as this façade will be highly visible from Jefferson Street. - PASS
4. Reconsider the addition of openings on both the north and south (side) facades.
5. Redesign the parapet wall at the box window on the front façade so that it does not over the windows above.
6. Restudy the design of the rear porches.
7. Restudy the gates at the former lane.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

23. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay, PA | 14-001846-COA | 201 Montgomery Street | New Construction: Part I Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Project description, context photographs.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Historic building survey and structural engineering report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Elbert Ward.pdf](#)

**NOTE: Mr. Merriman left the meeting at 5:20 p.m.**

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

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval of the City of Savannah's Cultural Art Center. The request also includes the rehabilitation of an existing historic outbuilding on the site.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the alterations to the existing building on the site with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Provide additional information on mortar composition and analysis, replacement brick and cleaning techniques.
2. Conduct a repointing test patch as described for staff review and approval.

**Ms. Harris** also reported that staff recommends approval of New Construction Part I Height and Mass for the Cultural Arts Center at 201 Montgomery Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II Design Details:

1. Provide transparent fenestration along MLK Jr. Boulevard or other features to activate the street.
2. Provide additional and more consistent and regular openings or other architectural features along Turner Boulevard.
3. Center the south entry on Turner Boulevard within the bay.

**Dr. Henry** said Ms. Harris mentioned an archeological analysis will be done. He asked if federal monies are involved.

**Ms. Harris** answered no.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the archeological analysis would be done anyway.

**Ms. Harris** said the archeological analysis is being done as a choice. They are not required to conduct the archeological analysis.

**Dr. Henry** said he was looking at the staff's recommendations. They have two

recommendations for the existing building and three recommendations for the new construction. He said this is remarkable as he has never seen the staff come up with such few recommendations for a height and mass in a new construction.

**Ms. Harris** stated that the petitioner has worked closely with staff in the development of the design proposal. She believes that this is shown within the level of recommendations.

**Mr. Gunther** asked Ms. Harris to clarify what preservation treatment is being used on the historic structure.

**Ms. Harris** explained her understanding with the concrete block additions are proposed to be removed. The original structure is being maintained. Any original fabric including a portion of the wall at the rear is going to be maintained. The steps and awnings are to be removed. The windows will be un-boarded. There are no existing windows in the building. The roof structure will be removed. The structure is almost presently opened and is caving in. The building will be preserved as a shell. Her understanding is [the petitioner could elaborate more on this] the building is proposed to be used as a children's puppet theatre or some other similar flexible use. The existing brick and stonework will be cleaned and repointed.

**Mr. Gunther** said that different terminology is used throughout. They call it rehabilitation in one place; preservation in another place; and restoration in another place. Therefore, he just wanted clarification on what treatment they are using on the historic building.

**Ms. Harris** stated that she believes the terminology being used is rehabilitation.

**Mr. Gunther** said rehabilitation is restoring a building to a contemporary effect use and by turning a building into a ruin; they do not classify that as rehabilitation.

**Ms. Harris** stated that she would not classify it as a ruin; the petitioner is proposing a new use for it which will be an outdoor theatre.

**Mr. Gunther** said this is his interpretation of what the definition is. He will ask the petitioner to clarify what the treatment is.

**Mr. Engle** said he would call it stabilization. The rotted material will be taken out, but you are stabilizing it.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Howington** informed Mr. Shay that he has 15 minutes to make his presentation. However, it does not mean that the Board cannot give an extension option on it, if needed.

**Mr. Shay** said he will do his best to remain at the 15 minute time limit. He said he was humble to be present today as a representative. He said that hundreds of people are already working on this project; the City of Savannah is represented here today; Marty Johnson is the special representative for the City Manager; Robert Cohen; Cara O'Rourke with Building Design and Construction; and Eileen Baker. He said that on his staff present were David Moore, leading project architect; Maggie Ward, Designer Associate Intern. Also a part of their team 20 is specialized consultants. They have had numerous public meetings and have engaged as widely as they possibly can. They held sit-down meetings during the programming stage with a lot of the people would will be operating this phase and using this phase. Therefore, they have done their homework more than thousands of hours.

**Mr. Shay** said one of the things he believes that is very significant for them regarding this project is it is a civic project. It is for the City of Savannah and is unlike the other projects that they see today. It is not a for-profit or for private residences or for private use. It is being built with sales tax dollars. Therefore, every citizen in Chatham County and some from far away have contributed to its construction and they also will have to subsidize its operation. Consequently, they have spent a lot of time trying to make the building operational efficient.

**Mr. Shay** said they want the building to be a forum. It is a place where Savannah citizens maybe especially our youth, our young people can go and interact directly with the artist and performances and actually become very much a part of the performance itself. First and foremost it is a forum and not a temple. He said another very important theme that did inform their design is the concept of pollination. They believe that this is one of those places where Savannah's culture has a chance to play out in a very important way where all our different culture aspects have a chance to inform and pollinate other aspects. Likewise, with the artist, participants, teachers, students, and children that will be attending here. The idea is that those who will come here from outside our city will be leaving pollinated by our culture and that we in term will be pollinated by some of the performances and artwork that will be ongoing in the building.

**Mr. Shay** explained that one of the most important things about doing the cultural art center for the City of Savannah is they have a legacy of art and commerce. These are the two muses that were placed deliberately on the front of City Hall when it was designed and constructed. They do the art and commerce together. He said that he has had the opportunity and pleasure of designing buildings in almost every ward in the National Landmark Historic District. But, he has never come up against anything such as this. Usually, they are working in contexts that are teaming with existing historic buildings that are significant. He said that in our vicinity there are almost none. In fact the little building that is on the site is the last remaining fragment of the 19th Century in the ward. What they have here is a ward that is a living testimony to what the automobile did to our city plan and to our culture for a while. This is an opportunity to reverse this and make a more balanced environment for our community. They have talked about the warehouse. He showed the Board a drawing that was done; and while they were looking at the model, they had discussion about the iron work, which is very distinctive. He said [pointing to an area] that building was on this corner when South Broad Street went straight.

**Mr. Shay** said he was asked what was here before. He stated that before the automobile was ever invented, the ward functioned like a normal ward, perhaps as Oglethorpe intended. A very significant building was close by, which was the City Auditorium Building. This building was demolished in 1971 so that the Civic Center we have today could be built. This was the last monumental building that was built by the City of Savannah in our National Historic Landmark District. What an opportunity they have with this building to bring in the 21st Century.

**Mr. Shay** said someone asked him what the design strategy was and he was struggling with it and they were talking about it in the office and he gave Mr. Engle a call and asked him what does the National Park Service says about doing new buildings in a National Landmark Historic District. He said sadly, the answer is almost nothing. Mr. Shay said that Mr. Engle led them to some great publications, one of which was the publication of the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia. What Greater Philadelphia called for were additions to be differentiated from the historic fabric and compatible with historic

materials, features, scale size and proportions in massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment. The recommended four strategies the third of which was to consciously avoid little resemblance or working in a historic style to balance differentiation and compatible with the balance tipped towards the former, towards the differentiation.

**Mr. Shay** said since the ward was devastated by the automobile movement of the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, they looked around to see what they could do to find the marriage of art and commerce that is in their midst. Where could they look? They decided to look not far from their site to the Round House. He said [from the photo shown on the monitor] that the Board could see what the Round House complex looked like in the 1930. They felt that this might be a place where they could find some of the architectural language that they wanted to be able to use so that it would have continuity, but without having to be literal and how it was interpreted. He said these were just a few of the photographs that they took and learned from them. Mr. Shay said they learned that, perhaps the most distinctive is the Round House; there is a way that they can do a round forum within another wise complex. There are ways even dating back to that area to do curtain walls and other features such as the stone base. These are things that they thought they could introduce into their project without getting too literal. He said they did a lot thinking about some of the elements of Savannah at large that they wanted to be able to incorporate into the building.

**Mr. Shay** stated that as he has said, the little building in the lane is all that remains of the 19th Century in this ward, but they were determined not to throw it away. During their investigations they found that not only is the building which was a part of the complex of the Wetter House was actually constructed after the family moved out and it was the Savannah Women's Orphanage that used from approximately 1870 until 1950 when it was demolished. However, there is also a big section of garden walls which is also going to be preserved. By the definition that they are allowed to come before the Historic Review Board word is rehabilitated. This what the petition is before the Board today. He said they believed that they were going to find and they think that they have verified that within the building, although it has been covered over with stucco and paint, that there some of the original Bermuda stone that is legendarily attributed to the house that was on the site before the Wetter House which was actually a Telfair House, has a stone foundation. The City has graciously and without being forced to agreed to have archaeological examination. He said that one of the things that they are hoping to find out is what are the foundations made out of. If they are still here, they strong suspect that in their haste to put in a parking lot, that they did not demolish the foundations; but they do not know this. If they are able to find the foundations, they intend to expose them and make sure that they are identified for interpretation purposes.

**Mr. Shay** stated that today they are telling the Review Board that all the stuff that has been added to that over the years have been neglected very unsympathetically and this is what they want to do a way with. He said the little building will be left behind. He said they want their site to become the missing link in connecting the art's community together so that someone who is visiting Telfair Square might logically decide to visit the SCAD Museum, the Round House Complex or some of the other wonderful museums that are so located along this corridor. He said that observing the pedestrian traffic in the area, they saw thousands of young people, especially coming from where there is a lot of student housing headed in the general direction by many different routes. A lot of the



students go by Ex Libris. This is the main safe intersection on all of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard to be able to cross as a pedestrian. He said [pointing to an area] you can do it here, but it is dangerous. Mr. Shay explain that you have to be able to hustle to get from one side of the street to the other during the light change. They wanted to create a place where people on this corner could enjoy the experience and may be even pass through the building, go into the square and create a friendly environment for pedestrian. This is also absolutely necessary because no surface parking is proposed. All the surface parking that is here today will no longer be here and they are going to rely on parking decks that will be located in the area. He stated that in order for people to park and visit this facility they have to walk. Therefore, they want to make a walking environment that is safe for them. This conscientiously has been a part of their design concept from the start.

**Mr. Shay** showed the Board their site master plan. He told the Board about some of the logic that went into their design. He said that they will recreate the lane. Literally, the lane will be a pedestrian walkway that will go through their building. They have deliberately chosen to make all of the entrances to the building very transparent so that there are giant voids in the solids so that there is no mistaken area to visit. This will be an ideal place to sit and have lunch, but it is a very noisy corner. They also would like for people to arrive in the future Montgomery Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard to be able to see Savannah. Mr. Shay said the acoustical issue is not small and on their plans the Board could see the facility which is the giant performance theatre. This will have two, 12 inch concrete block walls separated by an inch completely filled with concrete and reinforced and are 50 feet high in order to reduce the noise. They put the other theater that will be used for performance art on the corner. Mr. Shay stated that they have done everything they could to make this edge on these two streets as activated as possible so that as the people go by they will be able to look in the windows and see art, see art being made, even the studio theatre has windows, but they will be thick glass because of the acoustical reasons, so that you will be able to see in and out.

**Mr. Shay** said they have worked closely with Ms. Harris and she has been great to work with and had some great ideas. When they found out that Ms. Harris had some concerns, they sat down and figured out how to address the concerns. He said that the basic concept remains the same. There will be a studio theatre that's open to the street, art studio for the fine artist and other types of art on that corner; administration, and a little small pocket park for an art installation on the corner so that as you make the approach you will be able to see a big piece of art. He said [pointing to an area] back here will be the large performance hall which will be deliberately setback from the edge of the street to that they have a two-story mass along this side and even this will have studios inside of it, although it is a dance and performance studio. All of the performances are on the south side of the street for a lot of very good reasons; the fine arts and administration are on the north side of the area that they are recreating as a lane.

**Mr. Howington** informed Mr. Shay that his 15 minutes were up. However, due to this being a large project, if the Board did not object he would grant him another 15 minutes.

**Note:** The Board did not object to allowing Mr. Shay additional time to present the project.

**Mr. Shay** thanked the Board for the additional time. He encouraged the Board to look at the model as it really tells the story. He showed the Board the renderings and said they probably have seen some of them in the newspaper. This project has been well-publicized.

They have held many public meetings where this project was rolled out. He showed the Board the view from Oglethorpe Avenue at the corner of Montgomery Street. Mr. Shay said [pointing to an section] the area where they are going to make counter-flow is along that side. He said presently Montgomery Street is a great place to get run-over because if you hit the light right coming off of the I-16 ramp, you can easily get 50 miles an hour in front of the Civic Center. Mr. Shay said that he has watched hundreds of people walk across that open lot and jaywalking across there, too. He really fears for those peoples' lives. They want to create a situation where they close people down. Mr. Shay said [pointing to a section] that they would like for Montgomery Street to be two lanes headed in this direction because with I-16 dumping into Savannah, they cannot strict it to just one lane. But they want to create a counter-flow lane. If they could not do this, they would constantly be dropping people off on the wrong side of Montgomery Street. This building will be a platform that will be used by many thousands of children during different times. They want to ensure that when these young people get out the car or off the school bus are already on the appropriate side of the street in order to embark and disembark.

**Mr. Shay** said they will have a roof 12 inches of concrete in order to diminish the sound. They have been told that they may be able to hear a fire truck, but they will probably not be able to hear any less than that. He showed the Board a view of the building as you approach Oglethorpe Avenue from Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. There intention for the little building will remain is that it will be secured, will be stabilized. They are planning to program many things here. Therefore, this could be a stage, a place to have weddings, etc.

**Mr. Shay** said they like the fact that in scale is kind of a child's play. He said that his former partner and Eric Meyerhoff are very fond of the little tugboat on River Street. For that reason in a way, this is sort of the same thing. It is a nod to that mood; to make something that is a scale of a child, even though you giant container ships going by, they can actually relate to it. Therefore, they think having something on a scale of a child right there might help them to be able to relate to the much bigger boxes beyond.

**Mr. Shay** said one of the things that they will be using to a great effect on this will be translucence. The ordinance says it is all about solids and voids. They want a building that does not have as many windows as a hotel, apartment building, or an office building. Therefore, what they want to use is translucence as a way to be able to create that rhythm of solid and voids in ways that are a lot more interesting in some ways. They want to use green screen as a part of their design. They also like slatted wood. It is another form of translucence. It seems kind of obvious, but they will be using them in exciting ways. They will also use glass. He said that along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, the windows at the lower level are designed actually looking into the dressing rooms. Although this would be an interesting way for the streetscape to be activated and animated, he thinks they would have curtains that will make them opaque. Mr. Shay said, however, what they would like to do is work with the idea of using translucence for the lower portions of that glass and transparent for the upper portion so that they could still get daylight into the space; the spaces are very tall, but they will get the solids and voids through the interpretation of translucence.

**Mr. Shay** said the City of Savannah is very proud to be here before their own Historic Review Board to present what he thinks will be a very important statement about the future of Savannah and its continued dedication to art and commerce.

**Ms. Scheer** asked if the small building is just going to be four walls and foundation and will not have a roof or anything else.

**Mr. Shay** said it may have a serious trellis. He does not know whether they will call it a trellis because it will feel somewhat like a roof. They are working with the landscape architect to try to figure out the best way to execute this. It will be covered with vines, but it not be air conditioned inhabitant architecture space in that sense. They want it to be that when someone comes through here they know that this is what remains of the Augustus Wetter house and the orphanage. There will also be signage that will explain what was previously on this corner.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Shay if it would be fair to say that this building will be somewhat like the rose garden in Forsyth Park where it is a shell of a building and once had a roof.

**Mr. Shay** answered that what Chairman Howington said is a perfect example.

**Mr. Howington** reminded Mr. Shay an earlier comment about the little building. He asked him that when he addresses staff's recommendations, to also address that comment.

**Mr. Shay** explained that regarding little building, the preservation technology, they look forward with Part II and share with the Board all of their strategies. They have an architectural intern who also has a background in historic preservation from SCAD. The intern is at 1 West Victory Drive. He asked the Board to read the book that was created about the history of that building.

**Mr. Shay** said the idea of transparent fenestration along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, he thinks he has already explained it to the Board, they want to use translucence down below where it will be looking into un-activated spaces that use transparent up above in the same elevations. He said he believes that he had already addressed the question of the additional more consistent and regular openings and architecture features along Turner Boulevard. Mr. Shay believes the model is shown this. They also discovered that they need a deeper niche for the transformers and some of the mechanical equipment. However, they have regularized the elevation considerably. As far as the centering of the opening center, they call it the "white space." He explained that between the entrances that will be glass; and therefore will be void, as much as possible they want to have all solid. He said that symmetrical in pure elevation he could see why this matters. In the model the Board sees that since it has a diagonal that will run through the building and draw you into the building, it is probably an interpretation at that point, but if they need to work on figuring how out to center the openings within those spaces, then this is something that they are willing to do.

**Dr. Williams** asked what dictated the height of the tower.

**Mr. Shay** explained that the highest point in the spiral is the same height of the highest point in the mass of the proposal. He said they modeled it and very carefully studied it from different angles how it would appear. Although, mathematically it is the same height of the performance hall, depending on where you are, it will seem taller.

**Dr. Williams** asked if there was something that could limit this from being taller.

**Mr. Shay** answered physics and money, but they are open to it.

**Dr. Williams** said he does not know about the physics, but he understood the money. He

said obviously SCAD built a tower, which is about 50 feet. It could theoretically be taller.

**Mr. Shay** answered yes.

**Mr. Howington** stated the elevation on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard [he realizes that there has to be a loading dock], it suddenly drops down to the fence and it seems that this elevation could be given a little more attention since everything is so tall and former here. What are your thoughts on this?

**Mr. Shay** said the buildings that are directly across as shown in the sight model, for example, because they are head houses for the railroad buildings that were along this side do not tell the whole story. The sidings that were along here were all by their nature loading docks. There were miles of them on this side. Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard when it was called West Broad Street was actually and amazingly important thoroughfare because when there was cotton from the interior of Georgia on the Central of Georgia Railroad it was being hauled down to the riverfront to go off to another place or all the trade goods that came back in the other direction and eventually headed to Atlanta, came in the other direction. He said although they think of it now as a more institutional street, it also has a very important history as a commercial/industrial street.

**Dr. Henry** said he believes that Mr. Shay disagrees with the staff's recommendation #1 regarding the transparent fenestration on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.

**Mr. Shay** answered that he disagrees partially. He said on this side, they have panels of glass that have a lower and upper region. The upper region is proposed to be transparent. But in the lower region that will be looking into dressing rooms and other functions where privacy is badly needed, they prefer that this be translucent.

**Dr. Henry** asked what does activate the street mean.

**Ms. Harris** explained that all the other facades along Turner Street, Montgomery Street, and as well as Oglethorpe Avenue had active spaces for people to participate either visually or entrances to come into spaces with the exception of the space along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. A door is here, but it goes into the fire pump room. So, this will never be an active space. Therefore, this was one way that she could think of to possibly help address Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. Architecturally, there are other ways to do that, but this is the source of the comment.

**Mr. Shay** stated this is a design detail and they are open to continue to study this.

**Dr. Williams** said a row of offices are on the back of the theatre and a work station. He said along the back of theatre and the dressing rooms along MLK, this could theoretically be inverted. The dressing room could be by the stage and the offices by Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. He said he does not know problematically why it is laid out the way it is, but he thinks of how the Jepson has offices [it is not his favorite use] but it is better than dressing room. He imagines that you could at least see people alive and working in their offices as one potential idea. Is there a rationale for this arrangement?

**Mr. Shay** answered that the offices that the Board sees are really for the performance companies to use while they are staging and while they are on board. These are not everyday offices; the everyday offices, the administrative offices, are on the other corner. Now, he was not saying that they could not explore the idea of having something on that side. He does not know if an office is particularly activated, but he agrees that on the

Jepson Center that they do use a fair amount of translucent glass for exactly the same reason.

**Dr. Williams** said that he agrees with staff. If there is any part of the design that calls out for something more than just a utilitarian dressing. Hopefully, this is not the final design and that there will be opportunities to work collectively to really achieve something great.

**Mr. Shay** stated absolutely and that they could not agree with Dr. Williams more. They will bring this up with their operator and family of people that are looking at this and see if there is any possibility.

**Mr. Engle** said they could try rear projection video right on the glass. They do this for any number of things that are going on inside. This is done in Philadelphia for the stadium.

**Mr. Shay** stated that this is a good idea.

**Mr. Gunther** said that Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard has such a rich historic context, rich historic environment history. He said he understands that a building needs a back and that loading functions need to happen. It is almost as if this building cannot have a back. Mr. Gunther said he does not know how Mr. Shay will address this. He asked Mr. Shay if he could envision a way where this could communicate better with the primary street.

**Mr. Shay** said he needs to be careful, but they think that a backside could actually be beautiful and they are working on this.

**Dr. Williams** said one potential solution, and he guesses it is the pedestrian laneway use as a kind of entrance corridor. Do you put the loading dock adjacent to the lane, which has some historical logic to it as opposed to having it on Turner Street, which is as Mr. Shay mentioned, one of the two primary facades. Therefore, in the lower left at the left end/west end of one of those two primary facades, there is a loading bay.

**Mr. Shay** said in fairness, they have four frontages; one of them has to be the place where larger vehicles can block traffic for a while and do some of the maneuvering, etc. He said that they have been told that in absolute certain terms that they will not be having trucks backing in off of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, Oglethorpe Avenue, or Montgomery Street. Mr. Shay said they also have a back of the house situation where when it is time to load the baby grand piano for a concert, that it needs to be some place where it could be loaded in. He believes what they have to do and what they have done better in the plan that is in the packet today, is screen this side because they wanted to have a gate on that side so if a truck had to it could pull out, but they were told no that they could not have it. Therefore, they need enough space for a truck to maneuver so that the truck could come out, but not get onto Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and be able to back in and get back out. Mr. Shay said that 18 wheelers are not going to be able to do this, but panel trucks and the trucks that deliver musical instruments, etc. He said, therefore, their challenge is to screen that side off with a fence with a masonry base and on this side will have a retractable gate that has four or five panels that rollback, so that most of the time except in the middle of night when stuff is being delivered, you will not perceive this as a loading dock, but it will look more like a courtyard or a little service court.

**Mr. Howington** asked if there was a reason why the façade could not carry over another bay. It would be a tall façade with no windows or anything.

**Mr. Shay** answered that this is something they are willing to explore. He certainly cannot

commit to it.

**Mr. Howington** said it would be a larger mass on the Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard side instead of dropping down to a fence screen.

**Mr. Shay** said it is an interesting idea and he will not reject it, but he does not want to holdup the whole show in order to figure this out.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of History Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said their Architecture Review committee met and spent a lot of time on this project. She said that Mr. Shay talked about how the building has been sited and why it was sited that way. It was their natural instinct to think that the building should be currently addressing Turner Street, Hull Street, and Montgomery Street. She said they thought that mass to be addressing Oglethorpe Avenue and Martin Luther King J. Boulevard or Oglethorpe Avenue and Montgomery Street because these are the main streets. As Mr. Shay said this is a major intersection. But of course, there are so many things that have been discussed that need to be thought about and considered. Ms. Meunier said she guesses it is about how the different needs are weighed. She said they think the Montgomery Street façade is successfully.

**Ms. Meunier** said they agree with some of the staff's comments about incorporating more transparent and active uses. They are onboard with the concept of translucence that Mr. Shay has talked. However, for the HSF it is more about activating. They understand that there are many locations where you cannot have transparent glass and see all the way through into the uses of the this building. She said they thought about display windows which obviously do have an opaque background behind transparent glass, but considering that this is a cultural art center, it could be an opportunity for art displays, signage or something that at least would activate the street and create something for the pedestrian; and from these locations that they are talking about on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, potentially more so on Turner Street.

**Ms. Meunier** said she is hesitant to add this because she understands what needs to be required for that auditorium purely acoustically, but potentially something to activate the pedestrian lane which will be Oglethorpe Lane through the center of site where you really get the majority of the height off of that auditorium. Maybe it is not punched into that wall, but some sort of activation along that façade is needed.

**Mr. Howington** asked Mr. Shay if he wanted to comment to the public comments.

**Mr. Shay** said they appreciate the HSF's continued interest in the project and they have enjoyed engaging with them. They will continue to look for ways to address the HSF's concerns. Mr. Shay said in addition to the reasons he has already given, he will a couple more of why they are not hard to this corner. He explained that the corner does not really exist anymore because in the 1990s, the lanes were offset so that they could align with the Talmadge Bridge approach. He said you can actually see the old path and the giant oak trees actually show you where that lane was back in the day. This is a giant Magnolia Tree that they strongly believe was just a pup from the photographs that they have of the Wetter House. But, even if they were hard to this corner, they would still have an awkward shape. But, once they felt they had the awkward shape, one of the reasons they decided to stay away from it was they decided to make it into a park. It opens up and does some of the

things that they want to do. They are still hopeful that they might find enough of the Wetter House foundation that they could interpret it. Mr. Shay said, therefore, it would be more than just the outbuilding that was left from the female orphanage, but also perhaps with cornerstones or peeling back the ground and lowering it a little bit, they do this at the Round House with great effectiveness, to be able to show them that more is there than what they thought. This would give them the opportunity to interpret the signage. This would let the people know that this was one of the ten greatest losses in the history of Savannah according to Historic Savannah Foundation's list. They cannot bring back the Wetter House, but they believe that can by also staying away from that corner, have the opportunity for people to actually feel as if they were on the site. He said that the tall box façade that is along here will be very activated. As shown in their drawing, they will have large wood louvers. They will be lit from behind in an interesting and creative ways.

**Mr. Shay** said they need to understand that in the 21st Century with the American's Disability Act, every space within this building, backstage and even the catwalks, has to be accessible. Therefore, going with split level things and stuff that goes down in the ground, you end up with hundreds of foot long rails or additional lifts. It is really quite eloquent of the plan that Dave and the team have come up with. The stage is actually on the same level as the main lobby, it is just that when you come in, you come into the middle, then you go down to get to the front of stage and go up a little to get to the back. There is seating along the side where you can be at the same level as the stage, including in a wheelchair, and have a great view of the stage.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Shay what is the balcony for.

**Mr. Shay** answered that it is another level that can be secured at night. But, it is a level for the people on the second floor so that they go outside and sit under an umbrella table. It is not large.

**Mr. Howington** asked if they thought about putting projections on the wall because it is large.

**Mr. Shay** answered yes. He said they are talking about using environmentally responsible lighting. Therefore, it actually knows how many people are in the space. He will have more details on this the next time.

**Mr. Howington** stated that this is a very nice project. He congratulated Mr. Shay.

**Mr. Shay** said congratulations to all the wonderful people who have worked on this project. It has been a great team effort.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle said** he agrees with staff. He believes that this is an incredibly complex project. No matter what was designed for that site, not everybody will like it. The next presentation will be the critical issue. The wall looks huge, but if you go by the renderings it will not look that huge because of the texture, lighting, the green walls, and everything else. The mass is big, but it does not look like it will be gigantic 25 foot concrete wall like they had at the SCAD Art Museum. This wall will have a lot richness and texture which some other buildings do not have. Mr. Engle said he agrees with staff on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, but he thinks there are tons of ways that the translucence can be used to provide some movements and action, even if it is sound and light show on

the wall; people do not have to be inside as it can be color and change.

**Mr. Engle** said he thinks the double helix the right size and scale. He does not think it has to be 82 feet tall. He believes that once they realize how lit this building will be and how much contrast is going that it will disappear and become a part of the mass instead of an individual feature. Mr. Engle said he has no criticism.

**Mr. Gunther** said he appreciates the design and believes that it meets a lot of the challenges. He believes that any new development in this city should be responsive and respectable of the historic plan. They have the potential for a historic lane to be restored, two blocks of things which historically have rich densities to them. Mr. Gunther said the one visual compatibility factor that is not being met is with walls of continuity along those two primary corridors of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and Oglethorpe Avenue. He feels this component is missing from the design.

**Dr. Williams** said he agrees. He said he understand that the petitioner wants to drop off zone on Montgomery Street, but you have to imagine that this building at a time when the Civic Center no longer exist across the street. This building as the potential to outlive the Civic Center. The City has an intention to move the Civic Center, but when the Cultural Arts Center is built, they will say well it's too bad that we did not aim for those lines of continuity. He thinks the way it has been oriented actually follows the historic patterns of the center of the ward just as the center of gravity and that the inside streets of the ward be Montgomery Street in this case and what would have been McDonough Street would have been sort of the gravitational pull. As much as Oglethorpe Avenue and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard are broader avenues, historically you draw in towards the middle. Dr. Williams said, therefore, on that side he believes it almost invites the entrance to be on the corner at the black box theatre. He said that he does not know how fixed the lane entrance is and whether the discussions with hundreds of people have set this in stone. On one level, the petitioner is responding to the traditions of the Oglethorpe plan. The Jepson plan was supposed to bridge the lane and he finds it ironic that the city owns the site and the city technically owns the streets of the city. Therefore, here is a rare opportunity for them to restore the plan fully, not just two-thirds. He said he does not know how this would impact the overall form of the project. He likes the gesture of the tower, but he worries given the nature of tree canopies and other things, but it depends on where you want visibility from. If you want visibility from the bridge, then it will not be visible from the bridge; it is too short. Do you want it visible further off Martin Luther king Jr. Boulevard, likewise it will be challenging. He said on Montgomery it might be. One rendering has been shown from the corner of Montgomery Street and Oglethorpe Avenue, but this is the only place where the tower has any kind of presence.

**Dr. Williams** said he does not know if it is even on the table at this point to think about what Mr. Gunther said about the lane. He asked Mr. Shay that when he says the "line of continuity," how far back are the facades from the respective street lines.

**Mr. Shay** answered that they can see where the lane is; therefore, this façade is about 90 feet plus 20 feet from that corner. However, that is not the line of the street.

**Dr. Williams** said he was talking about Montgomery Street, Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, and Turner Street. Are these facades coming up to the street lines.

**Mr. Shay** explained that they are. He said that the main place is just a few feet setback because these towers are right on the property line and because they want to create a place



to drop off when they create the counter flow on Montgomery Street. However, it is a part of the property line and they will have a continuous hedge and probably at least some architectural delineation of the Wetter House along this side. Mr. Shay said, therefore, he thinks the continuity will be there.

**Mr. Gunther** said as the petitioner works through archaeology, that sometimes archaeological remains are best left covered. Therefore, working closely with the archaeologist will determine what is the best treatment.

**Mr. Engle** said the line of continuity is on existing historic structures. There are no existing historic structures on the northwest corner. Therefore, how can you have a line of continuity when there is nothing to be continuous with.

**Mr. Gunther** stated that the line of continuity relates to the historic context.

**Mr. Engle** said there is no road there any more.

**Mr. Howington** said that is what is being said; the interpretation of Wetter house they could at least define that line.

**Mr. Engle** said they could put a sidewalk along that line, which almost appear to be there.

**Mr. Gunther** said his comments are more leaning to the Historic Savannah Foundation's recommendations about letting that corner be activated by a building rather than activated by a hedge or empty.

**Dr. Williams** he does not know whether the design team is familiar with the Benjamin Franklin Court in Philadelphia, PA where the headline of the old house is done in two different metals and this might be away to evoke the Wetter House and the site will still be open and transparent, but it could be almost as a wire frame diagram that could establish the historic corner, remind people that this was a residential area.

**Mr. Engle** said this is not what's being proposed.

**Mr. Howington** said this is outside the purview of the Historic Review Board.

**Dr. Williams** said they can quiver about details, they can express their aspirations, but he believes that there are certain things that they might have considered that might be worth including.

**Board Action:**

**Existing Building:**

Approve the alterations to the existing building on the site with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Provide additional information on mortar composition and analysis, replacement brick and cleaning techniques.
2. Conduct a repointing test patch as described

for staff review and approval.

Because the alterations are visually compatible, and meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Design Standards.

**New Construction Part 1 Height and Mass:** - PASS

Approve the New Construction Part 1 Height and Mass for the Cultural Arts Center at 201 Montgomery Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II Design Details:

1. Restudy ways to activate the street along MLK Jr. Boulevard;
2. Restudy the tower height;
3. Restudy the walls of continuity at the northwest corner of the site;
4. Provide additional and more consistent and regular openings or other architectural features along Turner Boulevard.
5. Center the south entry on Turner Boulevard within the bay.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

**IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION**

**X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS**

24. [Amended Petition of Josh W. Bull for Greenline Architecture | 14-001307-COA | 466 MLK Jr. Boulevard | Staff approved - Stoop](#)

Attachment: [12042\\_AS11\\_Issued For Revision 1-2014-03-19.pdf](#)

Attachment: [COA - 466 MLK Jr. Blvd 14-001307-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of Gillian Wagstaff | 14-001455-COA | 19 Jefferson Street | Staff Approved - Awning Frame](#)

Attachment: [COA - 19 Jefferson Street 14-001455-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 19 Jefferson Street 14-001455-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 14-001583-COA | 223 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 223 West Broughton Street 14-001583-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 223 West Broughton Street 14-001583-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Gillian Wagstaff | 14-001636-COA | 19 Jefferson Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Changes](#)

Attachment: [COA - 19 Jefferson Street 14-001636-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Jennifer Deacon for Dawson Architects | 14-001637-COA | 126 West Bay Street | Staff Approved - After-the-Fact Modifications](#)

Attachment: [COA - 126 West Bay Street 14-001637-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [126 West Bay St\\_HRB 2014-04-04.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Christopher Welnetz | 14-001655-COA | 36 Price Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 36 Price Street 14-001655-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 36 Price Street 14-001655-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Natalie Aiken for Hansen Achitects | 14-001742-COA | 201 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Alterations and Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 201 West Broughton Street 14-001742-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 West Broughton Street 14-001742-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Scott A. Barber | 14-001745-COA | 423 East Charlton Street | Staff Approved - Color](#)

Change

Attachment: [COA - 423 East Charlton Street 14-001745-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 423 East Charlton Street 14-001745.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Liberty Jo Wallace | 14-001785-COA | 129 Abercorn Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 129 Abercorn Street 14-001785-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 129 Abercorn Street 14-001785-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Doug Patton | 14-001804-COA | 40 E. Bay Street | Staff Approved - Factors Walk Repairs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 40 East Bay Street 14-001804-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 40 East Bay Street 14-001804-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Abigail Thomson | 14-001823-COA | 535 East Gordon Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 535 East Gordon Street 14-001823-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 535 East Gordon Street 14-001823-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Joshua Beckler | 14-001839-COA | 115 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 115 East Bay Street 14-001839-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 115 East Bay Street 14-001839-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Amended Petition of Sarah Ward for Ward Architecture | 14-001840 | 148 Price Street | Staff Approved - Window, Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 148 Price Street 14-001840-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 148 Price Street 14-001840-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of David Bloomquist | 14-001851-COA | 18 West Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Shutters](#)

Attachment: [COA - 18 West Taylor Street 14-001851-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 18 West Taylor Street 14-001851-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Matthew Frankel for Hansen Architects, PC | 14-001856-COA | 208 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Windows](#)

Attachment: [COA - 208 East Bay Street 14-001856-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 208 East Bay Street 14-001856-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of Tim Lotimer for Remitol Holdings, Inc. | 14-001883-COA | 410 East Jones Street | Staff Approved - Gate](#)

Attachment: [Application and Submittal Packet - 410 East Jones Street - 14-001883-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [COA - 410 East Jones Street 14-001883-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Petition of Jonathan L. Yates | 14-001939-COA | 301 West Liberty Street | Staff Approved - Antennas and Mechanical Screening](#)

Attachment: [COA - 301 West Liberty Street 14-001939-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 301 West Liberty Street 14-001939-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. [Petition of Robert & Joan Murphy | 14-001980-COA | 440 Price Street | Staff Approved - Shutters](#)

Attachment: [COA - 440 Price Street 14-001980-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 440 Price Street 14-001980-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 2 - 440 Price Street 14-1980-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. [Petition of Tim Kinsey | 14-001997-COA | 224 West Charlton Street | Staff Approved - Garage Door](#)

Attachment: [COA 224 West Charlton Street 14-001997-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 224 West Charlton Street 14-001997-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. [Petition of Clegg Ivey | 14-002091-COA | 615 Montgomery Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 615 Montgomery Street 14-002091-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 615 Montgomery Street 14-002091-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. [Petition of Eric O'Neill for Greenline Architecture | 14-002103-COA | 140 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Existing Back Porch](#)

Attachment: [COA - 140 Habersham Street 14-002103-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 140 Habersham Street 14-002103-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

45. [Amended Petition of Linda Ramsay | 14-002104-COA | 124 East Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Security Gate](#)

Attachment: [COA - 124 East Taylor Street 14-002104-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 124 East Taylor Street 14-002104-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

46. [Petition of Natalie Aiken for Hansen Architects, P.C. | 14-002121-COA | 118 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Exploratory Selective Demolition](#)

Attachment: [COA - 118 East Broughton Street 14-002121-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 118 East Broughton Street 14-002121-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

47. [Petition of Patrick L. Phelps | 14-002122-COA | 101 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - New Storefront System](#)

Attachment: [COA - 101 West Broughton Street 14-002122-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 101 West Broughton Street 14-002122-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

48. [Petition of Patrick L. Phelps for Hansen Architects, P.C. | 14-002123-COA | 32 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved | Exploratory Selective Demolition](#)

Attachment: [COA - 32 East Broughton Street 14-002123-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 32 East Broughton Street 14-002123-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

49. [Procedural Question from Board Member](#)

**Dr. Williams** said he had a procedural question pertaining to approved staff reviews. He

asked what happens if there is an approved staff review, but the Board reviews it and believes it was something that probably should have come to the Board. What is the procedure since it has already been approved by staff?

**Mr. Howington** asked Dr. Williams which item was he referring to.

**Dr. Williams** said they were talking earlier about some of Broughton Street project. Especially, since this is a part of a larger series of things, he thinks anything that has to do with Broughton Street, that the Board see it because it will be like a lot of moving parts.

**Ms. Harris** explained that if staff feels there is a grey area, they contact the Chairman for his opinion. All the petitioners know that if their petition is for a color change or awning that it will be reviewed at staff level.

## **XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 5-14-14.pdf](#)

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

## **XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF**

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Items Deferred to Staff 5-14-14.pdf](#)

**Mr. Howington** said attached to the Board's packet is the report on the items deferred to staff.

## **XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

### **Notices**

52. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, May 15, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

53. [Next Meeting - Wednesday, June 11, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

## **XIV. OTHER BUSINESS**

## **XV. ADJOURNMENT**

### 54. [Adjourned.](#)

There being no further business to come to the Historic Review Board, Chairman Howington adjourned the meeting at approximately 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen I. Harris  
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem