



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
December 19, 2014 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

DECEMBER 19, 2014 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW SPECIAL CALLED MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Keith Howington, Chair
Ebony Simpson, Vice-Chair
Debra Caldwell
Justin Gunther
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Stephen Merriman, Jr.
Tess Scheer

HDRB Members Not Present: Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian
Marjorie Weibe-Reed
Robin Williams, Ph.D

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

1. Petition of Christian Sottile for Sottile & Sottile | 14-004597-COA | 200-500 West River Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details

Attachment: [KesslerHDBRPartII_00 Introduction.pdf](#)
Attachment: [KesslerHDBRPartII_01 RedevelopmentMasterPlan.pdf](#)
Attachment: [KesslerHDBRPartII_02 PowerPlant.pdf](#)
Attachment: [KesslerHDBRPartII_03 WestHotel.pdf](#)
Attachment: [KesslerHDBRPartII_04 EastHotel.pdf](#)
Attachment: [KesslerHDBRPartII_05 AccessoryStructures.pdf](#)
Attachment: [KesslerHDBRPartII_06 ArchitecturalModel.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Window Door Specifications.pdf](#)
Attachment: [PartI_PowerPlant04.pdf](#)
Attachment: [PartI_WestHotel05.pdf](#)
Attachment: [PartI_EastHotel06.pdf](#)
Attachment: [PartI_AccessoryStructures07.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Recommendation 14-004597-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Supplemental Information.pdf](#)

Dr. Henry disclosed that he met one-on-one with Mr. Sottile not on any particular project. He does not believe that this is a problem, but if it is the Board's desire that he recuse himself, he will do so.

It was the consensus of the Board that Dr. Henry did not need to recuse from participating in this petition.

Mr. Christian Sottile was present on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Howington laid out the ground rules for hearing this project. After the staff gives their report, he would like to go through each building separately. He will limit the presentations and the public comments to ten minutes for each building. His concern is that one Board member has to leave at 5:00 p.m. and he does not want to lose the quorum.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. Part I of this project was heard by the Review Board on October 8, 2014. At that meeting the Board approved the demolition of a small noncontributing building on the site and approved Part I: Height and Mass of the West Hotel, the East Hotel and the ancillary structures and recommended approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a number of variances. The variances are outlined in the staff report. The variances that the Board recommended have been before the ZBA and they granted approval for all the recommended variances. The petitioner is requesting approval for the Part II: Design Details for a new building to the west of the GA Power Plant site; rehabilitation of the Power Plant; Part II: Design Details for a new building to the east of the power plant; and Part II – Design Details for the multiple ancillary structures along the River Walk.

Ms. Harris said that she will start with the West Hotel and give the staff's recommendations. Then her report will move eastward to cover the project.

West Hotel/Park Deck

Ms. Harris stated the petitioner has revised the West Hotel/Parking Deck as follows:

- Though not visible, the project proposes four stories underground, whereas previously two underground stories were proposed;
- The south elevation, river Street, elevation has been revised to include a four foot deep storefront display area at the eastern bay;
- Also on the south elevation, five three foot by four foot windows with "crimped fire shutters" have been added to the center of each bay;
- On the west elevation, additional detailing has been provided included stucco header and sills and a projecting stucco base;
- Additional details have been provided for the north, River Walk, elevation;
- On the East, MLK elevation, the entrance opening to the valet parking has been reduced from 21' four inches to 16' eight inches wide; and
- Proposed materials include Cherokee Oxford brick with buff mortar, cast concrete with a natural finish, canvas in 'alloy vapor,' crimped metal panels in natural metal, and various shades of gray for the painted metal and stucco.

Ms. Harris said the staff's report recommended to continue the request for Part II Design Details of the West Hotel/Parking Garage in order for the petitioner to provide additional information. However, an attachment was added to the Board's agenda this morning entitled "Supplemental Information" showing that the petitioner has provided the additional information that staff has requested.

Ms. Harris said that the staff report outlines a number of variances that the initial proposal would have required, but they are not negated through the supplemental information that the petitioner has provided. Consequently, the Board can ignore the variance criteria section of the staff's report. No variances are requested for the West Hotel.

Ms. Harris reported that the staff's only remaining concern on this part of the project is the West River Street elevation. As the Board will recall, one of the conditions of Part I approval was to look at this elevation, particularly at the corner and restudy it to see if there was a better way to address the street along River Street. The petitioner has reduced the width of the garage opening and added the storefront, but staff does not feel that it is sufficient as it still maintains 181 linear feet along the river of inactive pedestrian dead space.

PETITIONER COMMENTS (West Hotel/Parking Deck)

Mr. Christian Sottile, Civic Design Architect for the Project, came forward and said that he was present to represent their team, Mr. Anthony Cissell, Clarence Vinson, John Campo; and they are working with Thomas and Hutton on this project. He stated that Mr. Richard Kessler is also accompanying the team today. Mr. Sottile thanked the Review Board for their time in coming together to hear their petition. He thanked the staff for their excellent work on the project.

Mr. Sottile said he will start his presentation by going back through the West Hotel, but first he wanted Mr. Kessler to come forth and briefly make some remarks.

Mr. Kessler wished everyone a Merry Christmas. He realizes that everybody has a busy schedule. Mr. Kessler thanked the Board for having this Special Called Meeting to help them remain focused and keep a momentum on the project. They are working diligently every day. They have three architectural firms, and engineers pushing forward to get all the work done so that they can remain on schedule. They are working hard to continue refine every little aspect of the project; particularly, the operation of things inside the buildings. Mr. Kessler said they have really created some very exciting venues inside. He is pleased to say that everything is coming together and every day it appears that they are discovering a little more opportunities to make it a little better.

Mr. Sottile said he will give a quick overview in their time limit on just the West Deck. He said as the Board is aware from the submittal package, the project includes the four components, three buildings and the ancillary structures.

Mr. Sottile said he appreciates the fact that they looked at the project as a whole as they went through Part I: Height and Mass. He thanked the Board for their patience in getting to know the project outside and inside.

Mr. Howington told Mr. Sottile that he knew he was expecting to go through the entire project again today; and, therefore, will allow him a couple extra minutes on the first part in order for him to get oriented. But, he does not want the Board to lose its quorum.

Mr. Sottile stated that as Ms. Harris said, he will go from west to east. The west deck holds down the corner of the project. It is really the industrial cousin to the power plant. Going beyond Part I: Height and Mass and really getting into the details, how it is detailed and why it is detailed is what he will focus on for Part II. They are looking at new standards, material standards and so forth as they get into this part of the ordinance. The updated plans have been provided and staff has touched on that. They did look at the River Street elevation in detail and addressing the Board comments. He will talk on this aspect when he talks about the elevation.

Mr. Sottile explained that they have updated the overall elevations in the package, the Part I elevations, with changes, and this is really structural in terms of how the submittal has been brought forward. They provide enlargements area by area to drive the core details. With this particular, the philosophy behind the details is really rooted in modern industrial vernacular. Therefore, they see it as a cousin to the Power Plant separated by 100 years. The details have a scale and a character to them that are durable and long lasting. They are not fussy, but they also provide a human scale.

Mr. Sottile said they have the four elevations and they began discussing the typical bay detail at the Part I review. But, now they have zoomed in to look at the character of storefront, canopies, details, and offsets in the brick work. The façade actually achieves 48 inches of reveal from the outer surface of the structure to the glazing. Therefore, everything has been turned up in scale to read from a great distance. It has been a real pleasure for their team to work through those details and bring them forward getting into the specifics on the balconies, canopies, and the main entryways into the structure. This is a primary riverfront entry where the building has a chamfer that allows access to some of the events space at the main level.

Mr. Sottile stated that turning the corner, they particularly worked to look at the first bay and a half as you turn the corner at Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, the first 45 feet of the building. He said looking at this area, they moved to the western side of West River

Street. As they discussed in the Part I submittal, is definitely a service oriented portion of this context. The façade of the building that was dedicated to providing service for the entire project. They must remember that this is the role of this particular building; it serves in a way as the engine for the whole development, providing centralized mechanical services, drop-off and loading entrance to the deck and so forth. He said that he really wanted to present this in a honest and authentic and way. They talked about this in Part I and they have now gone through the details of that façade.

Mr. Sottile said in taking in all the other conditions that the building presents based around that core rhythm of a concrete frame, cast stone concrete frame, with brick infill and then looking at each of the unique conditions with that. He said in blowing up the details and scales of some of the other elements such as the steel framing that will have an industrial character, there is a little bit of an edge to it; there is a little more refined; it is meant to be elegant. This is a building for people and is not just an industrial relic. They have provided the materials and samples physically as well as in the board's package. Mr. Sottile said he had some specific information that they prepared relative to the staff's comments. He said he will discuss this now or ask any questions the Board as up to this point.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Sottile to clarify the balcony dividers.

Mr. Sottile explained that on the sixth level of the West Hotel Deck the parapet wall is tall enough to be the guard. It is 42 inches in height. The detailing philosophy for them is a little lighter in nature. They have a canvas stretched around a crisp metal frame that will help add a little softness where everything is a hard surface material.

Ms. Caldwell asked if it is opaque or is it a sunbrella type.

Mr. Sottile answered that it is a sunbrella product. It is a weatherproof UV proof product and it is more of a canvas awning. He showed the Board the detailing of this project.

Ms. Simpson asked if the material of the sixth floor is glass.

Mr. Sottile explained that the sixth floor is setback nine feet seven inches from the parapet wall. The dividers actually sit inboard behind the parapet wall.

Mr. Sottile in addressing staff's comment about the corner, he said they returned to the direction from the Board's decision during Part I Height and Mass review particularly asked them to restudy the corner at MLK and River Street to better address those streets. With that focus in mind and further refining the corner, they took the idea of the two book ends, framing the view of MLK and focused on the details of that. The elements that they added to it is a storefront condition. They reconfigured the ramps inside the building to allow not just a storefront, but a four foot deep area behind it that can be part of a display and an exhibit area. They had also done a lot of brick detailing. They brought a water table detail here and have created a reserve area for a bronze plaque. There has been some discussion about marking this section of the city and have something here that could be more interpretive. Therefore, they have reserved a space for that.

Mr. Sottile said turning corner to the MLK right-of-way frontage, they have taken the width of the opening and have significantly narrowed the aperture down to the minimum that would be practical there and bringing in brick detailing and also bringing in truss work and other architectural elements to add more human scale and articulate detailing. Therefore, they felt the directive to restudy the corner was good and they left Part I with

this commitment. They worked hard to work with the parts of the building that were merely impossible to move as they have discussed that it is a building that is accommodating a large parking structure and knowing that they have a limited section of West River Street to designate as their service façade. They have no lane and they have reviewed this façade to relieve the rest of the entire project. With this in mind, they looked at how to make this corner better.

Mr. Gunther asked Mr. Sottile to discuss the three metal shuttered windows. Is this a new addition?

Mr. Sottile answered that they are new. He explained that in the earlier design, they had some place holders in the larger cast concrete surface designed on River Street. They have further detailed these as small accent windows within the façade to provide a rhythm to the composition. They are diminutive and they would actually provide some light into the deck of one of the upper levels. They are incorporated in two areas. One is on this façade and the other is on the party wall façade. They are designed as a compositional feature and have a traditional metal clad fire shutter which the staff has provided the information.

Mr. Gunther asked if the decision was to add articulation for the façade or are they serving a purpose for the interior.

Mr. Sottile said they felt in total the idea of a large surface that has a deliberate large articulation, a large addition of an element could be successful. They appreciate the Board's willingness to look at the West River Street façade as something that will not meet the ordinance strictly and they will recognize its authenticity, detailing as a higher good. In going forward with this, they looked at a lot of different precedences and ways in which they think they can get the façade to just the right amount detail. They felt that these compositionally would add a lot to that façade. They conducted numerous studies of the overall. This is an example of fire tower addition that has those smaller windows, but they can liven a surface and provide a sense of scale reference. The accent windows are a part of helping measure the bay rhythm on the façade when you look at it from a great distance. Mr. Sottile said they believe they are appropriate and add a level of distinction to this surface.

Mr. Howington asked if there was a way that they could get more storefront on River Street. He appreciates how the corner and the brick lattice, but he believes at the last discussion, they talked about some more of those bays might be used as a part of the interaction of the street. He realizes that it is tight here with the parking garage and the brick work here; he knows of the concern with the exhaust and so forth going up the ramp, but he likes the idea of the interactive display window such as at the Telfair where they could at least have a display on the south façade.

Mr. Sottile stated that in the final view of this, there are two access points to the deck. In part, they want to ensure that the main level to the building is as active as possible. Although the building will accommodate more than 400 parking spaces, the predominate square foot of the ground floor is actually active programming. To do this, they need to provide two systems of ramps, one to get down below and one to go up above so that the main level does remain an active level of the building. He explained that the entry ramps begin at both ends and there is no way geometrically to get them to possible come any closer than they are now. They also have three service loading bays here. In doing this, they were able to put the ramp in the area that they felt was most sensitive. But, they were not

able to go beyond that. What they have done on that façade is to incorporate a series of brick fins as a detailing element. This is something that they learned from the old power plant as some of old cooling fans inside the building are wonderful architectural feature of that structure. They have reinterpreted that along the West River Street façade to add a sense of scale, character and durability. They also looked at the sidewalk and brought in street trees and other elements to support a more pedestrian environment, but remembering that this is somewhat the end of the world. Mr. Sottile said they look at West River Street is a back of house condition west of MLK. So, they have taken this and feel that they have presented a solid response to that condition; certainly, more articulate than some of the other back of house loading docks that are here now. They believe that this sends the right message to someone coming to MLK that the line of desires is to continue to the river or continue right towards the east of the project.

Mr. Sottile explained that on the main floor plan, they have the main lobby to the hotel that is above as well as a 500 seat music venue; three ballroom banquet rooms; a pre-function area at the interior and exterior terrace that opens up to the river wall. Consequently, the main level is working as hard as possible considering the fact that they needed the service functions.

Ms. Caldwell stated that she was assuming that all the metal that is being used on the exterior will age.

Mr. Sottile said that most of the metals that they will use will be painted with the exception of the crimp metal on the sixth floor, which will be a natural finished metal that is designed to age over time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Bill Stuebe of the Downtown Neighborhood Association (DNA) said that he wanted to address the quality of life issues. The first is to endorse the staff's recommendation on page 10 to reduce the linear feet along River Street as inactive and pedestrian dead space. He believes they should really look at increasing the storefront display areas on the River Street façade. The addition of similar display windows at the suggestion of the Historic District Board of Review such as on the Barnard Street façade at the Jepson Center, really brought this stretch of Barnard Street alive to the benefit of the public and the museum as they use the storefronts to display what is going on inside the museum. Mr. Stuebe said he believes that if they took six inches from the areas that were just discussed and incorporate it in the depth of the wall, there will probably be 30 inches and this is all that is needed. This is really not a huge amount to talk about. He also wanted to suggest that this maybe the end of River Street today, but in the future there is bound to be development further west on River Street. Therefore, this will become an active pedestrian passageway from MLK. He does not believe that it is a dead end. A similar window was used on the Cay building on the north façade at the corner of Whitaker. Therefore, it works.

Mr. Stuebe stated that he wanted some thought to be considered to the entrance that serves both the West Hotel and the Power Plant Hotel concerning the turning radius here in the cul de sac. Is there is enough room here to maneuver and not back onto MLK when there is a lot of activity going on at the hotel? If this does not work, then the vehicle entrance to the hotel should be on River Street.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said that Mr.

Sottile tried to meet with the HSF's Architecture Review Committee, but was unable to. However, they did get a copy of the submittal book which was helpful to them in their review of this project. Ms. Meunier said she believed that a lot of things have already been covered, particularly, with the submittal information that the Review Board has been given. They are delighted with some of the applicant's changes and improvements that have been made; especially the changes on the River Street façade as they did have some concerns during this. One of their questions were going to be the concrete and scoring pattern and some more clarification on the scoring lines. But, their concerns have been answered.

Ms. Meunier said they do have a concern regarding the brick fin lattice infill on the panels on the ground floor. She said because of how it is represented in two dimensions, they believe they know what this is; however, they are asking for more explanation on what it would look like. Ms. Meunier said their final question is regarding the privacy screenings and the canvas which Mr. Sottile said would not be visible, but from what they can tell, it might be visible on the East Hotel.

Mr. Sottile explained that the brick fin details full length, double width brick. It is an eight inch brick fin and 18 inch depth. The brick fin extends above a sill and comes up under the header of the concrete frame above it. The idea is that it operates as a way of measuring space as you walk down the sidewalk and it creates a receding detail. It is somewhat a nonconventional detail. As he mentioned earlier, they do not have photos of the inside of the Power Plant, but the electric distribution rooms have the cooling fins, essentially heat sink that as inspired anybody who walked into this part of the power plant. They are an amazingly beautiful detail. As they focused on developing a screen in front of the deck and in front of the ramp, the way they could share some of what they learned from the old building. It had a different scale on the exterior surface. This is the thinking behind those fins. He wanted to note also that as they see in the façade, there are a few orders here of a larger concrete frame and everything below that frame is addressed differently. Consequently, they have the entranceway to the parking deck; they have rollup doors that screen the drop-off and loading area; and then they have the heat sinks (the fins) that fall below it. Therefore, compositionally, there is a reason for that. They think about the comment they heard concerning whether additional storefront would make this façade better. Mr. Sottile said he wanted to suggest to the Board that he does not believe that it would make it better. If you look at it all in context, there is a logic to the larger façade that is at work here. He explained that where you have an element of the building that is intentionally turned and is detailed away that is sympathetic with every other detail on the primary base of the building on River Walk and MLK and then when they move to the section of the building that accomplishes the screening of the parking structure, they move to a different scale, different rhythm and a different type of detail. Actually, structurally, the building has to step up in this area. Therefore, they went to that line and felt that it was the place for them to change the way the façade reveals itself. So, by continuing that storefront down the façade he does not believe that it would make this a better building. This is their reason for concentrating on helping the pedestrian understand that transition.

Mr. Howington asked if there is a reason they did not step up on the other end. Now, they have a sort of corner book end, it has been replicated on the west end, and also a part of the larger expanse turns the corner.

Mr. Sottile explained that the expression line remains high; this is the function that the parking structure picks up. He reminded the Board that in their plan they essentially have a parking structure that has a line around it and the floor height of both elements are not the

same. Therefore, they worked honestly to reveal this on the exterior in a way that is visually pleasing. Mr. Sottile said that this corner is not a book end, it is in line with River Street; it is on a party wall line; but this piece really is a corner. The idea is that the brick provides a visual base to the larger composition of the concrete surface above, then where the frames pick up for the areas of the buildings that fold around the MLK right-of-way and around the River Walk, they pick up at the line and the canopies put up all the other details. Mr. Sottile said they were thinking about what was below it. This corner element actually has a section that has no ramps in the area, but here they are concealing the diagonal ramps. In this section they actually have openings into the building so that natural light can come into the parking levels. It is brick on three sides and is a lighter version of the main bay design where they have bricks and glass.

Mr. Howington explained to the Board so they will understand the fins that Mr. Sottile is talking about, he explained that basically there is a vertical line of brick; an several openings in brick. The end caps follow the detailing protocols of the main bays where they have brick cheek walls with the water table details that step out. But, in this case, the water table becomes a sill and then the brick fins rise between the sill and the underside of the header of the concrete frame.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Sottile to address the turning radius.

Mr. Sottile said the turning radius is a site plan review issue. However, they have been working closely with Thomas and Hutton Engineering and City agencies. In fact, the area is ample for a turning radius. It is a 90 foot wide space between the buildings.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry said he was pleased to see that the petitioner has followed many of the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Merriman stated that he wanted to review the recommendations to be sure he fully understands them. He asked that the little shutters on the small windows that the Board would have to approve this as a part of their motion. As they are, they do not fit into the ordinance, but the Board is allowed to approve other material. Merriman said he believes the shutters are fine and they look good. They will be high up. Mr. Merriman said he believes the petitioner has met all the other conditions.

Mr. Howington stated that he believes the only concern is the River Street façade window opening. He said this was why he asked Mr. Sottile to discuss the brick fin. He asked the Board if they had any discussion on the brick fins or the interaction of River Street.

Ms. Simpson said she believed originally that the façade did not have any windows and the Board asked the petitioner to restudy this for possibly adding windows on the upper story.

Mr. Howington answered that the Board did not necessarily ask the petitioner to add windows as they liked it as it was. The windows are detailed and perhaps enhances it. They asked the petitioner to restudy the ground floor and the corner of MLK and River Street elevation. Mr. Sottile has explained his proposal in this manner and, therefore, he believes this has been addressed insofar as being restudied.

Ms. Simpson said she likes the scoring, but she likes it without the windows because of the addition of the detailing.

Mr. Sottile said they included details in that location during the Height and Mass submittal. They had not been developed, but there was recesses that were anticipating detailing that they were developing.

Mr. Howington explained that the fact that windows were added and the petitioner is proposing windows now, the Board is not proposing that they be changed. They have the petitioner's proposal and whether they like it with or without, the Board cannot change the design.

Mr. Gunther said he believes the addition of the storefront is a significant nod to the intersection. He likes the play of the fins as it is a nice detail.

Mr. Merriman moved for approval of the West Hotel/Parking Garage Part II as submitted with approving the metal shutters.

Ms. Caldwell seconded the motion. The motion carried with five for and one against.

Rehabilitation of the Power Plant

Ms. Harris explained that the Board reviewed this petition at the meeting of October 8, 2014 for comments only. This is a rehabilitation and is not divided within Parts I and II, but the petitioner wanted this to be a part of the overall conversation. There was never a formal motion made about the overall rehabilitation, although the windows were discussed.

Therefore, this is just a straightforward rehabilitation project. Ms. Harris said that the only variance that was associated with this is the Board recommended to the Zoning Board of Appeals related to the location of the three transformers on the River Street façade. They are supposed to be located on secondary rear facades and minimally visible. This has been subsequently granted.

Ms. Harris reported that the petitioner has revised the **Rehabilitation of the Power Plant** from the previous presentation as follows:

- On the west it was originally proposed that an existing window would become a door, but it has gone back to a window in the supplemental information.
- The following is an item that was discussed a lot in the context of the Secretary of Interior's Standards. This project is seeking tax credits. In the previous submission a different window configuration was proposed. A Board member raised a question about looking at schematics a larger window was proposed. An opinion was expressed at the last meeting that larger windows would be preferred. This is the first time that the Board has formally seen them in the elevation.
- The existing materials will be repaired and preserved. The new materials include channel glass, corrugated panels and stucco.

Ms. Harris explained that the staff's main concern is with the change in the window openings on the River Street façade meeting the Secretary of Interior's Standards in term of their size. The buildings evolve and they must be adapted to the new uses, but the new openings and alterations to historic material should be done as minimal as possible to accommodate the new use. Staff feels that the Secretary's standards with the larger openings is detrimental by taking out too much of the historic materials.

Ms. Harris stated that staff had a concern originally about a window change to a door

alteration on the west façade; but in the supplemental information, the petitioner has gone back to window façade. Consequently, this has been addressed.

Ms. Harris said a canopy is proposed for the main entrance off of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. The staff is concerned about the canopy because it is 22 feet in depth and the building is 53 feet tall to the cornice line. Therefore, it seems that it will alter this corner substantially and it seems out of scale. Staff is recommending that it be reduced. In the supplemental information they can see a little more on the details as to how this works. The petitioner has provided a statement that this is the drop off area. Therefore, cars coming in will have a covered area.

Ms. Harris said staff had a question in the initial staff report about the fixed windows being indicated in some of the window openings. However, the petitioner has provided information indicating that there are existing fixed windows on the historic building. Ms. Harris said [pointing to an area] that as the Board sees there are fixed and operable windows. Therefore, to use the fixed windows, she believes requires a variance, but given that there are existing fixed windows on the building, she believes that the variance would be justified. There are multiple additions on the rooftop with varying degrees of visibility. They do not obscure character defining features and are reversible.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the rehabilitation with their only concern being to restudy the River Street façade to maintain the minimal openings necessary to reduce the lost of historic fabric on that façade and reduce the depth of the proposed canopy on the west Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard façade. The other items have been addressed. Staff is requesting that a mortar analysis of four foot by four foot repointing test patch be reviewed and approved by staff. The petitioner has agreed to this.

Mr. Merriman said he was somewhat curious that on the River Street façade staff is recommending that there be a minimal removal of materials. He said regardless of how much material is moved, there will still be a removal of historic fabric. How is this in compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for rehabilitation?

Ms. Harris explained that the Secretary of Interior's Standard does allow for alterations to take place. It does not freeze a building in time forever. But, the scale of the alteration is what the Board would be considering for compliance. Is it the minimum necessary? Is the use compatible with the structure? In compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards, you would have to show that you are adapting a building for a new use and not for restoration which would be keeping everything the same. It does allow for buildings to evolve, but there are some grey areas.

Mr. Howington said he believes the key word is "minimum."

Ms. Scheer asked how is it determined what is minimum.

Ms. Harris answered that she believes it is on a case-by-case basis. For example, the most minimum thing would be to remove one brick, but that does not allow for the building to be used as a hotel. It has to go beyond that; and it is on a case-by-case basis. There is no absolute, firm way. There is a formula that must be applied which is your best judgment.

PETITIONER COMMENTS (Rehabilitation of the Power Plant)

Mr. Sottile thanked the Board for taking the time during the Part I process to review this building. He said that the updated plans and elevations are a part of the package now for the full review. He said he believed they have been able to work through a lot of the items that staff raised in the last few days. Mr. Sottile said he wanted to focus on the windows which they discussed at a great length during the Part I review. He realizes that there are some more pieces to this and he will ask John Campo to address that later. However, they came out of the Part I review process with the Board's discussion leading them in a direction that came from a conceptual design that had a singular opening rather than multiple punched openings as a more consistent design philosophy for the building. Staff has been supportive in helping to ensure that the Board's directive was clear with reviewing the minutes and sharing information. In fact, they have a letter that they used with SHPO and others that the Historic District Board of Review express their preference and support for the opening configuration from the concept drawings for the south façade rather than the configuration that had been shown as a part of the informal review that was given in Part I. Mr. Sottile said they took this to heart and went back and studied the condition in more detail.

Mr. Sottile said he wanted to point out some of their thinking that went behind why they think that it is a good solution for the building and consistent with the other design approaches to this rehabilitation:

- a. Removal of brick to create an opening, a wall with no windows. But it does it one time in each bay rather than four times.
- b. It is done with a steel sleeve and they have provided some close-up details of that. Therefore, it is some what a liner. As the brick is removed, a clean line is put back which makes it easily distinguishable. The temporary fabric is from a historic surface beyond. He does not believe that the element are removing is a highly character defining element. It is simply running bond brick. If it was to ever be replaced or reversed, it would be one of the most easiest reversible thing that could be done.
- c. In keeping with the spirit of the original architecture, they really fine tuned the design of the windows in their application. As the Board can see, it is a typical bay and they can see from the way the building creates an expressed pattern of piers and cording, they have designed the window to be a single opening within this, but it is actually the same proportion as the overall façade. It is clearly acknowledging and aware of the context that it is located in.
- d. In studying from the concept to this, they have reduced it size. They feel that now that is the smallest window opening appropriate to serve the interior uses of the new rehabilitation, leaving as much brick as possible. Their concept drawings considered including a balcony as a part of the detail, but they eliminated this in order to try to keep this as a simple clear and authentic evolution for the building. The bays currently have no windows.

Mr. Sottile said they are excited about the detail and believe that it has come a long way. They appreciate the conversation that came out of the former meeting that led them to proceed boldly and study this and to bring it back in this form. He said as the Board goes

through the detailing, they will see that the language of everything new has been added. For example, the canopies are done in a temporary mode, but done with industrial material. Therefore, there are toe-out steel channel, steel brackets that have a delicate lace-like quality; channel glass as a modern material as there is a need for transparency and like to come in. This has been a challenging building to work with, but a very exciting challenge as they worked through it.

Mr. Sottile explained that the question about the canopy and the entry goes back to really trying to come up with the best solution to reinstate the primary entry to the building. In their Part I submittal, they shared with the Board the information about the challenge and the fact that this entry has constantly been set for 100 years as the right-of-way and the slope down the river has grown around it. Therefore, their solution for the façade is to create a reveal around the main door that allows a site line to the whole doorway. Presently, it is somewhat in a hole. It is the primary entry of the structure. The philosophy is to reveal the architecture of the building as it was originally designed. In doing so, they have created a lower level to that entry that is flush with the history floor of the Power Plant and the upper level is the natural grade of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard as it goes down towards the river. Consequently, they believe that this solution is the right one, but as they thought about the practical needs of creating some cover and canopy, they thought about designing the canopy as they have presented it to the Board. Mr. Sottile said in addition, providing ADA access to this entry was a huge challenge without putting in separate ramps and rails. Therefore, a part of the lower entry allows them to move down to the lower level and come back to the entry.

Mr. Sottile showed the Board the detail section describing the condition. He said by having the reveal providing the required movement and ADA access, if they removed it somewhat a way from the building, in providing a canopy it would provide just a minimum amount of coverage to the guests coming to the building. They arrived at the 22 foot dimension as the best dimension for this. They coordinated it carefully back to the architecture. Therefore, as the Board can see, instead of the canopy coming out as a square-edge canopy, it actually has a rounded-edge echo; the line of the stair below provides just a little bit of coverage. It provides for vehicles in that location to drop-off. When they look at it in elevation, they will see that from a design standpoint, their thinking here is that its height does have a planned and elevation relationship; but it relates to the arches above. Mr. Sottile said, therefore, they are clearly adding something to the building, but they are doing it with sensitivity to the geometry of the overall structure. He believes that the rounded-edges, the height, and the width of the windows help them to do this.

Mr. John Campo of Campo Architects stated that the standards are subjective. There are some things that are presented in this project, such as the window openings on River Street that have to go through three levels of authorities jurisdiction. But the answer is, on the river side of the Power Plant, new windows are being installed in the place of louvers. Therefore, this is a great example of understanding that the building is a rehabilitation and instead of a restoration where you would restore the louvers, it recognizes that there are guest rooms there. They already have an agreement at this level and at the state level [they expect it also at the federal level] for that particular part of the building. Mr. Campo said he only brings this up because it is a great example of the subjective nature of the standards for rehabilitation. More than likely, they will have other iterations of the windows of River Street and they will come back with that. He said he agrees with Mr. Sottile that

when they look at the elevations and the simplicity of the windows and removing the balconies, he believes that it brings a lot of clarity and the proportions are correct.

Mr. Campo said, therefore, their job is to ensure that they get an alignment with the other authorities having jurisdiction on this issue. He entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Gunther asked Mr. Campo if their windows have been submitted to SHPO.

Mr. Campo answered that they have had three meetings in Atlanta with SHPO and they are being updated as they go. He explained that they are incorporating everyone's criteria that are being incorporated into the design. SHPO is aware of it and they are aware that there are options that are being discussed. Mr. Campo said that SHPO is in support of the windows. They have seen the ones that are presented today and an alternative that he believes were two-over-two. There has not been a formal submission. What they are trying to achieve is a buy-in so that when they make the formal submission that it is approved with minimal conditions.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Campo for clarification that SHPO has not given its official supportiveness, but that they seem to be supportive.

Mr. Campo answered yes.

Mr. Gunther said a similar situation is occurring on the corrugated section of the Power Plant where some of the corrugated material is being removed and replacing it with channel glass. He said he was curious as to how SHPO is reviewing this.

Mr. Campo said this falls outside the period of significance which means that it is eligible for the tax credits. They are more liberal on buildings that fall outside of the period of significance.

Mr. Gunther asked Mr. Campo what he means by the "period of significance." Is the building a different period than the other part of the Power Plant?

Mr. Campo explained that the building is in a national registered historic district. Because of this, the Power Plant is eligible for tax credits. However, when you read the national register's district application, there is a period of significance that is determined. Therefore, it will have a beginning date and an ending date. The fact that the building is attached physically, makes it legible, but it actually falls outside of the period of significance. Therefore, they are less stringent on the requirement.

Mr. Merriman asked if this is the period of significance for the whole area where it is located.

Mr. Campo answered that it is not individual, but for the entire area.

Mr. Howington said for clarification, Mr. Campo is saying that it has not been submitted to SHPO formally, but has been discussed with them.

Mr. Campo stated that SHPO is in support of the windows on River Street. Their next step will be to go to Washington, DC to the Parks Service who may change the proportions. It

is still somewhat a fluent on the windows. However, SHPO is informally supportive of the windows.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that many of their questions have been covered. They have some questions about the viewing platforms on the north side. Ms. Meunier said they acknowledge the transparent guardrails, the glass guardrails, and find them minimally intrusive. They are mostly questioning what is the existing height of the windows. How much is changing there if the windows are being extended to doors. They feel this may be a little misleading because they are full lite doors and it may look like this was the original opening. They suggest a different approach to the doors and may be a different configuration that involves solid where they were brick before. May be they could be translucent glass or something to indicate that this was not the original opening size of those windows.

Ms. Meunier said the HSF's concern is that the full glass lite door may appear that it is the original size of the opening. This may be a little misleading; therefore, they were questioning if there is another way to treat the door other than including a solid door. May be some other translucent may be glass to show that this was not always the full size of that opening.

Ms. Meunier explained that they believe that the height of the guardrail is probably more so than what the difference would be. They thought may be the best way to do it would be the door. But, they are just posing this question. She said in this, they are looking at some rehabilitation of this building. There are some changes where the petitioner will put in new windows and are putting in steel frames. This indicates that it is a new opening; but in this case because it is an existing opening that is being extended, they are asking if there is some way to differentiate this. It is not the material that they have an issue with. They are shown as doors, but now they are existing as windows.

Ms. Simpson asked if the windows would be come doors.

Mr. Howington answered yes.

Ms. Meunier said the petitioner actually touched on this; but they agree with staff about the proportions of the canopy. They understand why it is projecting that far, but they think that the proportions based on the scale of the rest of the façade that you view the canopy when you are approaching from the north and south where you see a profile view. She said that the HSF had questions about how that would relate to the view sheds if you are approaching from the south and look north to the river, how this would impact. Also, because it projects over a little into the traffic area where the cars will be loading and unloading, they do not know if there will be limitations on the sizes of vehicles or coach busses that are allowed. It just needs to be considered that there is an extended awning that is coming further out. These are just some things that they thought about of why it may be also a good reason to reduce the depth of the canopy.

Mr. Howington invited Mr. Sottile to address the public comments if he so desired.

Mr. Sottile said in respect to the viewing platforms at the fifth level, it is a building element that they have spent a great deal of time thinking through. He believes a question was raised about what parts would be modified. He said that there are existing windows that are small in this location which presented a challenge to the interior use of the space. Mr. Sottile explained that their use to overcome this was to alter by extending down from the existing width that is there so that the façade of the existing windows remain intact; the historic header remains intact and they come down to the height of the corbel cornice that is here. Therefore, it does take what was a window and make it a door. Their intent of having the door to be full glass was precisely to try to overcome the small size of the opening that is here now without adding windows next to it. They felt that this was absolutely an important part of the original design. They are very small buttons over the accent windows over the big arches which they love. Mr. Sottile said they wanted to bring a contemporary solution to it. He believes that the transparency of that glass is important to try to overcome the challenge at the end of day as being a rather small opening for the room. He believes that the viewing platform is a part of the solution and also restores a sense of the original proportion of the window as the balcony and the glass guard will come up above that and where the modern elements have been introduced, they have a clear detailing language of protocol there where the steel liners, the sleeve, is actually built in to where the brick had to be removed below the window. Therefore, clarity is to it and there is not a false perception that this was a window and is now a door. This is an area that has been an intervention. Frankly, they believe that it is reversible if the time came that this would be desired. He pointed out that in the side view, they can see the balcony and where the sleeve picks up to accept the glass guard of the balcony. Thereby this finishes the transition of what was once a window is now the height of the door allowing more light to come into the interior space.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Sottile if the sleeve will only happen at the balcony height down.

Mr. Sottile answered yes so that when they look up into it, they will still see the sleeve as they did not do any changes to it. There was no need to bring the sleeve through it. You will still be able to see the size of the brick and the jack arch.

Mr. Howington asked if the sleeve as a motif all around the building represents where the new openings are punched.

Mr. Sottile answered yes. It is the narrative explaining what is new and what is old.

Mr. Gunther asked if this also provides instructional tie for the balcony that is steel sleeve.

Mr. Sottile answered that the balcony will be self supporting. The steel sleeve is here to cap the brick where it has been removed. It accepts the glass guard and gives it a place to plainly terminate on the façade.

Mr. Gunther asked if, since it is the intent of the steel sleeve where new introduction is occurring, if you drop the steel sleeve to just be at the location where the new opening is being made.

Mr. Sottile explained that they brought it flush with the glass guard. The final attachment

part for the glass guard can attach to the steel sleeve and not have to attach back into the brick and create an other condition there. He said he believes that he addressed the canopy before, but just to reiterate the real challenge of this entry is to move back from the front door far enough to provide ADA access; to provide a view shed and provide site lines to the water table and the large original entry door. Therefore, with all the considerations in mind, they arrived at the 22 foot canopy. He said they also recognize and this is something to note that they always see large canopies that are square at the edges which actually increases the visual bulk of that when you see it. It is like looking at the difference of a round column versus a square pilaster. Because of their site line, they were intentionally about creating a curve geometry to that canopy so that as you approach it, it does not project visually more than really absolutely necessary to function. He said he believes that it actually helps to diffuse some of the directionality of that façade which is cantered into MLK. They believe that this is an eloquent solution and they have worked to structurally make it as thin as possible so that it will have a clean feel; of course it relates to the elevation both below and above. They have looked hard at the conditions hard knowing that they have a lot of challenges in this particular area.

Mr. Howington asked what is the estimated depth of the canopy.

Mr. Sottile answered 12 inches. It is very thin and this is really the idea that it has a crisp clean line.

Mr. Campo stated that this a great example of negotiating with several stakeholders. The original canopy was more ornate. After meeting with SHPO, one of their comments was that they would like to see this more industrial. Therefore, this is a great example of working with all of the authorities having jurisdiction. This is how the profile has evolved into some that is very industrial and simple.

Ms. Simpson asked what is the color of the canopy.

Mr. Sottile answered that the canopy is a deep brown color; Sherwin Williams.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry said he has two main concerns. One is the windows on the south façade. At their retreat the Assistant City Attorney said the Board must follow the law. He believes if there are small windows, they are not following the law on this. Also, the canopy will be 22 feet deep and judging by the picture, it appears that it will occupy about a third of the front. This building is the jewel of the complex. The façade is the jewel of the building. To obscure the façade because you want to keep some people out of the room does not make a lot of sense to him.

Mr. Merriman asked if Dr. Henry is saying that the smaller windows somehow fit the ordinance better than the large windows. He said he does not believe that this is what the staff is telling the Board in their report.

Ms. Harris explained that her report recommends going to smaller windows to meet the Secretary of Interior's standards.

Ms. Merriman asked staff if they felt that keeping the smaller windows was more in keeping with the spirit of the standards. But, not necessarily because it has anything tied to the ordinance.

Ms. Harris answered that the Secretary of Interior's standards are apart of the ordinance.

Mr. Howington clarified that at the last meeting, the Board liked the larger windows better. Therefore, the petitioner has resolved this with coming back to them with larger windows. The submission has been submitted to the other authorities and they are told that they are informally in favor of them. However, it has to go through other processes. They do not know how this will turn out. He explained as far as the Secretary of Interior's Standards he believes that the idea is subjective and that there should be minimal disruption in the removal. There are other authorities involved. Therefore, the Review Board does not have the final word on this project.

Dr. Henry said the Review Board has the final recommendation.

Mr. Howington said that the Review Board has a recommendation. But, not the final recommendation.

Mr. Merriman said he likes the larger windows. He is basing this on compatibility; how the windows fit with the building and the area.

Mr. Gunther said the issue here is with blank inset panels which will historically obscure the action that was going on. This is the character defining feature that they would be interfering with. If they are going along with the standard of new additions to be clearly distinguishable from the old, he believes that what the petitioner is proposing certainly honors this. Mr. Gunther said he believes that if they went to smaller openings such as two-over-one, then they would be repeating the past and not honoring the present. He concurs with Mr. Merriman that the larger openings present a new addition and is more visually compatible with what is occurring on the rest of the building.

Mr. Howington said the larger windows represent what is new versus punching holes. If they were to mimic the ones that are on the west façade towards the east, the smaller openings could be conceived as original.

Dr. Henry said the windows would not need to be mimicked.

Mr. Howington said the windows could just be made smaller.

Ms. Simpson stated that she agrees with Mr. Merriman in terms of the larger windows being more visually pleasing; however, she agrees with Dr. Henry in terms of the ordinance. Although, it is subjective, it does say minimally change. She does not believe that the smaller holes are visually pleasing. Ms. Simpson said the Review Board still has to make the decision even if it is changed by the other authorities. All the Review Board can go by is what they have in front of them today. The Review Board may approve the large windows, but the other authorities may change them.

Ms. Caldwell stated that this is the project that is committed to getting the tax credits and they are working as hard as possible with the entities that they need to work with to ensure

that they are doing something that will possibly be approved. They don't want to waste their time, energy and money going forward with something that will be turned down.

Mr. Gunther commended the petitioner on the material choices for the 1940s addition. He believes the glass will be quite stunning.

Mr. Howington said he realizes that the Board is mixed on the awning concerning whether it is too long. He commends the fact that it has been thinned down. He likes the contemporary iron bracket because it relates to an almost retractable awning. However, this is a different subject.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Sottile to talk about the fixed windows.

Mr. Sottile said he wanted the Board to keep in mind the massive scale of this project. He said that 500 people will be coming and going through the main door. They are really only providing a minimum amount of coverage there. He said in focusing on the windows in the location will be fixed panels. There are a bank of windows on the west elevation. Three windows are on this façade and the old louver above will have six windows. They all are fixed. An historic window is being restored and staff has shown the Board the update to that. The rest of the windows will remain historic windows.

Mr. Sottile stated that on the River Street façade the new windows that will be fixed will be the openings that they have been discussing within the bays of the structure which expresses a single opening that will provide windows for two levels interior, but will be fixed panels. Beyond is a setback element that was one of the additions that is laid behind the old louver monitor that also will have steel windows that will be fixed.

Mr. Sottile said for the east façade of the Power Plant building there will be windows set within some of the old fire openings on the brick section. There will be the addition of a window bank at the second level on one of the later additions to the building that will be a fixed panel to match the windows in this particular part of the building. The other sets are operable door sets. On the river façade, the other fixed panels will be the windows that will be added in the replacement of the old louvers in the louver monitor at the sixth level of the building.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Sottile if this façade is limited to fixed windows only on that upper level.

Mr. Sottile answered yes. The other windows on this façade are being restored. They are a combination of fixed and operable. But in terms of new windows that they are adding, they will be fixed.

Mr. Gunther asked Mr. Howington what is the special condition for the finding of fact.

Mr. Howington said he believes it is that special conditions and/or circumstances exist with are peculiar to the land, buildings, or structures involved and which are not applicable to other lands, buildings or structures in the same zoning district based on the fact that this building already has fixed operable windows. The special conditions to do not result from the actions of the applicant and the special conditions are not purely financial in nature so

as to allow the applicant to use the land, buildings or structures involved more profitably or to save money.

Ms. Harris said the special conditions would be historic fixed windows.

Mr. Howington explained that this is a special condition unique to this building.

Mr. Gunther moved for approval Power Plant rehabilitation as presented with the larger window openings and the petitioner has agreed to perform mortar analysis. Seconded by Mr. Merriman.

Dr. Henry said the canopy really detracts. He will vote against the motion.

Mr. Howington asked if the only concern was with the canopy and the windows. There is a way to handle those.

Mr. Merriman said that he is in favor of the window. He will vote either way with the canopies.

Ms. Simpson said she is struggling with the canopy and the window.

Dr. Henry moved that the canopy be eliminated.

Mr. Howington explained that he does not believe that the Board can motion that the canopy be eliminated, but they can move that the depth be decreased or increased.

Mr. Merriman said the Board cannot ask the petitioner to remove something that he has designed.

Ms. Simpson said the Board may deny that part. She seconded the motion for elimination of the canopy.

Dr. Henry amended his motion to show that the canopy be denied as presented.

Ms. Simpson seconded the amended motion.

This motion tied. Against 3: (Dr. Henry, Ms. Simpson and Mr. Merriman) For 3: (Ms. Scheer, Ms. Caldwell and Mr. Gunther). Mr. Howington voted against the motion. The motion to deny the canopy as presented failed 4 to 3.

Mr. Gunther moved for approval Power Plant rehabilitation as presented with the larger window openings and the petitioner has agreed to perform mortar analysis. Seconded by Mr. Merriman.

The motion passed 4 to 2 (Ms. Caldwell, Mr. Merriman, Mr. Gunther and Ms. Scheer).
Against 2: (Dr. Henry and Ms. Simpson.)

Mr. Gunther moved to recommend approval to the ZBA for the new windows as a special condition does exist which are peculiar to the land, buildings or structures involved and which are not applicable to other lands, buildings or structures in the same zoning district;

special conditions and/or circumstances to not result from the actions of the applicant and the special conditions and/or circumstances are not purely financial in nature so as allow the applicant to use the land, buildings or structures involved more profitably or to save money. There are existing historic windows in the building that are fixed.

Ms. Simpson seconded the motion.

The motion was carried and passed unanimously.

East Hotel

Ms. Harris stated that the Board approved Part I Height and Mass for the East Hotel with the following conditions to be resubmitted with Part 2: Design Details:

1. Restudy the south, River Street elevation to have a more prominent entrance; and
2. Restudy the north, River Walk façade of Building A to add an additional entrance.

Ms. Harris said the Board also recommended approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the following variances which were subsequently granted.

1. The exterior expression of the height of the second story shall be not less than 12 feet. The height of the second story is ten feet.
2. Exterior building walls shall use window groupings (including curtain walls), columns, and/or pilasters to create multiple bays not less than 15 feet nor more than 20 feet in width.

On building C on the south and west elevations, two bays on the south elevation are approximately 22 feet wide. One bay on the west elevation is approximately 25 feet wide.

Ms. Harris stated that the petitioner has revised the East Hotel as follows:

Building C:

1. The project proposes an additional, more prominent entrance into the restaurant on the River Street façade;
2. The entrance to the staircase on the River Street façade is further recessed;
3. Two entrances on the River Walk façade are now windows;
4. The overall width has increased from 136 feet, five inches to 137 feet, four inches, slightly modifying the proportions of the solid to voids;
5. Three additional balconies have been added to the River Street Walk façade on the second and third floors;
6. One additional balcony has been added to the River Street façade on the fourth floor;
7. Sixth floor mezzanine has been reduced in width to setback a little further from the River Walk façade; and
8. Proposed materials include board-formed concrete on the ground floor with corrugated cement panes above (matching power plant), crimped metal panels, curtain wall glazing and steel braces.

Building B:

1. Two double entrances on the River Walk façade are now windows and two double entrances have been revised to single entrances;
2. On the east façade, a double entrance has been replaced by a single entrance;
3. Four balconies each on the River Street and River Walk facades have been eliminated on floors two and three;
4. The width of the mechanical equipment area on the roof has been increased from 38 feet to 42 feet; and
5. Proposed materials include Cherokee Beaumont Brick with Coosa red mortar, reclaimed timber on the piers, stucco in Graphite gray, curtain wall glazing, steel panels, steel girders and steel canopies.

Building A:

1. On the north, River Walk façade, the solid to void proportions have been altered slightly;
2. At the northeast corner of the River Walk façade, an additional entrance has been added;
3. On the River Street façade, five balconies have been reduced to two on the second and third floors;
4. The dimensions of the fourth floor along River Street have reduced from approximately 40 feet to approximately 30 feet and the trellis has increased;
5. Proposed materials include reclaimed brick and stone, Cherokee Stratton brick with Coosa rose mortar, cast concrete with a natural finish, and crimped metal panels in natural metal.

Ms. Harris stated that the only variance that would be required is the variance from the modular masonry materials requirement on Building C for a minimum of 75%. Staff feels that the special condition will be met in that the building is located in the immediate proximity and that the Power Plant materials is matching those materials to be more visually compatible.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of both of those elements Part II Design Details for the East Hotel and a recommendation for approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the 75% modular masonry materials.

Mr. Howington asked staff that previously they recommended to continue the request for variances until the designs were resolved, but now they feel that they have been met?

Ms. Harris answered that all the design elements that she mentioned were standards that were not met, but the additional information that staff requested has been provided by petitioner and the standards are met.

Mr. Merriman asked if the petitioner is using the requested variance for brick to allow for one of the standards to get the additional story above the Height Map.

Ms. Harris answered no, the petitioner is not asking for a bonus story.

Mr. Howington stated that Ms. Harris has reported that all the concerns have been met.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Sottile said there were eleven items that they worked with staff on providing the information. They appreciate the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Howington said the choice of brick is so close and he did not understand why. They either have consistency where it looks like one building or looks like two building built at different times, but the bricks are almost the same. He does not know if the idea is to try to show that they were built at different times or were they trying to match the brick.

Mr. Sottile said he believes that this is something that they will look at in the field during the sample mock up period, but he agrees that the small samples do not communicate a strong visual difference, but he believes that when they look at the two particular brick, the Cherokee Stratton and the Cherokee Beaumont, they will see that Cherokee Beaumont brick is more red and has a little more slurry in it. The Stratton brick has a little more plum color in. They feel this is the right amount of differentiation. The mortar they will use will be slightly different also. Mr. Sottile said the intent is that the buildings will appear as being different from each other. They chose all three bricks carefully so that all three buildings could express itself best with its particular brick rather than for each project to get just one kind of brick. However, if they feel they need to make an adjustment, they will bring this back to the Board and staff.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Sottile to point out where the two different bricks are going. He said also it has been stated that reclaimed materials will be used. Where exactly will the reclaimed materials be used. How does the three buildings tie-in together?

Mr. Sottile displayed the entire elevation on the monitor. He explained that Building A will have the Cherokee Stratton brick; Building B will have Cherokee Beaumont; and Building C will have the cast concrete. The material changes with the massing of the building as they go from west to east. He explained that they have granite inset into the façade so that it will be seen with the brick. They have actually also detailed granite sills for a number of the exterior window and door conditions that comes down to the base. Therefore, the granite will be seen in context with the red brick.

Mr. Sottile said to address the question about the reclaim materials, they feel that the opportunity to bring reclaimed materials into the project may exist. What they have proposed is that they will use the reclaim materials on Building A at the foundation level. They do not know what the materials are at this time. Their intent is that during the construction process as materials come to light that a part of the property that can be used be explored. He said pending this, they have provided supplemental information that the base brick for that particular building is the Stratton Brick with the Coosa red mortar.

Mr. Howington said to clarify what Mr. Sottile has stated, that presently there are no reclaim materials; but this could be a possibility in the future.

Mr. Sottile explained that when they worked on the SCAD's Museum of Art they ultimately had 70,000 bricks that they were able to employ back into the site. With a project of this scale, they want to hold this idea, but at this time as he has said, they are

presenting it with the Coosa red mortar and the Stratton brick.

Ms. Caldwell asked if the red mortar will be red color as shown on the sample.

Mr. Sottile answered yes.

Ms. Simpson asked about the tapered angle post.

Mr. Sottile said this was a part of Part I.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated she might be incorrect, but she believes there was only color stated for curtain wall glazing on Buildings A - C. Ms. Meunier said the HSF believes the color is dark and is appropriate for Buildings A and B which are brick. But, Building C which will be the corrugated metal and concrete, that a lighter color material could be explored for use on this building.

Mr. Howington said the Board will clarify this with the petitioner.

Ms. Meunier said they believe that the canvas privacy screens will be visible on Building C. They are aware that there is a minimal amount here, but they are questioning the use of incorporating them here. They do not see this on the west hotel where it is being used. They understand the nautical concept. She said they have a question about the tapered angle post. This was a part of Part I, but she feels that it was a little conceptual and she did not have a clear understanding. Ms. Meunier asked what is the inspiration for the tapered angle posts. She believes that Mr. Sottile said they were kind of indicative of ship mass. However, they feel that they are a little abstract. Consequently, they are questioning whether it is going to be clear. If not, then the abstract nature of it is not necessarily blending with the rest of the building. Their thought is that maybe keeping this would be to include it on the glass bridges or connectors as they appear as different elements.

Mr. Bill Stuebe of the Downtown Neighborhood Association said their concern is how the additional traffic will be handled on River Street resulting from the proposed curb cuts that are being proposed. How will guests arrive and leave the hotel entrance by car when River Street is closed for festivals such as on St. Patrick's day? Mr. Stuebe suggested that an approval vehicle entrance to the East Hotel be subject to the approval of Traffic Engineering.

Mr. Stuebe said on a personal note, board formed concrete is a 1960's material. It did not work then and he does not believe that it will work now.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Sottile to please respond to the public comments regarding the window fabric, the angle post, the curb cuts and the concrete.

Mr. Sottile explained that the color of the curtain wall system is a dark bronze color. They believe the color is appropriate in this context of the weather more successfully over time than a stainless steel or a polish color. He said also as they look at Building C, they are looking at introducing elements that are a little more warmer and a little softer as this

is a building that has an industrial character to it. Therefore, this actually leads into this response about the canvas dividers. Certainly, there is a need for a privacy screen on these balconies. They felt, therefore, that the introduction of a contemporary detail for the softer side of the building would be visually compatible. Mr. Sottile said, in fact, they believe it will provide an improved aesthetic to the overall project.

Mr. Sottile as it relates to the balconies and the tapered post was absolutely a part of the Part I submittal and a part of the massing model that the Board approved at that time. The influence is more contemporary and as they think about the three centuries of history on this site and the fourth century that they are entering into, they are calling the mass of the tall ships along the wharfs of Savannah their inspiration. It is absolutely a contemporary element whether someone gets their inspiration or not, they feel that it shows that this is not a "copy cat" building and there is no false history here. Mr. Sottile said that with each building, they have looked to do something that is clearly beyond something that could be said that they copied something that they had seen somewhere else. Within this intent, he said they are very excited about this part of the building and believe it will really help activate the River Walk.

Mr. Sottile said the curb cuts is really out of their purview. He explained that the City of Savannah, Traffic Engineering and Thomas and Hutton are working with them on this aspect of the project.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Gunther commended the petitioners on the quality and richness of the materials that are being used.

Mr. Howington asked staff if they have a sample of the panels that are being used on Building C.

Ms. Harris explained that staff asked for additional information on this and the petitioner has provided detailing to show how this will work. It is the same concept for the paneling on the wall as well as the shutters.

Mr. Gunther asked if the corrugated materials on Building C will match exactly to the historic building.

Ms. Harris answered yes.

Mr. Gunther had a question for the petitioner as he wanted to know if there should be a way to distinguish two from each other as non-historic material will be used on a historic building, but mimicking that same material on new construction.

Mr. Sottile explained that they believe it is the bridge between using the same materials is a way of pointing out that the corrugated material on the Power Plant is not the original material as it is material of this time. It is the best material that they have available to them to recapture the rhythm of the original transit that was on this addition. Therefore, the most authentic thing to do is to use material of this era for the rehabilitation which involves the re-clad angle of that portion of the Power Plant and develop the new structure that has ties back to the structures that are on the site; particularly, generator #7.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Sottile what are the thoughts about the window color with this building where there are lighter material and a darker window.

Mr. Sottile said on the rehab where they will paint the windows, they have provided that color. It is a deep brown that is compatible with the bronze that the new windows will have.

Mr. Howington asked if all the window colors are consistent.

Mr. Sottile answered yes.

Mr. Henry moved for approval of Part II Design Details and that any changes in materials be brought back to the Board and that the finding of fact for the 75% modular masonry material be recommended to the Zoning Board of Appeals for approval.

Ms. Scheer seconded the motion which was carried unanimously.

ANCILLARY STRUCTURES

Ms. Harris explained that the petitioner has revised the Ancillary Structures as follows:

1. Three pavilions are proposed (as in the previous submission) and their precise location has been revised slightly;
2. The proposed trellis size may have been reduced in width- it is reflected as such in the site plan, but not on the elevations where the new retail kiosks have not been incorporated into the elevation;
3. Six retail kiosks have replaced the three previous shipping containers and the kiosk locations have changed;
4. Two pre-fabricated restrooms are proposed at the edge of each pavilion;
5. Pavilion 1, located in front of Building C, has increased in height from 22 feet to 23 feet. Staff recommended that height be decreased back to 22 feet and petitioner has agreed. Staff requested a paint sample of the wooden gate and it has been provided and has a sample of the crimped metal panel.
6. Pavilion 1 solid to void ration has altered, but the solid to void ration is unclear- it appears that only the middle passage is a void and the other bays are solid;
7. Pavilion 1's proposed materials are brick with street trusses and a metal roof;
8. Pavilion 2 and 3, located north of the Power Plant, have decreased in overall height from 18 feet to 16 feet 10 inches. They originally proposed arched openings, but are now change in regards to the Board's comments to square openings;
9. The six kiosks are 10 feet by 14 feet and 10 feet tall; varying floor plans are proposed;
10. Both the electric moon and trellis proposal have remained consistent although additional details have been provided; and
11. Proposed materials include board-formed concrete, iron, metal roofing, glass, crimped metal panels, brick and blue stone.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of the Part II Design Details of the accessory structures.

Mr. Howington asked staff just for clarity if the kiosks are not made from the shipping containers, but they still take on the same form.

Ms. Harris said they are smaller than what was previously proposed.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Harris if everything has been met with the staff's approval.

Ms. Harris answered yes.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Sottile said they have agreed to reduce the height of pavilion; they will provide paint samples and provide samples of the crimp metal. They are in agreement with all of the staff's comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said the materials for Pavilion 1 which is in front of Building C, the East Hotel, is brick and Pavilions 2 and 3 in front of the Power Plant are board formed concrete which is the material that is being used on Building C. She said the HSF was wondering why the pavilions are not necessarily relating to the buildings behind them. This may be to actually differentiate them from the buildings behind them. Ms. Meunier said she does not know, however, if they are suggesting that they switch them, but it just seems kind of weird that the aesthetic seems different. If anything, the HSF definitely likes Pavilion 1 and the brick that is used there. Consequently, if any changes are going to be made they would be in agreement with putting brick on pavilions 2 and 3.

Mr. Sottile said the material choices for Pavilions 2 and 3 are associated visually with the Power Plant. Pavilion 1 is associated visually with the East Hotel. The material choices were chosen to keep a diversity in the way that the buildings are read. Therefore, the brick helps to offset the cast stone concrete of Building C where the cast stone concrete of pavilions 2 and 3 help to not mimic the brick that is here at the Power Plant.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Gunther said he likes the prefabricated restrooms.

Ms. Scheer said she appreciates that public restrooms are here.

Mr. Howington asked if the restrooms will be the color as shown.

Mr. Sottile answered that the restrooms will be a dark green. They associated the color with the infill panels on the pavilion. It is a product that is pre-finished.

Ms. Scheer asked who will maintain the restrooms.

Mr. Sottile said the restrooms will be maintained privately; they are on the exterior of the River Walk, but they are a part of the project and not on the public River Walk area.

Mr. Howington asked the Board how they felt about electric moons.

Dr. Henry said he loves the electric moons.

Mr. Merriman, too, liked the electric moons.

Mr. Howington said he wanted to ask Mr. Sottile a question about the electric moons because to him, they look somewhat like a light on the side of an interstate. How would

these lights be different than the lights he sees on the interstate?

Mr. Sottile said the electric moons are a modern industrial product. They chose the electric moons for that reason. They are referential to previous history that the City has in the area. But, he would actually associate the electric moons more with the Port. As you come over the bridge into the City, look to the right and you will see the Port lines with the shipping containers and stacks. These are actually the same lights that are used in this context. Therefore, this is their story here; they are melding the edge of the City with the edge of the Port. The big difference is where they come to the ground. They have outfitted the base with a brick pedestal, bluestone cap. Therefore, they are pedestrianizing the scale of modern industrial object and then bringing it down as a useful piece of urban streetscape, the pedestrian infrastructure of the River Walk.

Mr. Howington said the light will be directed straight down. His only concern is the same concern he had at the last meeting, which is that there is such a nice façade on the west parking garage building and now they will have big expanses of light. He would hate for the electric moons to take a way from the façade.

Mr. Sottile said the intent is to be an ambient light and not to diminish from the architectural lighting that the buildings will have, but to accentuate the features of the building. In the evening, they do exist in an area of the River Walk where a park is below and an expansion is to the River Walk area. Therefore, this provides a little additional light for safety. The lights will be a straight down illumination.

Board Action:

The savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for Part II Design Details for the West Hotel/Parking Garage as presented with the metal shutters because it is visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.
Second: Debra Caldwell

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

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review deny the canopy as presented. - FAIL

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Ebony Simpson
Debra Caldwell - Nay
Justin Gunther - Nay
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Nay
Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Marjorie W Reed - Not Present
Tess Scheer - Nay
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Not Present

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for Part II Design Details for the rehabilitation of the Power Plant as presented because it is visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther
Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.
Debra Caldwell - Aye
Justin Gunther - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Nay
Keith Howington - Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Marjorie W Reed - Not Present
Tess Scheer - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Nay
Robin Williams - Not Present

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the following variances because the criteria are met.

Windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, awning, casement or Palladian.

The Power Plant proposes fixed windows on the building.

Required. Building walls on street fronting facades shall incorporate modular masonry materials in the form of brick, cast stone, stone, concrete formed or assembled as stone to achieve a human scale over a minimum of 75 percent of surface area (including windows, doors, and curtain walls). The remainder of the wall surface may incorporate other materials [Section (n)(6) Exterior walls].

- PASS

Building C proposes corrugated cement panels.

Vote Results

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

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District board of Review does hereby approve the petition for Part II Design

Details for the East Hotel with the condition that should the materials change that it be brought back - PASS to the Board because the project is visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Tess Scheer

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

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic district Board of Review approve the Part II Design Details of the Ancillary Structures as the project is visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Tess Scheer

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

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

2. [Revise By-Laws to allow the Board to determine a Conflict of Interest](#)

Attachment: [Proposed amendment to Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest Section of By-laws 121914.pdf](#)

Mr. Howington explained that Dr. Henry submitted to the Board in accordance with their meeting of December 10, 2014 where he proposed that the Historic District Board of Review adopt DeKalb's County Historic Preservation By-Laws and Provisions to determine if a conflict of interest exists. He asked Ms. Harris to cover the amendment. The Board will not be able to vote on the revision today. But, this item will be on their agenda for the next meeting and they will vote on it.

Ms. Harris explained that amendment to the Historic District Board of Review By-Laws has to presented to the Board at one meeting and then voted on at the next meeting. She said that the By-laws contains an appendix "A" that talks about a code of ethics. If this would be added to it and not replace it. Most of this is probably already covered under their present Code of Ethics. The main difference would be statements one and two which say "that the individual member shall divulge the existence and reasons for the potential conflict; and the Historic District Board of Review shall decide if such a conflict exists.

Ms. Harris said, therefore, this would change from an individual making that determination to the individual making everyone aware of that so that the Board could discuss it; ask questions and then the Board as a whole could decide if a conflict exists.

Mr. Gunther asked does this mean that every time an individual brought up a conflict that the Board would need to vote on that or can the individual still recuse herself or himself.

Ms. Harris explained that she believes the Board would have to make a determination and vote on it.

Mr. Howington explained that he believes that it means that the Board would have to vote on the issue every time. He said for example, some meetings he has a conflict because the firm he works with presents petitions to the Review Board. When this is done, he recuses himself and leaves the hearing room until the Board has made its decision on the petitions. If the Board

revises their By-Laws according to what is being recommended, if this firm has two or three petitions on the agenda that day, the Board would have to vote on each petition individually.

Dr. Henry said he thought that if a Board member decided not to recuse himself, only then would the Board potentially vote on whether the person should recuse herself or himself.

Ms. Harris explained that in any situation whether the Board member would like to recuse herself or himself or the Board would not like to recuse herself or himself. The way it is written, the Board member would have to disclose it to the Board that there is a potential here. Then the Board would have to discuss it and ask the Board member questions. The Board would then make a determination if they feel it is a conflict of interest.

Ms. Caldwell asked when would the Board do this. Would the Board come earlier to take care of this.

Mr. Howington said the Board would have to do so at the beginning of the meeting. It would be listed as an agenda item.

Dr. Henry said he believes there is some confusion about what a recusal means. It is not some sort of admission of guilt. When someone has a conflict of interest and refuses to recuse herself or himself, it reflects on the Board. This plays right into the hands of all kinds of people who think that some corruption is going on. All the person has to do is ask if the Board feels she/he should recuse themselves. The person would do just as he did at the beginning of this meeting.

Ms. Caldwell said that Dr. Henry's discussion was easy. But, what if the Board is split.

Dr. Henry said if one Board member said he should recuse himself, then he would do so. He has never seen a situation where a person says there is an apparent conflict of interest and the person refuses to recuse.

Mr. Howington said he realizes that this could be a concern of everyone, but he believes there is a standard that they must adhere to. As he has said before just because he knows someone in the audience and he has a relationship with the person outside of the petition, he could easily say that he wants to recuse himself as he does not want to deal with the situation that he voted for or against the person. But, as a Board member they should not recuse herself or himself because they were appointed to do a job. They cannot use this as an easy out. If they do, they will not have a quorum on this Board.

Mr. Howington explained that in the Code of Ethics that they have a job to do and unless there is an obvious conflict of interest, then the person must recuse themselves. But, if the person does not believe that there is a conflict of interest, then it is that person's right. He clarified that on this project today, it

has been stated at two or three meetings that the person did not feel that he had a conflict of interest. Therefore, they did not have to do that today, as it was already in the records.

Ms. Caldwell said they need to be sure that they understand what this is and she does not know if this is addressing Dr. Henry's concern. She said the document states that the individual member shall disclose any potential conflict.

Mr. Howington said this is what the Board does presently.

Dr. Henry explained that what was stated in October is that there is a working relationship between the dean and the SCAD employees; and this is true. This was misleading in his opinion because working with is not the same as working for. Now, this should have been said.

Mr. Gunther said he specifically said that he is an employee of SCAD and that the petitioner was his dean. This was given to the City Attorney who said there is no conflict. He said this was requested from the City Attorney before they heard the petitioner's petition.

Dr. Henry said this was not presented at the public meeting.

Mr. Gunther said he sent his concern to Ms. Harris who sent the concern to the City Attorney.

Mr. Howington stated that Mr. Gunther requested clarification from the City Attorney before any vote took place on any of Mr. Sottile's projects. The City Attorney responded that he did not believe that it was a conflict of interest. Ms. Harris put this on the agenda and the Board discussed this. Mr. Gunther made his statement before Part I of review was heard. Therefore, this was covered at that time.

Mr. Howington said that Dr. Henry feels that this should be looked at and discussed. He wants to put the conflict of interest issue on next month's agenda and the Board will vote on whether the By-Laws should or should not be changed. He asked the Board members to review DeKalb's By-Laws. If they have questions or opinions, this will be discussed at that meeting and then the Board will vote on it.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

3. [Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the Review Board, Mr. Howington adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen Harris
Director of Urban Planning and historic Preservation

EH:mem