



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
September 10, 2014 1:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

SEPTEMBER 10, 2014 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Keith Howington, Chair
Ebony Simpson, Vice Chair
Reed Engle
Justin Gunther
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Stephen Merriman, Jr.
Marjorie Weibe-Reed
Tess Scheer
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Member Not Present: Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian
Debra Caldwell

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Order](#)

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

2. [Petition of John Post for Commonwealth Construction | 14-003914-COA | 401 East Hall Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Application - 401 East Hall Street 14-003914-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 401 East Hall Street 14-003914-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 14-003914-COA.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition to install a projecting principal use sign and fascia sign for the property located at 401 East Hall Street as - PASS requested because the proposed work is visually compatible, and meets the preservation, design, and sign standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Tess Scheer

Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

3. [Petition of Ralph Anderson | 14-003921-COA | 107 East Gordon Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [COA - 107 East Gordon Street 13-002558-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 107 East Gordon Street 14-003921-COA.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the construction of a two-story brick addition to an existing structure located at 107 East Gordon Street as requested, because the proposed work is visually compatible, and meets the preservation, - PASS design, and sign standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Tess Scheer	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

4. [Petition of Flint North for Speedi Sign | 14-003980-COA | 513 Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [14-003980-COA Staff recommendation.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Application - 513 Whitaker St. 14-003980-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a principal use freestanding sign at 513 Whitaker Street because- PASS the proposed work is visually compatible, and meets the preservation, design, and sign standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams
Second: Tess Scheer

Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

5. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs Inc. | 14-003984-COA | 236 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Sign](#)

Attachment: [14-003984-COA- Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 236 East Oglethorpe Avenue 14-003984-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Application - 236 East Oglethorpe Avenue 14-003984-COA.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a principal use fascia sign at 236 East Oglethorpe Avenue because

the proposed work is visually compatible, and meets the preservation, design, and sign standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Tess Scheer

Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

6. [Petition of Powell Pittman | 14-003995-COA | 207 East Jones Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Context Images.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition to install privacy fences around the rear of the property located at 207 East Jones Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible, and meets- PASS the preservation, design, and sign standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Tess Scheer

Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye

Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

7. Petition of Gavin Macrae-Gibson | 14-004237-COA | 31 East Jones Street | Carriage House Alterations

Attachment: [Application - 31 East Jones Street 14-004237-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 14-004237-COA.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the carriage house alterations to 31 East Jones Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Provide screening for the new vent and mechanical unit proposed on the roof.
2. Remove the security bars on the first floor windows on the east façade.
3. Ensure that all new doors are inset not less than 3 inches from the face of the building.
4. Relocate the proposed refuse storage area to be on private property (within the buildings or in the courtyard). Remove the proposed refuse screen. - PASS
5. Provide all color selections to staff for final review and approval prior to execution of the work.
6. Revise the drawings to correctly indicate that the existing windows will be repaired (or replaced in-kind).

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Tess Scheer

Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Not Present
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

8. [Adopt September 10, 2014 Agenda](#)

Board Action:

Approve the adoption of the September 10, 2014 agenda. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Tess Scheer

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

9. [Approve Meeting Minutes of August 13, 2014](#)

Attachment: [08-13-2014 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of August 13, 2014 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

10. [Petition of Beth and Tim Gaudreau | 14-002343-COA | 527 East Jones Street | Alterations](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve to continue the petition requesting alterations to 527 East Jones Street. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ebony Simpson
Second: Justin Gunther
Reed Engle - Aye
Justin Gunther - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Marjorie W Reed - Aye
Tess Scheer - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

11. [Petition of Joseph's Clothiers | 14-003471-COA | 28 West Broughton Street | Signs](#)

Board Action:

Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition requesting signs at 28 West Broughton Street due to an incomplete application. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ebony Simpson
Second: Justin Gunther
Reed Engle - Aye
Justin Gunther - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Marjorie W Reed - Aye
Tess Scheer - Aye

Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

12. Petition of Jeff Cramer for Diversified Designs | 14-001183-COA | 615 Habersham Street | New Construction Part I Height and Mass

Attachment: [Staff recommendation 14-001183-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Stephens Ward.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Model Photographs.pdf](#)

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

Mr. Jeffrey Cramer was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to demolish an existing non-contributing building at 615 Habersham Street and construct five new townhomes, four of which will face Hall Street and one will face Habersham Street. The buildings are proposed to be two stories tall with a near full width porch. Parking will be provided at the rear, with the entrance to the parking area provided off Habersham Street. A similar application was reviewed by the Board on April 14, 2014 and was continued at the request of the petitioner.

Ms. Harris stated as the Board recalls, they previously discussed the building being oriented towards Habersham Street. She informed the Board that the building has now been reoriented towards Hall Street and is significantly redesigned as well.

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

1. Align the heights of the windows along the north (rear) façade.
2. Add a fence along the Hall Street façade at the west property line.
3. Increase the foundation height.
4. Reduce the pitch of the main roof.

Mr. Engle stated that the elevation towards Habersham Street has no relief on the roof. He asked Ms. Harris if she made any comments on this aspect.

Ms. Harris answered that it is a secondary façade and as it does not have as much presence on the street as the front façade, staff felt it was okay, but if this is something that the Board would like the petitioner to look at, it is at their discretion.

Mr. Engle said this really is not a secondary façade as it is the entrance to one of the units. Therefore, it is a primary façade.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cramer stated that after he saw the staff's report, he restudied the roof and the shallow pitch.

Dr. Williams said regarding the site plan, the Hall Street façade is not parallel to Hall Street. It appears to be trending northward towards the west end. He asked Mr. Cramer to please explain the site.

Mr. Cramer stated that the site is not square. The property line is not a 90 degree relationship.

Dr. Williams questioned which property line Mr. Cramer was referring to.

Mr. Cramer explained that he was referring to Hall Street and the side property line. He said that Habersham Street and the back property lines are parallel.

Dr. Williams stated that the building could theoretically be brought to the zero lot line on Hall Street. He explained that it would be something other than a 90 degree angle on one of the corners.

Mr. Merriman said the builder would have to build the building out of square or hang it over the lot line.

Mr. Cramer said initially he had the building square before.

Mr. Engle said he believed the Board discussed in the past that they would not review revised presentations if they were not submitted prior to the meeting.

Mr. Howington said he believed the Board said they would look at them, but it had no bearing on accepting them at that time.

Mr. Engle said the Board has not seen the revisions and, therefore, they could not consider the revisions today. He said the Board's agenda is very long today. Therefore, he suggests that they should not be reviewing revisions that they have not seen before.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Cramer how many drawings he had.

Mr. Cramer said he had approximately three drawings.

Mr. Howington informed Mr. Cramer to show the revisions quickly. In the past, they have had issues with things they had not seen prior, but was presented at a meeting. The Board cannot vote on these things.

Mr. Cramer said he brought the pitch down on the sides and left the dormers as they were, a 10 to 12 pitch. He has another with the same front, but the dormers are 8 to 12; however, he does not like these as well. He likes the steeper pitch because a lot of roofs in this area

have steep pitches.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Cramer if he would be amenable to keeping the corner tower roofs at one pitch and the other roofs at a lower pitch.

Mr. Cramer said he likes this idea.

Mr. Engle said the roof looks like it want to be a mansard, but it is not. It is looking like a Georgian, but it is not a Georgian building.

Dr. Henry said this is an improvement and he likes the suggestions about the towers.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Cramer to respond to the staff's remaining comments regarding the fence along the property line and the foundation height.

Mr. Cramer said the foundation can be increased as long as they can add some steps to the front of the building; they will probably encroach a little on the sidewalk approximately two steps. The windows on the back of the building were a little off, but they are now lined up.

Mr. Engle stated that a dark dash line was shown in the elevation. What does that represent?

Mr. Cramer said it was bad drawing on the AutoCAD. They were trying to make it look like shingles.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they believe this design is an improvement over the last design. They credit the petitioner for taking into consideration the comments that were made by the Review Board and the HSF. She said that the HSF is for the most part in agreement with the staff's recommendations and the changes that the petitioner has presented today. They believe that the issue that Mr. Engle raised today about the conflicting styles, possibly the Georgian versus the Victorian probably on the Habersham Street side has some more of that symmetry. Therefore, maybe there could be an opportunity for the petitioner to study the roof shape on that façade that hopefully may help that conflict. Ms. Meunier said they believe that the building could be setback a little further as in this area they are set back much further. But, it does create a little continuity with the buildings across the street.

Mr. Patrick Phelps said he was speaking as a neighbor. He lives on the street at 308 East Hall Street. He said the he was unclear with the site plan. He said the elevation shows front stoops and stairs, but they are not show on the site plan. The face of the wall is flush with the face of the exterior wall. He said this is continuous on Hall Street on the block east and west, but there is a continuous set back from the property line about 10 or 15 feet.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Phelps that when his bottom steps come straight down, are they at the zero lot line.

Mr. Phelps said he was assuming that his property line is the curb. He has two steps, then a four foot landing and then the stairs.

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

Mr. Cramer explained that he believes the petitioner's house is about 13 feet to the porch and then he has steps coming down. The row houses on Hall Street across the street have steps on the sidewalk that are similar to their houses.

Mr. Engle asked if the houses could be pushed back with the parking lot being here.

Mr. Cramer answered no. He stated that the site engineer told him that the parking lot is perfect and that he appreciates that they have made it this size. However, the parking lot cannot go back any further. Also, they have a house behind here.

Dr. Williams said the model shows that the front of the site line is not parallel within the inside curb line. Steps are shown, but the first floor plan steps are shown four or five feet in front of the central area of the house. What is between the top stair and the door?

Mr. Cramer answered it is a porch.

Dr. Williams asked if it is a continuous porch running between the two end bays.

Mr. Cramer said he was considering probably putting up a wall that lines up on the columns between the units, but he did not show this.

Dr. Williams said the line in front of the porch is pulled back from the zero lot line more on the left than the right.

Mr. Cramer answered yes. It is tighter on the right than on the left.

Dr. Williams asked if the steps on the right slightly encroach on the public right-of-way, but the steps on the left are pulled back.

Mr. Cramer stated that none of the steps are encroaching.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle stated that he believes they have come a long way with this since the last time. He said that he empathizes with the parking issue because it is impossible in this situation. If the lots were larger, they could push them back 15 feet, but if they push them back ten feet, they will not be able to get the parking here. This means that they need to abandon this or accept the fact that they will be on the zero lot line. The only problem he has with this is the roof. It is neither a Georgian nor a mansard. He is also bothered by the Habersham Street side as it is one massive roof with no elevation. He stated that the top of the dormer line looks different on page A-3. If this was the height of the roof, it would make it look much better.

Mr. Howington said that is the height of the roof.

Mr. Engle stated that it is not reading well on the screen; it seems that it could be tremendously improved by bringing the roofline down to the height of the top of the dormer and let the two towers stand as towers. Presently, they do not read as towers.

Mr. Howington explained that if he understood what Mr. Engle said, the eaves of the dormers should not be the same height as the eaves of the towers on the end.

Mr. Engle said cut the roofline level with the top of the dormers.

Dr. Williams agreed and stated that this would force the towers to be defined.

Mr. Engle stated yes; this would cause them to come down on both sides and give some break up. He explained that lowering the pitch does not do anything except make it look like a Georgian house, but it is not a Georgian house. He asked Mr. Cramer if he understood what he was suggesting.

Mr. Cramer stated that he understood what was being said. This would make the bays look more like towers. He does not need the big attic above. Therefore, he believes they could do something like this. He agrees that they could reflect the bays on the Habersham Street side.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Cramer if he could inset the central part of the Habersham Street façade just a little so that the polygonal bay also reads on the Hall Street façade and continues around the corner. He said that a house on the corner of Huntingdon and Habersham Streets has the polygonal bay not only on the front, but it wraps around and the side walls are pulled back. This will help to alleviate one of Mr. Engle's problems about the monolithic quality and help disguise the alignment issue. He asked Mr. Cramer if this was possible.

Mr. Cramer answered yes.

Mr. Howington said the eave on the overhang on the front porch is different than the eave on the side. He asked Mr. Cramer if there was a reason for this. Can the eaves be consistent?

Mr. Cramer explained that this is somewhat an engaged column on the edge of the bay window. However, he understood what Mr. Howington was saying about the overhang. He will look at this.

Mr. Howington said that Mr. Cramer stated that the parking is the minimum depth; however, they have parking spaces and 28 feet from the back of the house to the parking spaces. This is a large area and could possibly allow it to be set back.

Mr. Cramer said it is 24 feet. It would be nice if you back your car out, but this would allow the car to go in and out. He explained that they have already had their Site Plan Review and traffic engineering is happy with their parking. They were told that they would need more room with the cars coming in from the edge of the street. Traffic Engineering told him that he needs at least 20 feet coming in from the gate; he has 17.5 feet; therefore, he has to move the gate back a couple of feet.

Mr. Engle said this is all paver. Therefore, there is no green space on this entire property.

Mr. Cramer said they have a little green space on the Hall Street side.

Mr. Engle said he believes Mr. Cramer said this was zero property line. How could there be green space?

Mr. Cramer explained that he was saying zero property line based on the steps. Some people do not consider the steps as a part of the building.

Ms. Harris explained that at the SPR meetings with the city, traffic engineering is requiring the setback as reported by Mr. Cramer to be able to get in and out of the spaces.

Therefore, if the Board's decision references this, they might want to put a caveat in there "contingent upon traffic engineering" as this was the minimum they were requiring.

Dr. Williams said he has a concern with the lack of alignment with the Hall Street zero lot line. As you come down Hall Street, he would say that this is the more premiere street than Habersham Street especially if Mr. Cramer recesses the central part of the house.

Mr. Howington said it could be pushed back a couple of feet.

Dr. Williams said the front of the building should be parallel to the curb on Hall Street. The building sits on its site east and west. However, either the building needs to be set as a parallelogram or adjust the initial alignment to the site on the east and west elevation.

Mr. Merriman said he believes the situation looks worse on paper than it really is. The building is parallel. The line in the front is 90 degrees to either one of them.

Dr. Williams said the entire building could be rotated.

Mr. Howington said he would like to see the building parallel with Hall Street and see it setback a little more. However, he cannot overrule SPR, but he knows that 24 feet is a lot to back up into. He believes that maybe they can get at least five feet out of here.

Mr. Engle said he believes they need to be careful. There are no curbs along the back of these houses. There is no fence here either. If this gets too tight, someone will back out and drive into these houses. There is nothing to stop someone from backing into the back porch. He asked what the parking space requirement is. Is it one and half spaces or one space?

Ms. Harris answered that it is one space.

Mr. Engle said he does not believe that the building could be set back enough to make a difference. Mr. Cramer has said that they need 24 feet.

Mr. Howington said it is exactly 28 feet, except for that one parking space.

Mr. Engle said the people will need some place to put their bicycles, strollers, etc. Parking cannot be right up against the back wall of the house. There has to be some space back there. There is no front yard.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve Part 1: Height and Mass of new construction at 615 Habersham Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II: Design Details:

1. Align the heights of the windows along the north, rear façade;
2. Add a fence along the Hall Street façade at the west property line;
3. Increase the foundation height;

4. Reduce the pitch of the main roof but not the turrets on the three corners;
5. Ensure the south elevation is parallel with Hall Street; - PASS
6. Recess the bays on Habersham so that the turrets read more prominently.

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

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve of the demolition of the non-contributing building at 615 Habersham Street because the building is not eligible for historic status.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

13. [Petition of Matthew Frankel for Hansen Architects | 14-003378-COA | 230 West Broughton Street | New Construction: Part 1 Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 14-003378-COA.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Decker Ward.pdf](#)

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

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for Part I Height and Mass for a four story building with a full basement at 230 - 240 West Broughton Street. The building features three 30 foot wide bays and a central storefront. The Board will recall that a similar petition was heard by them on August 13, 2014 and was continued at the request of the petitioner. The Board's discussion focused primarily on the

overall height, the storefront entrance, and the stylistic differentiation between the upper and lower floors.

Ms. Harris explained that the changes to the design from the meeting of August 13, 2014 include an overall reduction in height. The fourth floor of the building has been recessed from the front façade approximately 11 feet; the storefront entrances both height and width has increased; the cornice is more articulated and the window openings are more consistent on the front facade.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of Part I Height and Mass for new construction of 230 – 240 West Broughton Street with the condition that the second and third floor-to-floor heights be reduced in height and submitted with Part II Design Details because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards.

Dr. Henry asked about the basement.

Ms. Harris explained that there are basements along Broughton Street. She believes that initially a basement was at this site.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Phelps reported that they made some other modifications that he will present to the Board. They have strengthened the pilaster or columns in-between bays so that they get a stronger sense of a three bay rhythm that is predominant a long Broughton Street with a 30 foot wide bay system. They have modified the storefront by lowering it and also creating a stronger band in-between the first and second floor. They propose awnings that are shown in the renderings that will also unify the first and second floor structures. There are a number of buildings on Broughton Street that have two stories and awnings are on the two story level that they are trying to repeat.

Mr. Phelps said staff mentioned the recess for the grand entrance which is similar to Globe Shoe Store and a couple of other buildings on Broughton Street. They are increasing the presence of this and modifying the entrance. He said the ordinance is not specific to actual floor-to-floor heights, it references expression of the floor-to-floor height. Therefore, they want to create a banding in the exterior façade so that at the ground floor they maintain the 16 foot and at the second floor they are at 14 and at the third floor they are at 14 feet. With the extended parapet and decorations on top just as a number of other buildings on the same block and down Broughton Street.

Mr. Phelps said in looking at heights of three story buildings existing along Broughton Street at their main cornice line they are at 51 feet 8-inches and at the top of the structure they are at 56 feet – 8 inches. The Kress Building at the main body of the building, they are at 52 feet. The Mark Jacob's building is 50 and the adjacent building approximately 51 feet; Urban Outfitters at 219 West Broughton Street is at 48 feet.

Mr. Howington said this is a strong improvement from the last meeting.

Dr. Williams agreed that this is a strong improvement. He said that the center piers on the drawings have a line down the middle of the pier. There are two piers side-by-side, but on the drawings they appear as a flush, smooth surface.

Mr. Phelps said he is anticipating that this will be a control joint. He said that when they do the design details, they will clarify this.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Phelps that since he is going to the effort of articulating the central bay all the way to the parapet, will there be a depth change?

Mr. Phelps stated that all the buildings on Broughton Street have a flat façade.

Dr. Williams said maybe in Part II Design Details, Mr. Phelps could address how this will be differentiated.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they, too, believe that this design is certainly improved and they appreciate that the petitioner brought the revised design to them ahead of time and gave them the opportunity to review this. They agree with staff's comments, particularly, about reducing the floor-to-floor heights on the second and third floors; to reduce the overall height and make it visually compatible with the surrounding historic buildings. Ms. Meunier believes that at the last meeting a discussion was held about the visibility of the stair tower. She wanted it confirmed whether this was addressed and whether it will be pushed back a little so that it will be less visible.

Mr. Howington invited Mr. Phelps to respond to the public comments and he told Mr. Phelps that he had already addressed the floor-to-floor height and he feels that what he has is correct, but he just wanted him to restate his position on this so that the Board would cover this in their discussion.

Mr. Phelps reiterated that floor-to-floor height is not dictated in the ordinance. He said that exterior expression is what they were looking at and he has demonstrated those dimensions and feel that they are in compliance with the ordinance. Mr. Phelps said they moved the stair tower back. He apologized that the drawings are somewhat incorrect. They are looking at emulating what is provided in the model. The stair tower will be sloped to follow the rise of the stairs. They will also reduce the mass on the front end.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he disagrees with staff on reducing the floor heights. He believes that what has now been accomplished results in not having a monolithic building. It is clearly articulated as a tripartite. Mr. Engle believes if the floor height is brought down, it would make it squatter. The proportions to him now look right; it is comparable with the other large buildings on Broughton Street and the top of the windows on the second floor form some kind of continuity with the adjacent building. Mr. Engle believes the building is good just as presented.

Dr. Williams said he believes, too, that if the floors are reduced it would be squatter. He said a building (now lost) was located at 20 West Broughton Street and called the "Citizens and Southern National Bank" was a two-story building. This was a monumental two-story building that was at least three stories tall and had a grand entrance. He sees this building being discussed now in the spirit of the building that was once located at 20 West Broughton Street. Dr. Williams said he likes the simplicity of the building and believes it now has the balance that the Board called for. He believes that reducing the floor height will take away what the Board was hoping to see. When they look at the model from a massing and scale point of review, it is still consistent with its surroundings.

Mr. Gunther said he agrees with not reducing the floor heights.

Dr. Williams stated that he would like to see the petitioner restudy the piers and correct this in his Part 2 Design Details.

Mr. Howington said Mr. Phelps has already stated that he will explore this. The Board will review this in Part 2 - Design Details.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Appeals hereby approve Part 1: Height and Mass of new construction at 230-240 West Broughton Street as - PASS submitted because the project is visually compatible and meets the design standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Tess Scheer

Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

14. [Petition of Shedrick Coleman for SHEDDarchitecture | 14-003482-COA | 407 and 409 East McDonough Street | New Construction: Part 1 Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation14-003482-COA.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Crawford Ward.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Public Comment- Lee.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Public comment- Rosenwald.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Public Comment- Moore.pdf](#)

Mr. Shedrick Coleman was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of Part I Height and Mass for new construction on a vacant lot at 407 and 409 East McDonough Street or 406 and 408 East Perry Street. The new construction consists of a four story duplex with parking on the ground floor, accessed from East McDonough Street. The petition also includes a variance request from the 30 foot structured parking standard.

Ms. Harris said a similar petition was reviewed by the board on August 13, 2014 and was continued at the request of the petitioner. Many property owners voiced their opposition to the buildings fronting McDonough Street. The Board held much discussion on the orientation of the building, height and the front entrance. The new proposal has been revised to face Perry Street, hence the Perry Street addresses, rather than McDonough Street, and a raised covered stoop has been added to the front facades.

Ms. Harris stated that staff did an analysis of the ward and found that historically the buildings on this site faced McDonough. There are no existing contributing buildings on this block of McDonough Street (except the buildings facing Habersham). All buildings within Crawford Ward, either to the north or south of McDonough Street, face McDonough Street. Therefore, staff believes that McDonough Street is the appropriate orientation for the buildings.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval with the following conditions to be submitted with Part 2, Design Details because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards:

1. Add gates into the parking area to the west of the structures.
2. Orient the buildings to McDonough Street.
3. Reduce all floor to floor heights. Reduce the stoop height to be comparable to the adjacent historic stoop which measures approximately seven feet tall.
4. Reduce the perceived height of the parapet.
5. Reduce the mass of the fire wall on the fourth floor as much as possible.
6. Retain only one vehicular access point along the street to the west of the project with a human door along the opposite street (subject to approval from Traffic Engineering).

Ms. Harris reported additionally that staff recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the 30 foot structured parking setback requirement because the project meets the variance criteria.

Dr. Henry said at the last meeting, Mr. Coleman presented the buildings' orientation to face McDonough Street and the Board recommended that the buildings face Perry Street.

Ms. Harris explained that she believes the Board's decision was for the petitioner to restudy the buildings' orientation. Mr. Coleman said he would talk with the owner and they would look at it and come back with their decision. The petitioner is now proposing that the buildings face East Perry Street.

Mr. Howington stated that a property owner sent a letter to the Board regarding the buildings facing East Perry Street. The Board discussed this at their last meeting and Mr. Coleman agreed to look at this.

Ms. Harris said the Board received three letters.

Dr. Henry asked if the three letters were all requesting the same thing.

Ms. Harris answered no. One letter was in support of the buildings facing Perry Street; the other two letters have different views and a variety of concerns.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Harris if now the staff is recommending that the buildings face McDonough Street.

Ms. Harris answered based on further research, staff is recommending that the buildings face McDonough Street.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Harris to restate why staff is recommending that the buildings face McDonough Street and not Perry Street.

Ms. Harris explained that if the Board looks at the ward, they will see that on this block there is not a lot of historic context. They know that historically, a duplex was on this site and it faced McDonough Street. However, staff feels what is more significant is that if they look at the context in the rest of the ward and as they go closer to Crawford Square, you have a group of contributing buildings which are in the same situation as they are between McDonough and Perry Streets and they face McDonough Street. If they go to the other wards within the district, you can find a variety of things which tend to be block by block or ward by ward with the way they face. In this ward, the buildings tend to face McDonough Street and do so historically as well.

Dr. Henry asked how many buildings face McDonough Street.

Ms. Harris said that four buildings are on the adjacent block, are contributing, and face McDonough Street. On the other side of the square, three historic buildings face McDonough as well. A total of seven contributing buildings in this ward face McDonough Street. The buildings that are noncontributing also appear to tend to face McDonough Street. Ms. Harris said a building at the corner, which is noncontributing, actually has access on both sides. The parking is underneath and essentially faces McDonald and Perry Streets. She said the back of the buildings will have to face someone's house. Staff feels historically that the precedence is set for the front entrance to be on McDonough Street. However, the orientation decision is at the Board's discretion.

Dr. Williams said another way to look at this is that there are no historic buildings on the trust lot. There are seven contributing buildings that face McDonough Street and no buildings are facing Perry or Hull Streets.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Coleman said he will cover the staff's concerns. He said pertaining to adding the gates to the parking areas, they removed the gates in discussion with the adjacent property owner who is served by the easement as he preferred not to have the gates. However, if the Board wants the gates replaced, this is not a problem as the original designed showed them. He said the orientation of the buildings to McDonough Street is a little perplexing for him because their original design showed the McDonough Street orientation. They clearly went through the same evaluation of why the buildings should face McDonough Street. At the last meeting an argument was made that the Perry Street orientation might be better serving the adjacent property owners that are on Perry Street; and also that Perry Street is a narrow street and accessing the garage might be better served off of McDonough Street which had a lot of parking on the newer construction coming off of this street. Mr. Coleman said, however, they have no problem putting the building back to orient

McDonough Street. As he has said, they thought the discussion led to preferably being oriented to Perry Street. This is why they looked at the orientation and gave it consideration. However, the property owner has no problem flipping the orientation back to McDonough Street; but they need some direction from the Board in this regard.

Mr. Coleman said regarding the floor-to-floor height reduction and especially regarding the stoop height, the contributing building faces Habersham Street and its front and stoop are toward Habersham Street. They are looking at the back of the building and the expression of their stoops and to put a 7 foot - 6 inch lower floor will preclude any opportunity for them to do their parking or anything else. He said that they do not have a site to do any alternatives here. Consequently, they need the opportunity to park underneath their building. Mr. Coleman explained regarding that one foot of the building being above ground, new buildings require that they have a one foot free board for flood purposes. Therefore, they are forced to raise the building up at least that one foot to start their floor height elevation. So, they really feel that they are stuck within the parameters of the ordinance and just by nature of other rules, they have arrived at their height. The second set of doors on the bottom floor are optional. They can take these doors out as they are not required. He said that they can put windows here and, therefore, would not have any door openings on the lower floor. Mr. Coleman said, however, their reasoning was that with the nature of this style of architecture that doors are usually apparent.

Mr. Coleman stated pertaining to the reduction of parapet height, they believe the height is appropriate and is working with the overall scale of the building, plus they have roof access on one-half of the building which requires a three foot railing around it, which they want to have this accomplished with the parapet and not have to do additional railing. They believe the proportion here is a nice end to the building rather than something that is squat and narrow. The firewall on the backend does not have to go up that high; therefore, it is easy to reduce this.

Mr. Coleman said regarding the vehicular access, when they were at SPR because of the 20 foot access easement in the reconfiguration that will be required of the adjacent property owner, it was stated that the two access points would be required on both streets because the depth would not accommodate two-way parking. So, there is a need for it to be a one-way access which will acquire access from each street. This is why they have openings on each side of the street.

Mr. Coleman said they are happy with the way the buildings have turned out; whether they are oriented to McDonough Street or Perry Street, he believes that the addition of the stairs and stoops have added to the building. He believes that the Board has liked their two side elevations, he feels that it is important that the elevations remain as they are because when you review the ordinances, it states that the windows on the principle street are required to align vertically. This is not a requirement on the sides and they feel that they need the architecture and spaces that are within the building to govern where the window placements on the elevations and let their buildings function that way.

Mr. Howington said Mr. Coleman addressed the stoop height, but he does not know how he felt about height of the parapet.

Mr. Coleman said there are two ways they can take a look that the height of the parapet. He said if he reduces the structure by one foot, they cannot get the building systems in one

foot of structure. Therefore, this is why they have the two feet between floors. If he reduces the ceiling heights, they would be looking at a nine foot ceiling on the first floor and eight foot ceilings on the other floors. Therefore, this is not marketable from this standpoint. So, they feel that they are stuck within those areas and if they did take height out, it would have to be the structural direction and then they would have to drop down ceilings in certain places to get the necessary clearances through the building and they feel this would be negative. Also, they would get a reduction of three feet which when you look at what is going on, the three feet will be imperceptible to the other buildings around them. Therefore, they want the height to remain as presented.

Dr. Henry said at the last meeting, staff recommended that the side windows be realigned. He said he does not believe that Mr. Coleman has done this.

Mr. Coleman explained that they prefer not to align the windows and they are not required by the ordinance to be aligned.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. David Moore resides at 230 Habersham Street -Unit 3. He said that he wanted to talk on the gate that has access for the parking for the property on Habersham. The first exhibit he wanted to show is basically something that is not identified on the current documents. Two large oak trees are adjacent to the property. One of the trees has a 17 foot drip line. The stair and a significant portion of the building encroaches in the tree's existing drip line. A substantial amount of work would have to be done to the tree in order for the building to be built as the buildings are currently designed. The other tree is smaller and will have to be removed because of the new driveway that will go into the parking area.

Mr. Moore pointed out the area where the parking entry is currently located. He said the curb cut is significant and is almost 26 feet wide on the Perry Street side. There are six parking spaces here now, but this is not shown. The parking spaces will be compromised by the new buildings. There is nothing that the Condo Association or the tenants can do about the building being constructed on its property, but this indicates that the parking that currently exist which is a part of the sale of the units and ownership, include the six parking spaces; one for each unit. The parking will have to be revised.

Mr. Moore said that on Perry Street all of the structures adjacent to this building are two-story. If you go down Perry Street to the next block, you will see that all of the structures are two-story. The existing buildings that are on McDonough Street directly opposite the property and the adjacent property actually have three stories in height and they are protected in a sense or shielded and brought down in scale because of the large vegetation of the trees which break the scale of these units which are directly across from McDonough Street. The adjacent building has an existing oak tree which changes the entire scale of the three story building. This new building being proposed does not have any vegetation and will end up being a four-story building, completely exposed to the existing streetscape.

Mr. Moore said he wanted to superimpose an image of the height of the current structure being proposed as well as the new stoop that is being proposed along Perry Street.

He wanted to reiterate the staff's suggestion that the stoops and entry be located along McDonough Street. This is the primary location for most entries to units along McDonough Street. If they look at Perry Street, they will see that the only entrance is on the opposite side of the street, but on the same side of the street all of the entries are either back door or they look like a lane. Mr. Moore said, therefore, they do not represent a major entry face on the north side of Perry Street. Habersham Street is a much wider street and significantly larger than Perry Street and, therefore, represents the right opportunity for entry to have the stairs come down and still have access around the parameter of the proposed building.

Mr. Moore said no one in the area is against a new building being built, but the parking situation for 230 Habersham Street will have to be reevaluated and will require modification. Currently, the existing building has a historic wall that is a part of the original building at 230 Habersham Street. It has stairs that you climb up to the second floor balcony to the 230 Habersham Street units. This is on both sides and go a half flight up and then turns into a circular stair that goes up to the third floor of 230 Habersham Street. These components will have to be removed in order to allow the parking to still be in place for the six parking spaces at the unit. He said he was not presenting this to the Board now, but he wanted to make them aware that work will have to be done to the adjacent building and presented as a modification to the historic building as a result of the construction of this building. They are also concerned about the stairs that exit into the right-of-way access easement. They are checking into this along with whether the balconies can be there on the second floor over the access easement.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Moore to show the Board the photograph of the trees he spoke of.

Mr. Moore showed the photograph of the trees and pointed out the large tree that has the 17 foot drip line and the other tree that is situated almost at the corner.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Moore if he was saying that the building needs to be altered in order for the tree to survive.

Mr. Moore said that nothing has been identified in terms of the submittal that these trees exist. He just wanted to be sure that the Board was aware that the trees do exist and are a very significant streetscape feature as a part of the street and the neighborhood.

Mr. Engle stated that the Review has no purview with trees or parking. The trees are not City trees; they are on private property.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with many of the staff's recommendations. They agree particularly with the recommendation of the orienting the buildings to McDonough Street. At this point she believes this issue has been resolved. Obviously, McDonough Street has a wider sidewalk which indicates that the primary façade should be on this street. This trend should be continued. She said that reducing the perceived height of the parapet as staff mentioned; reducing all floor-to-floor heights and reducing the stoop heights. Ms. Meunier said the HSF believes that the proposed height of the stoop is very inappropriate. The few examples where similar heights have been used, example is on the east side of Crawford Square which was approved about a year or two ago by the Board looks completely out of scale and inappropriate. She said that the extra height in this design particularly means that

the stairs extend beyond the façade of the building; and they think this is atypical.

Ms. Meunier said in addition to the staff's comments, they think the columns proposed on the portico and the stoops support are very skinny which further emphasizes the fact that they are tall. Therefore, they suggest increasing the massing of these elements. She said the HSF believes that the alignment of the windows on the east and west facades could be improved. However, overall they feel that it might be more appropriate to restudy the design of the building to be more contemporary instead of trying to make it fit into the more historic aesthetic that is proposed, particularly, as it relates to the incorporation of the raised stoops. Ms. Meunier said they think there is an opportunity to maybe keep some of the height with a restudied design that moves away from the traditional raised stoop and focus on the ground level entry so that this level could be treated as a full floor.

Mr. Daniel Carey resides at 508 East McDonough Street. Mr. Carey said improvements were made to this and he appreciates the petitioner's attention regarding the comments made last month. As the staff has done, he wanted to remind the Review Board of the three letters that have been submitted.

Mr. Carey said the overall height of the building is still disconcerting to him. He believes that sometimes it is confusing with the context of contributing buildings and noncontributing buildings. While it may be more visually compatible with noncontributing buildings, he is more concerned with the contributing buildings, lower buildings; particularly, 230 Habersham Street. Mr. Carey said he believes they know that the new construction can work at a lower level as there are a number of examples along Perry Street and even along McDonough Street on the other side of Price Street that work within those lower heights. He said while Mr. Coleman was defending the higher floor-to-floor ratios and the overall height of the building; he is not sure that he kept up entirely, but he knows that everything adds up and it all counts. At one point, he believes he heard that Mr. Coleman might be able to pick up three feet or reduce it by three feet which he believes this would be significant and not create a squatty building as was talked about earlier. The height of the ground floor with the raised stoop is of particular concern to him. It is almost as if the building is being designed to satisfy SUVs and tall vehicles. To him this is the wrong premise; he believes they need to be less concerned about the parking situation on the first floor and a little more concern about the visual compatibility of the building with the rest of the block.

Mr. Carey stated that in its defense, as he stated last month in his capacity with HSF, he supports the more contemporary nature of the east/west façades; the irregular spacing of the windows; even as he calls it the dorsal fin on the eastern façade. He thanked Mr. Moore for pointing out the proximity to the existing trees. Mr. Carey said he realizes a conflict is here, but he thinks the design is good and he supports it. But, obviously, any consideration for the trees ought to be given. He also agrees with staff. He believes they were open, as the Board was last month during its discussion about reorienting towards Perry Street versus McDonough Street. However, he believes that if they are erring at all, it makes more sense to err on the side of tradition and orient the building to McDonough Street. He believes legitimate arguments were made by residents along Perry Street, but a more traditional orientation of the building to McDonough Street makes a lot more sense.

Mr. Carey said in the end, he believes this will be an improvement in many respects and is

a solid design. However, he believes it is too tall and believes the problem begins at the lower level where they are creating this extraordinarily tall building due to accommodating the parking underneath. Mr. Carey said he believes that this creates a chain of events that affects negatively the rest of the building. Consequently, he implores the restudy of the height and to reduce it in accordance with the staff's recommendation.

Mr. Tom Sharpe, Association Manager for 230 Habersham Street, stated that while the staff's recommendation for the gate and the new walls are beautiful and they would love to have gated parking here, it is not possible to maintain the deeded parking spaces that exist here with the fence and a wall. They will have to take a part of the existing brick wall in order to fit six parking spaces here. Mr. Sharpe said he realizes that parking is not the Review Board's purview, but the association feels strongly about the spaces and they will have to spend a lot of money to rearrange the staircases and tear down walls in order to fit six vehicles in that space.

Mr. Howington stated that parking is not the purview of the Review Board, but the continuity of walls is the purview of Review Board. He invited Mr. Coleman to respond to the public comments.

Mr. Coleman stated that the height and parking requirements are not arbitrary. He said that they have a site that has a lot of limitations; it has a very small footprint that they can build a building on and if they could put the one parking space for these units anywhere else on this site, they would have to park inside the building. The issue of the height being driven by accommodating a vehicle would go away, but this is the reality that they face. The ceiling height for that ground floor is 8 feet and it is not overly excessive by the time they look at what they are looking at for the structure, makes up for the other one foot - six inches that make up the expression for the ground floor. Mr. Coleman said they have looked at all the heights and as he said, he can reduce the other floors height a foot each. They believe that this is not in their best interest, but they are willing to do this. But, when it comes to the ground floor and accommodating cars, they have to meet the minimum here; and he feels this is relatively important.

Mr. Coleman said they have had phone calls and conversations with the association manager of the property next door. He said that his property owner and he have tried to work with him on the parking. Consequently, they have tried to look at what they could do to accommodate them. He said they have a ground easement [access easement] which they are maintaining and are ensuring that they have it. There is not much that they can do; they know that it is going to affect their property owners at some point because of the easement and they are trying to minimize that impact and present to the Review Board the best direction that would minimize this. Clearly, there will have to be some modifications to accommodate what is definitely a significant limitation on the parking spaces.

Mr. Coleman said regarding the drawings that were shown, the height of their building to the adjacent building with trees, at the last meeting he provided renderings with his architectural showing the adjacent massing which showed his building and not blocks. He believes that when you look at a building as a big massive block verses the articulation of a building, it has a totally different feel for what it is. Therefore, he feels it does a disservice to show blocks of what their building mass would be without the articulation of how it works for the architecture. As he has said before, they will be happy to orient their building back to McDonough Street and this will allow them to deal with the stairs

protruding passed the end of the building because they could turn the stairs toward McDonough Street which gives them more than enough room which was not available on Perry Street.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Coleman to explain again the access easement. The question was that the balcony would not be allowed; but from what he understands the balconies would not disrupt the access because they are high enough.

Mr. Coleman explained that the access easement is for vehicular access; it is not an air rights issue, but an access easement for their parking. He said as they have stated, they will take a look at the issue of the balconies. They have concluded, he has talked with the property owner about this, that if the balconies become an issue, they will delete them. They are not going to fight something like this if it becomes a constraint that hampers access to the easement. They understand that this is a requirement on their part. They feel, however, that the balconies provide the necessary clearance; but, if it is found that there is some issue, they are willing to delete it.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Coleman that as the balconies are now, they do not hamper access to the easement.

Mr. Coleman answered that the balconies do not hamper access to the easement.

Mr. Howington said Mr. Coleman mentioned that the ground floor and stoop height had to be one foot.

Mr. Coleman explained that the current flood regulations require that regardless to where you are, that you have a one foot free board above whatever are your elevations. Therefore, you cannot build your residential building directly on the ground, it has to have that one foot clearance to the finish floor. This is what they are accommodating.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Coleman if this applies to the parking.

Mr. Coleman answered that the parking does not have the free board. The parking already steps down to accommodate that.

Dr. Williams asked if the interior floor to floor height of the ground floor is eight feet, is it taller than the garage?

Mr. Coleman answered that it would be taller than the garage.

Dr. Williams said he does not know what the minimum expectation of height in a garage would be, but it seems to be 9 feet.

Mr. Coleman explained that they have living space on the ground floor; therefore, this is where the eight foot minimum is. They have gained a little because they are able to drop the floor elevation in this area.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Coleman if there is an opportunity to take the stairs inside and go up to the ground level in order to reduce some of the height from the outside.

Mr. Coleman responded that his original design had you entering on the ground floor. This was not his preference to doing this; but because he recognized the stairs were an issue he had some that was more attune to what was happening across the street, which was the entry was at the ground level and there was no stair. However, it was requested that they had a normal stair relationship there. Mr. Coleman said he is not bothered by the height, but maybe getting rid of the door on the ground floor takes away that perception of what the elevation is. They do not need an entry on the ground floor on the front. Once this goes away, there is no stoop at the ground floor.

Dr. Williams said regarding the parapet, there are two feet between each floor. Is this the norm for a residential construction?

Mr. Coleman stated to get air conditioning, ductwork and all the other things, two feet would be about what you would be looking normally for floor trusses for residential structure and multi-story. The lowest you will get will be approximately 16 inches. However, he also has fireplace flues that are going through here. Mr. Coleman said he had to look at everything that will be going through the floors and to get the fireplace flues through here, he needed the 24 inches as well.

Dr. Williams stated that pertaining to the parapet as well, Mr. Coleman shows two feet as a ceiling. It is not measured on the elevations, but it appears that the top floor is higher.

Mr. Coleman said basically it is two feet; then he has three feet to provide him with a balcony type rail to the roof access. Therefore, it is another three feet.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he agrees with Historic Savannah. He has a problem with the steps. Instead of facing Perry Street, they can make a change, make a right angle and have a landing. This will change the elevation. He said he is also troubled by the height. The entire ward has two and three story buildings, but they are putting in a four story building with a fire tower. Mr. Engle said he believes this is too much. It will stand out like a sore thumb. He believes this has to be worked on again. He cannot support this the way it is now. He has no problem with the modern approach. There is a lack of symmetry on the side, but he believes it is too much. The rendering shown by Mr. Moore shows one building taller. He asked if the model is correct.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Moore to come to the podium as the Board wants him to explain what he said about the building height.

Mr. Moore said according to the drawings and he has no way to measure the adjacent structure, but the proposed building is 48 feet – one inches and the existing structure is 48 feet as well. The computer model that he did basically took the drawing information shown on the drawings by the architect and incorporated that into the Photo Shop of the same view, angle and everything. The drawings are correct. Mr. Moore said he believes the reason that it does not appear quite so tall is that the trees make it look smaller as the huge oak tree physically brings the scale of the entire façade down to a lower level. The side is completely blocked from vision.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Moore if his comparison was to this building.

Mr. Moore said his comparison was to both of the buildings.

Mr. Gunther said the buildings are not visually compatible with the rest of the ward. He said he agrees with Historic Savannah Foundation. He believes that whatever can be done to reduce the height, should be done.

Mr. Howington said the petitioner has agreed to look at this.

Mr. Engle said they can look at the units to the north and see the massing of those outrageous parapets. Maybe if the parapets were eliminated entirely and just a simple railing was on the roof and setback, they would lose an amazing amount of massing.

Mr. Howington said this could be put in the motion as the petitioner has agreed to look into this.

Mr. Engle stated that he does not see how the Board can support a motion as they need to see the elevation with the stairs redone on the front and also see the roof changes. He said these are major changes. Therefore, he believes this needs to go back to the drawing board.

Mr. Howington said the petitioner has agreed to all the staff's recommendations including item #3. The Board could look at Part I in the next phase. He is not saying that Part I and II will pass in the next phase, but sometimes the Board allows the petitioner to do that.

Dr. Williams said given the constraints of the site and the nature of this relatively being four stories, he believes that external stairs either on Perry or McDonough might help to mitigate and soften the effect. He asked if the doors on the ground floor have to be the same size. Dr. Williams said he believes that having the doors on the ground floor, coupled with the stairs, the elevated porches help to break this up. He asked the Board how they felt about the orientation of the buildings.

Mr. Howington said he believes the orientation facing McDonough Street is better.

Dr. Williams said the model shows a shorter elevation for the setback on Perry Street.

Mr. Howington said he does not believe that the model has been updated.

Mr. Gunther asked if the Board was saying that the petitioner needs to ask for a continuance of Part I.

Mr. Howington told Mr. Coleman that he understood that he has addressed all the items, but the Board is willing to look at Part I and II at the next meeting. However, he has the right to ask the Board to vote on Part I today.

Mr. Coleman asked for a continuance. He did not want the Board to consider Part I and II together. They will come back with Part I at the next meeting.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review
does hereby continue the petition for Part 1:

Height and Mass new construction at 407-409 East McDonough Street. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Tess Scheer - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

15. [Petition of Murray K. Barnard for Barnard and King Architects | 14-003640-COA | 516 East Harris Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Staff Photographs.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Simpson left the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Mr. Murray K. Barnard was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to relocate an existing window on the west (side) façade of the building located at 516 East Harris Street. The northernmost, second floor window on the west façade is proposed to be relocated 2 feet-6 inches to the south to accommodate a new bathroom on the existing second floor stair landing.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends denial to relocate an existing window on the west (side) façade of the building located at 516 East Harris Street because the proposed work does not meet the preservation standards and is not visually compatible. The proposed alteration destroys the historic symmetry of the building and creates a false sense of historical development.

Ms. Michalak reported also that staff recommended to the petitioner that a potential solution would be to keep the existing window in its current location, closing the shutters, and add an accent window in the center of the façade at the second floor level. Per the ordinance: *Accent windows may be round or other shapes.*

Dr. Williams asked if the petitioner closes the shutters, what happens to the window.

Ms. Michalak answered that hopefully there would be just drywall on the inside and that the window would remain in place.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, the window sashes would be retained.

Ms. Michalak answered yes.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Barnard stated they made the request for a practical reason to relocate the window so they would be able to put a bathroom on the second floor and also to get light into the stairwell. If the window is closed, there would be no natural light on the second floor. A fence and a yard is next to the house; and the Beach Institute, which is a three story building, is on the corner. Therefore, you would have to look very closely to see that the window is not symmetrical with the other windows. Consequently, they thought this would be a good solution to their problem.

Mr. Merriman said he knew the petitioner's problem is with lighting, but what the staff has recommended would be to put sheetrock over the inside and put the bathtub there. He said he has worked on a lot of projects where this was done and it looks fine.

Mr. Barnard said they could do this, but it would leave the question of some light for the stairwell. This is what they were trying to accomplish by moving the window over 2 1/2 feet. Since the window is located on the west side, from Harris Street or Price Street you would really have to be looking very hard to tell that the window is moved over.

Dr. Williams asked him if he gave thought to the staff's recommendation regarding leaving the window, but add a small accent window that would provide the light to the stairwell. In doing this, the window would not be altered.

Mr. Barnard said in order to make the window symmetrical, the accent window would have to be put between the two windows. A stair is here that goes down and, therefore, they would not be able to have access to that window.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Barnard if he has considered getting a skylight.

Mr. Barnard answered that this is not possible.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Barnard if he considered installing a tube that brings the sunlight down through the attic.

Mr. Barnard said they would have to build a shaft from the roof all the way down to the ceiling of the second floor.

Mr. Howington informed Mr. Barnard that he believes Dr. Williams was referring to a sola tube.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Barnard how high is the attic.

Mr. Barnard said there is standing room in the attic. Therefore, it would have to be a shaft built from the roof all the way down to the ceiling in order to bring light in.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Barnard if he wanted the window closer to the back near the other window. He said that Mr. Barnard has said that it is only 2 1/2 feet from where the window is presently.

Mr. Barnard explained that the reason that they wanted to move the window 2 1/2 feet is because it would then be at the stair's landing.

Dr. Williams asked him how tall is the attic directly over the landing. At this point, there is the return down slope of the roof.

Mr. Barnard answered that it is at least eight feet.

Dr. Williams said this seems awfully tall. He said in the photo he is looking at shows that from the center point of the peak of the roof in the attic, does not look that tall.

Mr. Barnard stated that he does not know exactly how high it is, but he believes it is more than six feet. He said the other aspect of this is if they wall off the window, they will have a false window there; and to him, this is worse than having it off centered.

Dr. Williams said it would still be reversible. If drywall is put on the inside of the window, it would still be a real window. He explained to Mr. Barnard that looking at the front elevation, it appears to be solid shades behind the windows and could almost read as drywall. Dr. Williams said the Board's concern is about the historic fabric in the future.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that they hold an easement on this property. They have not reviewed the petitioner's request yet. But, they do enforce the Secretary of Interior's Standards when they review their easements.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Meunier if the Review Board can act on something without the HSF giving its opinion on their own easement.

Ms. Meunier answered that she believes the Review Board could pass a decision either way, but because of easement the HSF would have the higher power. It is legally required by the easement that whatever the HSF approves is ultimately what has to be done.

Mr. Engle said if the Review Board does not approve relocating the window, the HSF could not approve that the window be relocated.

Mr. Howington invited Mr. Barnard to respond to the public comment.

Mr. Barnard did not wish to respond.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle stated that he believes that a skylight would be the best option here. He believes that an accent window would be an intrusion. Mr. Engle said the shutters could be shut, put up the drywall, put in a "sola-tube" and if someone later wants the window, it would still be there.

Mr. Howington stated that it is not that the petitioner wants to put in a "sola tube", but if he did, it does not need to come to the Review Board as it would not be seeing by the public as it would be on the roof. But, the petitioner would have to go the Historic Savannah Foundation.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the petition to relocate an existing window on the west (side) façade of the building located at 516 East Harris Street because the proposed work does not meet the preservation standards and is not visually compatible. The- PASS proposed alteration destroys the historic symmetry of the building and creates a false sense of historical development.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Tess Scheer

Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

16. [Petition of Brian Denison for Golden Isles Signs | 14-003926-COA | 2 West Bay Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Application - 2 West Bay Street 14-003926-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Revised Submittal packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [building measurements.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 14-003926-COA.pdf](#)

Mr. Brian Denison was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to remove and replace four (4) existing signs with the new Hyatt Regency corporate brand image signs. The proposed signs include two (2) sets of high rise channel letters (that are to be located along the top edge of the hotel towers) and two (2) sets of low rise channel letters (to be located over the entrance at the front of building and overlooking the river, at the back of the hotel).

Ms. Harris stated that she talked with the Zoning Administrator because clearly the existing signage that is currently on the building does not meet the standards. She asked him if there was any consideration for grandfathering in additional signage. Staff was told that there is no flexibility for grandfathering the signs. Staff informed the petitioner of this, but he asked that the request come before the Review Board for a final decision.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends denial of the four principal use fascia signs at 2 West Bay Street because the size of the signs exceeds the maximum size permitted.

Mr. Engle said since the Review Board does not have the authority to grant a variance, why is the Board hearing this request?

Ms. Harris explained that the petitioner did not request a variance. If he had made a variance request, the Review Board could make a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals on the variance based on the variance criteria and staff's recommendation.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Harris if she had the square footage dimensions of the existing signs.

Ms. Harris said the square footage might be in the petitioner's proposal.

Dr. Williams said it appears that signage is doubled.

Ms. Harris stated that her assessment, when she said the signs were larger, was based on visual perception. She does not know if the petitioner can provide the signage dimensions for the existing signs.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Denison stated that he is the subcontractor for this job. He is aware that staff has recommended denial, but the contractor just wants to pursue all avenues. Mr. Denison stated that on the east and west side of the building, the current size is 87 square feet and by going to 28 inch letters, they reduced this to 73 square feet. He said for informational purposes, to get within the 30 square feet limit would require the sign to be 11 inches tall. From River Street to the top of the buildings is 92 feet. Therefore, 11 inches at 92 feet you would not be able to read it. The same thing would apply to other side of the building.

Mr. Denison said his client told them that in 1981, they had a 32 foot sign. They do not have a problem with going back with a 30 square foot sign on the front of the building. On the back of the building facing the river what is current is 82 square feet. He understands that the his client's intention is to make the sign visible from the river and also the other side of the river. However, in this situation, the client is also willing to reduce this sign to

30 square foot.

Mr. Denison said [pointing to an area] even if they shrunk here and put "Regency" under, it would reduce the total square footage, but the problem is this is a solid concrete wall; the roof line is actually here and there is no access on either side of the building to power the signs. Therefore, the sign has to be above the roofline.

Ms. Scheer asked Mr. Denison if the request to change the signs was due to change in logo or change in ownership.

Mr. Denison answered the business is now legally Hyatt Regency and they have to put "Regency" on all of their buildings.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked what is the square footage now on each façade.

Mr. Denison answered 87 Square footage.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said the sign is already outside the guidelines and he wants to go back with something outside of the guidelines.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said if there is no grandfathering on this and the law is the law, why is the Board considering this. The Review Board does not have the authority to supersede the law. If the Zoning Administrator has said this does not meet the standards, the Review Board cannot say forget the standards.

Ms. Harris said the petitioner has a right to submit the application.

Mr. Engle said the Review Board does not legally have the right to supersede the sign ordinance.

Mr. Merriman said what the petitioner is requesting is outside of what the ordinance allows. He understands the petitioner needs a sign, but they need to look at the ordinance and see what is allowed and make the sign fit.

Mr. Gunther said he understood that this is currently nonconforming to the ordinance. He asked as long as the petitioner does not expand upon the nonconforming, could new signage still be allowed to meet what is currently there.

Ms. Harris answered no.

Mr. Merriman said that with other projects that he has worked on where you have something that is existing that is not in compliance, but when that changes, the MPC has always made the person get into compliance with what they are doing new. Mr. Merriman said he does not see why this would be any different.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the four (4) principal use fascia signs at 2 West Bay Street because the size of the - PASS signs exceeds the maximum size permitted.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

17. [Petition of Richard Sioufi | 14-003946-COA | 501 East Charlton Street | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Mr. Richard Sioufi and Dr. Nancy Linder Sioufi were present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report .The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations to the main building and carriage house for the property located at 501 East Charlton Street. (Front stoop roof alterations, window replacement on both buildings, and carriage house roof replacement indicated in the application and submittal packet are not part of this scope of work or review.)

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends:

1. Denial of the following:

Main Building:

- a. Main building siding and trim replacement with fiber cement materials.
- b. Stair replacement with fiber cement materials.
- c. Window frame replacement with fiber cement materials.
- d. Soffit and fascia replacement with fiber cement materials.
- e. Restucco of all foundation walls and brick piers.

Carriage House:

- a. Removal of the existing brick stairs at the two lane entrance doors.

- b. Removal of the two existing lane entrance doors.
- c. Do not paint any unpainted brick stairs.

Because the above proposed work is not visually compatible, and does not meet the preservation and design standards.

- 2. Approval of the following with conditions:
 - a. All color changes.
 - b. Main building stucco repair.
 - c. Repair carriage house wood lap-siding (in-kind).

Conditions of Approved Items – provide the following to staff for final review and approval prior to commencement of the work:

- a. Provide physical samples of all color selections.
- b. Door frames (both buildings): select a different paint color than the doors.
- c. Trim Prism Decoration (main building): provide clarification of the location of this etail.

- 3. Recommend denial to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the design standard that states:
 - ... smooth finish fiber cement siding may be used on new residential construction, which includes additions. The use of fiber cement siding is prohibited on historic buildings as a replacement for existing wood siding.

Because the request does not meet the variance criteria, the material is strictly prohibited in the ordinance as a replacement material for wood on historic buildings, the proposed work is not visually compatible, and does not meet the preservation standards.

Ms. Scheer asked for clarification because at first glance it looks like a contradiction pertaining to the recommendation of denial to restucco the foundation walls of the main house (#1 - e) but recommends approval (#2 - b) of the main building stucco repair.

Ms. Michalak explained that there is a contradiction in the submission. She said the petitioner's application shows that they want to repair the stucco, but the contractor's scope document shows that they want to remove all of the stucco and replace it. The staff's recommendation is to repair the stucco, but not remove it.

Mr. Engle asked if the Broad previously approved the balusters on the front porch and stairwells.

Ms. Michalak said the work is done but she could not find an approval by the Review Board for the work.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Dr. Sioufi stated that she is a tenant of the Noble Hardee House. She said that they are not the sole owners of the property, it is broken up into condos both the house and carriage house. There are six units in the main house and two units in the carriage house. Their homeowner association collects funds for repairs. They are well aware that the property needs to be repaired. The property is in the Beach District.

Dr. Sioufi said in front of their house is the Frank Callen Boys and Girls Club which has

cement blocks and on the sides of their house are two cement block houses; behind their house are some wood structures in the lane. She pointed to a photo and said they would like to have their house look like this which is cement siding.

Dr. Sioufi said they are requesting a variance for the cement siding. She said she was unaware of the soffits, stairs and everything else. Consequently, they were only requesting the siding. They see evidence of numerous cement sidings all over historic homes in their area.

Dr. Sioufi said Kern and Coleman evaluated their house and they were told that they need to remove all the siding as they have structure problems. Therefore, they need to replace all the siding. If they could they would patch with wood, but they have an issue where they need to really look at the structural integrity of their house as the pictures show. She said that they want to preserve the house with cement siding. Dr. Sioufi stated that in determining that their house is almost all wood, they understand that wood rots quickly in Savannah and on different places of their house the wood starts at the eight foot mark and goes up to 35 feet. They would have to rent scaffolding and continually have costly examinations on their house. This is not a one or two story house, but a very high elevation. Consequently, they would have to spend money annually to look at the cracks in the wood.

Dr. Sioufi said they will save \$40,000 by doing the cement siding. Their homeowner association will probably have to get a loan in order to be able to look at their structure needs. As she walks her dog around town, she and her husband have been looking at the difference with the aesthetic of cement siding versus wood. When you drive your car, you cannot tell the difference; when you walk your dog, you cannot tell the difference. The only way you can tell is by going up closely and trying to decipher if it is wood or cement siding. On many houses, repairs have been done with cement siding when it is a wood façade and it is a historical home. Therefore, a little bit of cement siding is at the bottom and a little bit of wood at the top. The pictures that they will show the Board, will tell the story. They are trying to do the repairs honest by coming to the Review Board.

Dr. Sioufi said they realize that wood is not green and that it will take between 50 to 70 mature trees to repair their house. They feel that their house was built for a low cost socio-economic residence. She said they are those kind of residents. She and her husband are teachers. The people that live in their building all are renting; the highest purchase price of one unit is probably \$150,000. Therefore, they are not financial able to continually repair wood. They know if they have wood that they will have to do repairs throughout the years. Home Depot and Lowes do not sell wood siding any longer. They have recommended that they go to a boutique lumber yard to get wood. So, they cannot purchase wood siding from Home Depot or Lowes.

Dr. Sioufi stated that they would like to spend the \$40,000 savings on historical details as opposed to the wood siding. They believe that the fiber cement looks so much like wood that they are keeping the historical integrity and historical character as opposed to only relating to historical materials. This is a new project with cement siding. If they look at cement siding, it does look a lot like wood. She showed the board a picture and said this is actually wood that she guesses someone painted the chipped portion where the paint came off. She said that this siding is on the Beach Institute which is a historical building

that is visited by persons who come into their district.

Dr. Sioufi said in their drive around Savannah, they see many dwellings of almost condemned properties that have not been maintained. They don't want to be like this. They know that the City is recommending that they do patch jobs, but they know that they need to look inside their building; they live here and know that they need to do more. They know that it will be very costly and they do not believe that a patch job will be the answer to their problem. She showed the Board a typical rot water damages to their house. As far as keeping the doors as symmetrical is understandable, but she believes they fall within a special criteria with what they have as their house may not last much longer if they do not repair it. The wood is getting cracks in the middle of the planks and the water is seeping inside; they are getting water damages coming from the inside to the outside. Therefore, they have issues with water damages, issues with birds, and other animals. They are getting water inside the sheetrock and within their electrical system. They have serious joist problems and structural problems that need to be addressed. Dr. Sioufi explained that the money they have collected with their homeowners association needs to be available for structural issues. This is the reason they have asked for the variance.

Dr. Sioufi said once the skin comes off, they do not know what else they will have to replace. They are trying to preserve the house and keep the same character of this house even if it is cement siding. She showed the Board pictures of old and new structures within their neighborhood that are done with cement siding. These buildings blend well historically, look good and keep the integrity. She said a house on Oglethorpe has both wood and cement siding on it. Can you tell which side has the wood and which side has the cement siding? She answered that you can hardly tell the difference. She pointed out that directly behind their property, a house in Charlton Lane was renovated on the outside with wood siding last year and they already see puckering and all kinds of things going on with the paint.

Dr. Sioufi said they believe that fiber cement holds the same aesthetic as wood and last four to five times longer. Fiber cement costs less to install, it costs less to repair and its maintenance is less. It is nonflammable and is the cheap material of today. Wood is superior as far as it was a historical material, but cement siding looks just like wood and you really cannot tell the difference.

Mr. Howington complimented Dr. Sioufi on her presentation.

Ms. Scheer said she believes that they all understand the benefits of the hardi board and she does not believe that nobody is apathetic to the cost effectiveness of it. However, this is one of the old antebellum houses. Ms. Scheer asked Dr. Sioufi if there is a reason that every single board has to be taken off.

Dr. Sioufi answered that the interior is rotten and this is what the structural engineer recommended to them.

Ms. Scheer asked if there is a reason that the boards cannot be carefully taken off and patched with wood instead of re-skinning the entire house.

Dr. Sioufi answered that she believes if this could be done, they would do so. But, because

they see so much bad evidence, they feel they need to open it up and take care of the problem.

Ms. Scheer ask if this has to be replaced with new materials. She said she could not imagine that every board on this huge building is bad. Based on what she sees, the majority can be repaired or replaced in patches if necessary and matched.

Dr. Sioufi answered that her thinking is as wood ages, it deteriorates further. The wood here now is probably from the 1970s. Are they just going to put back 1970 wood onto the house that will get cracks and expansion contraction that will become brittle as opposed to their money of getting the most bang for their bucks and put back something that will not do that?

Ms. Scheer stated that for every benefit, there is a cost. The benefit of living in one of these wonderful old homes is the cost of the materials to maintain it. She believes the best approach is to repair and maintain as much as possible and replace when needed.

Mr. Gunther, too, commended Dr. Sioufi on a thorough presentation. He said there is no question that there are issues here with rotting, water infiltration, etc. Mr. Gunther asked Dr. Sioufi if they only got one opinion from a structural engineer. It is always good to get more than one opinion as people will approach this situation in different ways.

Dr. Sioufi said in looking at her husband, it appears that they did get more than one opinion.

Mr. Engle asked Dr. Sioufi, what is the thickness of the existing siding?

Dr. Sioufi answered may be three-quarters of an inch.

Mr. Engle said that the hardi board is only three-eighths of an inch thick. This will be one-half the thickness which means that the shadow lines will be cast on this building and will be totally different in the relationship of the siding. The trim will be different by almost one-half inch. This is not almost identical.

Dr. Sioufi asked if they could get the thickness exactly the same, would that work?

Mr. Engle informed Dr. Sioufi that they could not get it exactly the same thickness. A three-quarter inch hardi board is manufactured, but it will cost a lot more.

Mr. Howington stated that with putting sheathing behind it, it will have to be bumped out even further than the existing siding.

Mr. Engle said it is very rare that the structural failure is going to be more than four or five feet up the building. If it is all the way to the top, then he is not sure what is holding the building up. When people go in and intervene and have to replace sills, it is about three or four feet of siding that has to come off, not the rest of the building. Mr. Engle said if the studs are gone and the down braces are gone all the way to the attic, major problems are here and no new siding will save this.

Dr. Sioufi said the scenario that Mr. Engle is talking about, they do not know this until they find out. They are dealing with the unknown of what is behind the siding that they need to address.

Mr. Engle said the Board is being asked to say that it is okay to throw out all the original fabric without the petitioner knowing if there is an existing problem.

Mr. Howington stated that the Board is not bound by the structure beyond, but by the visual exterior skin. The structure is not the Board's concern.

Dr. Williams said the greatest likelihood is that the cladding on this building is from 1853 not 1970. He agrees with Ms. Scheer's comments. Dr. Williams said he also agrees with Mr. Engle based on his own house which was 100 years old and he had to have the entire sill replaced. The damage went up about three feet and the rest of the building had integrity. He said he does not know what the other opinions were that were given to Dr. Sioufi. The hardi plank even from a distance, is no longer the authentic article. Swapping materials on this building makes a difference in the value of the building. In fact, the building has more value if it has more of its historical materials. The building can be saved without sacrificing what is actually important here.

Mr. Merriman said there are some other local companies that he deals with that have reasonable prices.

Dr. Henry agreed with Dr. Williams about the property losing its value if the hardi board is approved for the property. The resale value in the historic district would be decreased. People buy structures in the historic district because of its authenticity.

Mr. Engle said if this proposal was undertaken as is proposed, no integrity would be left of the exterior. He would propose that the property be removed from the registry.

Dr. Sioufi said they would like this as they would be able to fix the house and be able to live here.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) commended Dr. Sioufi on the presentation and for humanizing what is sometimes a difficult issue about historic building materials or some modern materials that are conceivable more efficient, last longer, etc. Mr. Carey said the HSF has an easement on this property. They would be more than happy to consult with the condo owners about suggested consultants, architects, engineers, and contractors. He believes that while this is a difficult position to be in and they are sympathetic, this is largely the result of deferred maintenance. The HSF wants to be helpful and assist in resolving this problem.

Mr. Carey said there are few areas of black and white in preservation and what comes before the Review Board. He said a lot of it is open to subjectivity and different opinions, but he believes that with this, the ordinance is clear. The Secretary of Interior's Standards are clear. While they all can share sympathy with this, they should hold the line on this so that they all can work with the condo owners to come up with the best preservation solution.

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

Dr. Sioufi did not have any comments.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle stated that he empathizes with the petitioner, but he believes that Mr. Carey is absolutely correct. Maintenance is not happening on this building. Since he has been a member of the Review Board for almost six years he does not believe that he has seen an application that has this many variances from the Secretary Standards. This is just not possible for the Board to consider approving the request.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

1. Deny of the following:

Main Building:

- a. Main building siding and trim replacement with fiber cement materials.
- b. Stair replacement with fiber cement materials.
- c. Window frame replacement with fiber cement materials.
- d. Soffit and fascia replacement with fiber cement materials.
- e. Restucco of all foundation walls and brick piers.

Carriage House:

- a. Removal of the existing brick stairs at the two lane entrance doors.
- b. Removal of the two existing lane entrance doors.
- c. Do not paint any unpainted brick stairs.

Because the above proposed work is not visually compatible, and does not meet the preservation and design standards.

2. Approve the following with conditions:

- a. All color changes.
- b. Main building stucco repair.
- c. Repair carriage house wood lap-siding (in-kind). - PASS

Conditions of Approved Items – provide the

following to staff for final review and approval prior to commencement of the work:

- a. Provide physical samples of all color selections.
 - b. Door frames (both buildings): select a different paint color than the doors.
 - c. Trim Prism Decoration (main building): provide clarification of the location of this detail.
3. Recommend denial to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the design standard that states:
- ... smooth finish fiber cement siding may be used on new residential construction, which includes additions. The use of fiber cement siding is prohibited on historic buildings as a replacement for existing wood siding.

Because the request does not meet the variance criteria, the material is strictly prohibited in the ordinance as a replacement material for wood on historic buildings, the proposed work is not visually compatible, and does not meet the preservation standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Tess Scheer

Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

18. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 14-003988-COA | 229 West Congress Street | New Construction: Part 1 Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 14-003988-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 229 West Congress Street 14-003988-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Historic Photograph.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of Part I: Height and Mass for new construction of a three story building at the southeast corner of West Congress and Jefferson Streets. The proposed building will have a corner primary entrance, one secondary entrance along Jefferson Street and two secondary entrances along West Congress Street. Ms. Harris stated that awnings are not typically a part of Part I Height and Mass, but because of the prominent nature of the awning structure on the roof, staff recommended that the petitioner provide this information in Part I instead of having this in Part II - Design Details.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of Part 1 Height and Mass for a new three story building at the southeast corner of Jefferson and West Congress Streets with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II Design Details:

1. Reduce the height of the awning structure on the third floor;
2. Increase the ground floor height to 14 feet six inches to meet the standard;
3. Incorporate windows on the second floor rather than storefront which is more typical on second floor along Congress Street; and
4. Ensure that the horizontal banding continues on the street facades of the building beneath the awnings. Consider lowering the height of the storefronts and the awning installation to further emphasize the differentiation between the first story and upper stories.

Mr. Engle said it appears that the thing on the roof is being glossed over. Is it a pergola? If so, 12 feet is the approved limit and the one here is 15 feet - six inches. This is a highly visible feature. Is it compatible to anything else in the neighborhood?

Ms. Harris stated that staff is recommending that the overall height be reduced. It is setback from all the facades of the building. It will be visible and with the reduction in height, will be less visible. She explained that normally, she would consider these awning structures in that there are poles covered in fabric providing shade. One might consider them umbrellas as temporary structures, but because they are a part of the structure of the building, she thought it was important to bring this in Part I. However, the awning can be removed in the future. The fabric can be changed and all this could come to the Board in the Design Details to see exactly what this would look like. Staff is recommending an overall reduction in height to reduce the visibility a little further. Ms. Harris explained that they have gotten into the issue in previous meetings of how do they classify the newer structures that are coming in, which do not fit neatly into the definition or thought processes of being an umbrella or awning, but do not have standards to address it. She said she classified this under awning.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Harris to clarify the nature of the staff's recommendation in lowering some windows and differentiating floor levels.

Ms. Harris explained that this goes back to the standard that talks about dividing the

building and having a differentiation between the first and second floors of the building. She explained that as the Board can see in the elevation there is a horizontal band, but they cannot see if the horizontal band is continuous beneath where the awnings are. Therefore, staff is recommending that the horizontal differentiation between the first and second floors be further emphasized which may include lowering the storefront system so that the awning detail will be more apparent.

Mr. Howington asked staff if they have a dimension on the bottom of the awing.

Ms. Harris answered that she does not see a specific dimension, but the height of the first floor is 14 feet.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she noticed that site lines are not included in the submittal package indicating how much of the canopy is visible from the street. She said that when the petitioner is making his comments, maybe he can clarify this.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay stated that accompanying him at today's meeting were Ms. Minnie Poole, Design Associate; Mr. Dan O'Neill, Architect; and Ms. Kailey Baker, student intern. Mr. Shay stated that they agree with the staff report. However, he wanted to offer a clarification about the location of the electric meters.

Mr. Shay explained that the electric and gas meters will be located in the lane. All of the roof top mechanical equipment will be screened from view. They have just begun the design detail development process with the engineers. Therefore, they do not know the sizes and configurations of the meters or roof top mechanical equipment, but they do commit to the Board that they will meet this standard. He explained that with regards to the awning structure on the third floor, they are prepared to reduce the height of the overall awning structure by approximately two feet. They think it will be less obtrusive and less visible from the street. However, they do not want it to be invisible. The point is that the restaurant on the corner would like for its patrons to know as they approach the building that there is an area on the roof that would allow them to go up there and dine. They are willing to reduce the overall height about two feet.

Mr. Shay explained that the model will show this a little better, but the leading edge is the most visible from the street and it actually comes to a point. Therefore, it is relatively narrow at the front and the main elements that run along this line from front to back are sloped in such a way that if you were standing across the street on the sidewalk, you would be able to see some of it, but it is not as obtrusive as the elevation would make you believe.

Mr. Shay said increasing the ground floor height to 14 feet six inches they agree with. He said they will increase this to 14 feet eight inches because it is a masonry course in convention. This will work out better. He said regarding the windows on the second floor, he confesses that he did not fully grasp the staff's suggestion. Mr. Shay said they are proposing that the window fenestration pattern up there be subdivided to have mullions similar to the adjacent windows. They would like to keep the glass below because it is a double cantilever corner and they want it to be visibly as light as possible. Regarding the horizontal banding, Mr. Shay said that when they added the eight inches to get from 14 feet

to 14 feet eight inches, they added from the top of the awning up. Now, they have the ability to have a rowlock course and some kind of masonry detailing here that will be visible above the awning, He said that they also concur with the staff recommendation to lower the height of the storefront so that it is more visible and this, too, will have a soldier course of some kind. Therefore, between the pilasters will be continuous. They do not want to interrupt the pilasters as they want to make them continue to be the base spacing vertical in its overall expression.

Mr. Shay explained that they have a section if the Board cares to look at it that confirms the things that he has told the Board. He said in general, they concur with the staff report and are willing to comply with the requests and look forward to advancing into Part II - Design Details so that they can resolve some of the other issues regarding the materiality and detailing.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Shay that on the far right of his illustration, he assumes the lower part is the awning.

Mr. Shay pointed out where the awning is located. He said to answer a question that was asked earlier, it is approximately 11 feet. He said, pointing to an area, that these are actually awnings and this is an element that when he comes back he will tell the Board more about. It is made out of canvas, but really is a sign.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Shay if he explored the possibility of having an awning structure that his client wants visible as opposed to scenarios where they have roofs that makes it discreet and hidden as much as possible. He said it is funny because he finds the model works great; it is all permanent as much as possible in terms of color, but he looks at the elevation with different colors. He asked Mr. Shay what does he considers out of the setback requirement for this awning structure since he has the height and if they could call this a third story, what if this structure was an extension of this façade and integrated into the design of the building and parachuted down to the base. Is this possible?

Mr. Shay stated that he wanted to explain their design logic first. He explained that the elements that they are proposing that are permanent were appropriate and traditional. However, the elements that are by comparison are temporary, would be the elements that they would start to have a little more flare and fun with. This seems in keeping with a lot of the things they see going on in City Market. There is a precedent for a rooftop awning, but it is not on a historic building. Mr. Shay said that diagonally from this, a building is there that has a roof garden with an awning over it. Consequently, they felt that this would be appropriate. They have not decided on color yet, but the reason this look likes that is because they get carried away and feel they need to show every brick joint. He does not believe it will be red brick, but he is not sure.

Mr. Shay explained that they felt that having the light structure on the roof as an awning could easily be removed when the tenant or the circumstance changes. To them, this seems to be the most logical approach. They also have it set back from the edge of the roof for two reasons. One is so that it will be less apparent and the second is that this area of the Historic District has a terrible drainage problem. They are responding to a request by the City of Savannah that they try to create a rain garden on the roof and take all that water and shed it to a rain garden that actually is between the parapet and the edge of the deck so that they can store, dissipate, or retain as much of the rainwater as possible so that when it is

discharged into the City's sewage system that it will be polished and clean water. Therefore, they want to have a roof that sheds water, but not into the street without at least having the opportunity to pass through the rain garden.

Mr. Shay said, therefore, in speaking to Mr. Engle's question, they looked at the idea of a pergola, but the problem is it does not help them with the rainwater situation. It does not channel the rainwater at all.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Daniel Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation said they like the design of the main building. They believe that it is nicely articulated. They also agree with the staff's recommendation. She said, however, they suggest that the petitioner consider spacing the windows on the second level. Presently, there appears to be less spacing between the two windows and more spacing on the edges. Ms. Meunier said the HSF suggests evenly spacing the windows within the bay or maybe bring the windows closer together so that there is either no space or minimum space.

Ms. Meunier said the HSF also suggests exploring the use of more glass in the recessed entrance to be more in keeping with a typical design for recessed entries. She said she believed this goes up stairs and that this is a tenant space; therefore, it cannot be fully glass, but maybe there is an opportunity here to incorporate more glass here.

Ms. Meunier stated that they share some of the same feelings as what Dr. Williams has expressed about the awning structure on the roof terrace. They feel that it does not really appear to relate to anything else in the rest of the design or with the historic context. Therefore, they feel this particular element could be removed or restudied.

Mr. Howington invited Mr. Shay to respond, if he desired, to the public comments.

Mr. Shay responded that the comment about the spacing of the windows and the addition of more glass in this area are reasonable suggestions and something that they will be willing to study in the next phase.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Shay that the awning he proposes on the roof if he is seeing this simply as temporary as opposed to conceiving it from the outside as a permanent feature.

Mr. Shay answered that they did not want it to read as a third story.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Shay if he was familiar with the old YMCA building on Madison Square. They had to remove a pergola structure. If you go to the Georgia Historical Society, you can see photos of a five story building where the brick piers extend up beyond the roofline pergola. He said, therefore, imagine replacing wood with awnings. This is what he had in mind. Dr. Williams said this would give Mr. Shay a visualization of the kind of idea. However, this seems to hinge on what is it programmatically conceived as. Is it temporary; is it a step above removable furniture, but is not intended to be there a long time, because if it did a different design approach it might be worth the investment.

Mr. Shay said this is something that he is willing to discuss with his client as to how

committed they are to this. He knows because this is a landlord/tenant building, that his experience in the past has been that the building seems to outlast the tenant.

Mr. Engle said the only thing he is wondering if there is not some way to bring a horizontal banding in at the lowest level of that fabric so that there will be some sort of horizontal line. Maybe Dr. Williams has a concern of the angles and everything else is because there really is no strong horizontal. If ten inches of something was put between the poles, it would reinforce the horizontality of that building and maybe lessen the diagonals a little.

Mr. Shay said this is something that is worth considering. He said what they would like to ask today is that they be given the height and mass approval for the idea and then have the opportunity to come back in working in concert with the people who design canvas awnings. Mr. Shay said he believes this is a valid conceptually ideal to make it a little more structural.

Mr. Howington said that once the petitioner begins looking at this, maybe the members will have to become a little larger structurally.

Dr. Williams asked what if the Board approved the height and mass; then Mr. Shay comes back with something that shows site lines are integrated, would he be permitted to do that if the Board has approved what is presented today and in the second round he has modified it.

Mr. Shay stated that in this regard, he would come back and ask to modify Part I and approve Part II.

Mr. Howington stated that he believes this would be allowable.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Merriman said this is a nice building and he can go along with the height and mass. He was thinking about the playground they heard not long ago. The residents had many things to say about the coverings. This is a great building, but he believes that something has to be different. If this is approved, it will be the only thing in this district that is compatible with that playground. Mr. Merriman said, therefore, this has to be a little more permanent.

Mr. Howington said what is being requested today is a little different from what was requested for the playground. What is being requested today is more of a rooftop structure. He sees this as a different object. This will be placed on the top of a permanent structure.

Mr. Engle said what will be seen is basically the front bay. When you are on the sidewalk you will see the front. Therefore, the only place where definition is needed is on the front and side.

Mr. Howington stated that he believes that when Mr. Shay returns, he will provide a perspective from the street of how much will actually be seen.

Ms. Wiebe-Reed stated that she believes in looking at something in this way without

looking at in perspective is totally improper. She believes that when Mr. Shay comes back it will be different.

Mr. Gunther said the permanent structures are creating a third floor. As the awning structure becomes more integrated, it will help unify everything on the rooftop.

Mr. Engle said look at the Moon River Brewing Company where they have the building, then the pergola comes out from it, the beer garden. It all works together. But, this does not seem to be working together on the third floor.

Mr. Howington said they understand that this will be restudied.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a new three story building at the southeast corner of Jefferson and West Congress Streets with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II Design Details:

1. Reduce the height of the awning structure on the third floor;
2. Increase the ground floor height to 14 feet six inches to meet the standard;
3. Incorporate windows on the second floor rather than storefront which is more typical on second floor along Congress Street;
4. Ensure that the horizontal banding continues on the street facades of the building beneath the awnings. Consider lowering the height of the storefronts and the awning installation to further emphasize the differentiation between the first story and upper stories;
5. Restudy the disposition and massing of the third floor;
6. Restudy the awning structure to be more integrated into the overall design;
7. Add additional glass to the recessed entrance on Congress Street; and
8. Restudy the spacing of the second floor windows.

- PASS

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

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Nicholas Henry

Keith Howington	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Reed Engle	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

19. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 14-003993-COA | 20 East Broad Street | Alterations and Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Context Images.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Trustees' Garden Ward Map.pdf](#)

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

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

NOTE: Ms. Weibe-Reed abstained from discussion of this petition. She serves as a consultant to Dawson Architects.

Mr. Neil Dawson was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations and an addition for the property known as the Pirate's House located at 20 East Broad Street. The addition will be located at the east end of the existing building, internal to the site but visible from East Broad Street. It will be one-story and will house new restroom facilities to support the restaurant.

Ms. Michalak stated that on January 14, 2014, staff approved to replace the entire existing corrugated metal roof with a standing metal seam roof; and on August 13, 2014, the Board approved rehabilitation and alterations for the front (historic) areas of the building.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for alterations and an addition for the property, known as the "Pirate's House," located at 20 East Broad Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

- a. Provide a sample of the brick, with the applied parge coat, and mortar to staff for final review and approval.
- b. Ensure that the relocated windows and the new window are inset not less than three inches from the exterior façade of the building.

Ms. Michalak additionally reported that staff recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for a variance from the permitted maximum lot coverage within the R-B-C zoning district: (Proposed: 74.7 percent - Existing: 73.7 percent – Permitted: 50 percent)

Mr. Gunther asked Ms. Michalak if the petitioner explained how the parge coating will be applied to the brick.

Ms. Michalak answered that the petitioner did not say how it would be applied and this is why staff is asking for the sample so they will know exactly what the coating will be. She said the Board may ask the petitioner how he intends to match the existing brick or what is their plan with this.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson stated that Mr. Bob Turner, owner of the Pirate's House was accompanying him at the meeting today. He entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Gunther asked Mr. Dawson to give additional information on the parge coating.

Mr. Dawson explained that there is a brick fence on the front part of the Pirate's House along East Broad Street that has this same type of finish to it. He said that the photo that the Board was reviewing is good because some of the red brick shows through, but they also have some of the rough parge that sits on top of it. This is the kind of illustration that they want to achieve.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he will vote favorably for this, but he wanted to go on record that this is a classic case of a false sense of history. They are taking a new brick building and putting parge over it so that it will look like it is 200 years old.

Dr. Williams asked if this could be a brick wall without parge. The Pirate's House used to pride itself as being the oldest building in Savannah built in 1754. But this building isn't the oldest building as it was built in 1794 at the earliest if not later. The upper story of the long addition 1980 wood looks old by virtue of not being painted. He asked if this is good for the building to keep expanding this sort of neo-history.

Mr. Howington said he believes it should be a modular size brick that is not a historic replica. He asked what is more important: the public or the preservation of the building.

Mr. Engle stated why not use modular brick and don't parge.

Mr. Merriman said is not the entire purpose behind the Secretary of Interior's Standard is that when people walk by they know there are differences in the old and the new.

Mr. Howington said sometimes they build 2014 buildings that look like 1890 buildings and the average person could not tell the difference.

Mr. Engle said this is one big false sense of history and because it was done 50 years ago

does not make it right for them to do it again.

Mr. Howington said to him, the preservation will explore the materials within the structure and to him, this is what is more significant than fooling the public eye.

Dr. Williams said the little gate posts on the entrance of the sidewalk in both of the photos are actually modern brick. Yet, they are not parged; they look old, but they are not. He said the walls that connect the new building to the old building looks somewhat like Savannah Grey Bricks, but it is hard to tell. They are left unparged; therefore, he believes it would help to tell the story that gives this part of the building its own identity and not pretend to be from the same vintage as the genuinely old wall on East Broad Street.

Mr. Dawson said their petition is in front of the Board. If it is visually compatible, then the Board should vote on the petition. But, if they want to design the petition, then they vote on the motion not to parge.

Mr. Howington stated that the petitioner has a point. The Board cannot redesign the petition. They can vote on the petition as is with the brick being a condition, but they cannot redesign it.

Mr. Gunther said he does not really have a problem with parging, it is just a new version of coating bricks.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Gunther if he was saying here at this location that it would be alright to parge as everything else is already done.

Mr. Gunther said he does not believe that the parging gives a false sense of anything.

Mr. Howington, for clarity, asked the petitioner that he does not have concerns using modular bricks, but that the finish on the parging is what he wants to maintain.

Mr. Dawson answered yes to Mr. Howington's question. He said he believes that there are too many projects in Savannah that are done with fake Savannah Grey bricks that are machine tumbled. Therefore, he does not know what the difference is. Parge coating is not a unique thing to historic buildings; they see it on new construction. They think that it is not any less visually appropriate than a machine tumbled Savannah Grey or frankly even the siding on the second floor that looks like it is 150 years old.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Dawson that to help differentiate the historic, would he be willing to go with a more modular brick.

Mr. Dawson said there is a wire cut modular brick which is a cleaner line brick.

Mr. Howington stated that the petitioner has agreed that a wire-cut modular brick would be used and he wants to maintain the parge.

Mr. Engle said this Board has refused materials many times.

Mr. Howington said they have also stated that they cannot substitute materials for petitions.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

Approve the alterations and an addition for the property, known as the "Pirate's House," located at 20 East Broad Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

- a. For the addition and existing wall material change, select a wire-cut, modular brick in order to differentiate the old from the new (a parge-coat can be applied to the brick.) - PASS
- b. Provide a sample of the brick, with the applied parge coat, and mortar to staff for final review and approval.
- c. Ensure that the relocated windows and the new window are inset not less than three inches from the exterior façade of the building.

Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the permitted maximum lot coverage within the R-B-C- zoning district: (Proposed: 74.7 percent - Existing: 73.7 percent – Permitted: 50 percent).

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Tess Scheer

Reed Engle	- Nay
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Nay
Marjorie W Reed	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

20. [Petition of Becki Harkness, Coastal Heritage Society | 13-004372-COA | 303 MLK Jr. Blvd. | One Year Extension Request](#)

Attachment: [Request for extension staff recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Request for One Year Extension.pdf](#)

Attachment: [COA - 303 MLK Jr. Blvd 13-004372-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review hereby approve a 12 month extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) issued on September 11, 2013 for wall stabilization to 303 MLK Jr. Blvd. [File No. 13-004372-COA]. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Marjorie W Reed - Not Present

Tess Scheer - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

21. [Petition of Mounir Hasbi for Ruan Thai Cuisine | 14-003243-COA | 17 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 17 West Broughton Street 14-003243-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 17 West Broughton Street 14-003243-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of James Beasley for Sign Mart, Inc. | 14-003538-COA | 605 MLK Jr. Boulevard | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 605 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard 14-003538-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 605 MLK Jr. Blvd 14-003538-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Amended Petition of Erik E. Puljung for Hansen Architects, P.C. | 14-003802-COA | 138 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Windows](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 138 Habersham Street 14-003802-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Erik Puljung for Hansen Architects, P.C. | 14-003803-COA | 22 West Harris Street | Staff Approved - Demolition](#)

Attachment: [COA Decision.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of Brian Robin for Robin Restoration, LLC | 14-003871-COA | 220 East Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Repair Front Steps](#)

Attachment: [COA Decision- 220 East Gaston.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 220 East Gaston Street 14-003871-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Amended Petition of Doug Bean Signs Inc. | 14-003982-COA | 109 MLK Jr. Blvd. | Staff Approved - Sign](#)

Attachment: [COA - 109 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard 14-003982-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 109 MLK Jr. Blvd 14-003982-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of John Post for Commonwealth Construction | 14-003912-COA | 401 East Hall Street | Staff Approved - Color Change and Awnings](#)

Attachment: [COA - 401 East Hall Street 14-003912-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 401 East Hall Street 14-003912-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Joshua Beckler for Coastal Canvas | 14-003916-COA | 204 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 204 W. Broughton St. 14-003916-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 204 West Broughton Street 14-003916-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Brian Robin for Robin Restoration, LLC | 14-004046-COA | 220 East Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Stucco Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 220 East Gaston Street 14-004046-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 220 East Gaston Street 14-004046-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Derek Adams | 14-004078-COA | 23 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 23 West Broughton Street 14-004078-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 23 West Broughton Street 14-004078-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Demetrice Rooks | 14-004087-COA | 512 East Hall Street | Staff Approved - Window Replacement](#)

Attachment: [COA - 512 East Hall Street 14-004087-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 512 East Hall Street 14-004087-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Brian Robin for Robin Restoration, LLC | 14-004044-COA | 24 West Gaston Street | Staff Approved - Stucco Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 24 West Gaston Street 14-004044-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 24 West Gaston Street 14-004044-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of James Beckler for Coastal Canvas | 14-004110-COA | 127 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 127 East Broughton Street 14-004110-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 127 East Broughton Street 14-004110-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Gavin Macrae-Gibson | 14-004231-COA | 31 East Jones Street | Staff Approved - Rehabilitation and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 31 East Jones Street 14-004231-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 31 East Jones Street 14-004231-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of James F. Reardon | 14-004258-COA | 125 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard | Window](#)

Attachment: [COA - 125 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard 14-004258-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 125 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard 14-004258-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Bart Redmond | 14-004262-COA | 105 Whitaker Street | Staff Approved - Repoint](#)

Attachment: [COA - 105 Whitaker Street 14-004262-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 105 Whitaker Street 14-004262-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Josh Bull for Greenline Architecture | 14-004264-COA | 10 East Taylor Street | Staff](#)

Approved - Color Change

Attachment: [COA - 10 East Taylor Street 14-004264-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 10 East Taylor Street 14-004364-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. Petition of Joshua Beckler for Coastal Canvas | 14-004286-COA | 115 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Awnings

Attachment: [COA - 115 East Bay Street 14-004286-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 115 East Bay Street 14-004286-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 14-004305-COA | 217 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard

Attachment: [COA - 217 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard 14-004305-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 217 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard 14-004305-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. Petition of Timothy and Debra Arnold | 14-004320-COA | 211 West Hall Street | Staff Approved - Color Change

Attachment: [COA - 211 West Hall Street 14-004320-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 211 West Hall Street 14-004320-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. Amended Petition of Jennifer Deacon for Dawson Architects | 14-004331-COA | 548 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved -

Attachment: [COA - 548 East Broughton Street 14-004331-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 548 East Broughton Street 14-004331-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. Petition of Brian T. Keyes | 14-004370-COA | 119 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Awnings

Attachment: [COA - 119 Bull Street 14-004370-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 119 Bull Street 14-004370-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. Petition of Ashley Kubista | 14-004371-COA | 413 Whitaker Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Change

Attachment: [COA - 413 Whitaker Street 14-004371-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 413 Whitaker Street 14-004371-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. [Petition of Don Ferguson for News Place Master Condominium Association, Inc. |5 Whitaker Street | Staff Approved - Exterior Light Fixtures](#)

Attachment: [COA - 5 Whitaker Street 14-004375-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 5 Whitaker Street 14-004375-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 9-10-14.pdf](#)

Mr. Howington said the staff has given the Board a report of recent work performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA).

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Items Deferred to Staff 9-10-14.pdf](#)

Mr. Howington said the staff has given the Board a report on the items deferred to staff.

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

47. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, September 11, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

Mr. Howington stated that the next case distribution and Chair review meeting is scheduled for September 11, 2014 at 3:00 p.m., but because he has a conflict with this date, the meeting was moved to Friday, September 12, 2014 at 3:00 p.m.

48. [Next Meeting - Wednesday, October 8, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

49. [Vinyl Awnings Discussion](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Harris Vinyl Awnings 081314.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Preservation Brief 44 - The Use of Awnings on Historic Buildings Repair, Replacement, and New Design.pdf](#)

Attachment: [List of Awnings in Historic District.pdf](#)

Mr. Howington informed the Board that Ms. Harris emailed them the report that Mr. Glenn Wood of Coastal Canvas Products Company provided showing the locations where vinyl and fabric awnings are installed. He asked the Board to go to the various locations and look at the awnings. Mr. Howington said since Mr. Wood is not present today, this item will be back on the agenda for the October 8, 2014 meeting.

50. [Review Position Guest Editorial Letter](#)

Mr. Howington gave the following background information on the guest editorial letter. In the Board's July meeting they discussed and agreed that Dr. Henry would put together a list of talking points to take to the Mayor and Aldermen. He said that during the months of July and August Dr. Henry has done an extensive letter. In the Board's last discussion they mentioned that there were some concerns and/or discussion about the content and length of the letter. They all agreed to look at the letter and provide edits individually to Ms. Harris.

Mr. Howington said the Board agreed that they would review the letter at today's meeting and vote on whether the letter would be presented to the Savannah Morning News as an editorial. He believes that they all have reviewed the letter on their own time. He is aware that three comments were sent to Ms. Harris. The comments were sent by Ms. Scheer, Dr. Henry and Mr. Gunther. Mr. Howington said he spent a couple of hours on the letter and decided to withdraw from being a part of the letter.

Mr. Howington said he does not know whether they should 1) vote whether they want to write a letter; 2) whether they want to submit the letter as written, or 3) if the vote is not to submit the letter as written, then he guesses the next step would be to form a committee and write the letter.

Dr. Williams said he understood that Mr. Howington is saying that he will not sign the letter. He asked if the letter would be from a series of people on the Review Board.

Mr. Howington said he believes this could be a part of their discussion. He said he would not mind signing the letter if it was written by a committee. He does not wish to sign the letter as written as there are some things in the letter that he would never say or do. However, this is just him personally and has

nothing against the way the letter is written. Since there were only three Board members who commented on the letter, it was not as a full Board.

Mr. Engle said he commented on the letter three times. He reported that Ms. Simpson is in agreement with the letter.

Mr. Howington said that Ms. Simpson is not here; therefore, they do not have her vote. He said that he could step down and recuse himself from this discussion, but as written, he does not want to sign his name on the letter.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Howington if he would have a vote on the letter.

Mr. Howington explained that he does not vote on petitions unless he needs to break a tie vote. However, if a letter is involved he will vote on the letter.

Mr. Engle said the only way to do the letter would be to put the Board members signatures on the letter. If Mr. Howington is not on the letter, then he would not be endorsing the letter. He said if a committee is formed, they will have the same situation. Some of the Board members will feel that the letter is not strong enough and will not sign for that reason. He said that last week the Review Board was overturned by ZBA again.

Dr. Henry said his opinion is that the Review Board has functioned as a committee and as a whole. He ensured that every Board member received the letter. They are never going to agree entirely on the issue, but he tried to come close and keep everything in mind.

Mr. Howington expounded that it is not just the tone of the letter and for him personally there are things in the letter that he would not say, but one of his biggest concerns with this letter is he thinks they can have a strong tone for the letter, but work at an educational level. He believes that by the time the person gets through three or four pages of the letter, they will not really pay attention.

Dr. Williams asked if the letter would be signed as the Savannah Historic Board of Review or will it be signed by the individual Board members. He believes that if there are any public concerns, questions about the letter or comments, that it is the Chair's responsibility to comment on those questions. If the Chair is not on board with the letter as written, how can he effectively respond to questions or concerns?

Mr. Howington stated that he believes the answer to Dr. Williams's question would be that it could be signed by the individual Board members and not say that the letter is from the Historic District Board of Review, but say that it is from members of the Board of Review.

Dr. Williams said if the letter is signed that way, he does not believe that it will hold any weight.

Dr. Henry said he felt driven to write the letter as shown.

Mr. Howington said he is not against writing a letter, but against writing a letter that he feels is not a committee letter. They have a 12 page letter that they are being asked to vote on. He does not feel that it is fair to the other Board members. Mr. Engle sent his personal letter to the Editor.

Ms. Scheer said she is totally in support of writing a letter to the Editor. She does not want to reinvent the wheel, but maybe this is what they need. She said what the letter is missing is what this Board does positive. For example, she said look at Broughton Street's monstrosity that they presented to the Board last month. But, now they have a huge improvement because of the Review Board's comments. This is because of the cooperation between us and them. How much power in what it created! What it could have been and what it really will stand to be now. Maybe they should show what they do and not here is what they do against us. This Board needs to show what we doing and show what the others undo with what the Review Board is doing in a positive light. She believes if the Board does it right, people will read it as a slapping of hands.

Mr. Engle said unfortunately they are very effective on working on local homeowners, but when it comes to big issues such as the seven local hotels, they have been overruled on every one of them. He said that the ZBA is exerting authority that they do not have.

Mr. Carey stated that it is important for the Historic District Board of Review to get a letter in to the Savannah Morning News. The letter needs to come from the total Board. The editorial letter needs to achieve something. The Board needs to plan its strategy and defend its turf. He encouraged the Board to go forward with the letter.

Dr. Henry said he understood Mr. Carey to say that there needs to be full Board agreement.

A committee was appointed to draft the editorial letter and then bring the letter to the Board. The committee members are: **Dr. Henry, Dr. Williams, Mr. Gunther, Mr. Howington, and Ms. Scheer.** They will meet on September 19, 2014 at 4:00 p.m. in the Jerry Surrency Room.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

51. [Adjourned.](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, Chair Howington adjourned the meeting at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen Harris
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem