



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
July 13, 2016 1:00 P. M.
Meeting Minutes

JULY 13, 2016 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Stephen Merriman, Jr., Chair
Justin Gunther, Vice-Chair
Debra Caldwell
Jennifer Deacon
Kellie Fletcher
Becky Lynch
Andy McGarrity
Tess Scheer

HDRB Member Not Present: Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian
Dr. Betsy Dominguez
Keith Howington

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Call to Order and Welcome](#)

Mr. Merriman called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. He outlined the role of the Historic District Board of Review and explained the process for hearing the various petitions. Staff will present each application with a recommendation. The petitioner will have the opportunity to respond to the recommendation. The petitioners are asked to limit their presentation to 10 minutes or less and only address the items identified as inconsistent with the ordinance and questions raised by the Board. The public will have the same allotted time, ten minutes, to comment. The petitioner will be given the opportunity to respond to the public comments.

The Board will then go into Board discussion at which time no further testimony is received unless specifically requested by the Chairman. Each Board member will be given two minutes twice to provide comments, if they so desire.

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

2. [Approval of Consent Agenda July 13, 2016](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the Consent Agenda of July 13, 2016. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer
Second: Becky Lynch
Debra Caldwell - Aye
Jennifer Deacon - Aye
Kellie Fletcher - Aye
Justin Gunther - Aye
Becky Lynch - Aye
Andy McGarrity - Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain
Tess Scheer - Aye

3. [Petition of Homeline Architecture | 16-002758-COA | 20 West Jones Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details Carriage House](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial - Facing West.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Mass Model.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Part I Materials and Specifications.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Part I Photographs and Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Part I Renderings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Part II Materials and Specifications.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Part II Photographs and Drawings.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations and additions to the main building, and for Parts I and II for new construction of the carriage house for the property located at 20 West Jones Street as

requested because the proposed work is visually - PASS compatible and meets the standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Andy McGarrity - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

4. [Petition of Cornerstone Minerals | 16-003422-COA | 31 West Congress Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a projecting principal use sign at 31 West Congress Street, because the work meets the standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

-

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Andy McGarrity - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

5. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 16-003498-COA | 20 East Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a projecting principal use sign at 20 East Broughton Street, because the sign meets the standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Andy McGarrity - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

6. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc. | 16-003499-COA | 135 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for multiple signs for the hotel under construction at 135 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the sign standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Andy McGarrity - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

7. [Petition of Ellsworth-Hallet Home Professionals | 16-003450-COA | 548 East Taylor Street | Color Change and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Rendering.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Specifications.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations to 548 East Taylor Street, because the work meets the standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Andy McGarrity - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

8. [Petition of John Post | 16-003480-COA | 612 Drayton Street | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [16-003480-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Revised packet- Application, drawings, photographs, specifications.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Previously approved drawings 10-14-15.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations to the addition of 612 Drayton Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Revise the proposed new window on the south façade to meet the 5:3 ratio.
2. Ensure that the door frames are inset not less - PASS than three inches.

3. Provide a specification for the new doors and the new window on the south façade.

Because the alterations are otherwise visually compatible and meet the standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Andy McGarrity - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

9. [Petition of Kathy Ledvina | 16-003511-COA | 143 Houston Street | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Specifications.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition the COA for 143 Houston Street (14-005608-COA) to replace the existing roof and for alterations to the East (front) and North (lane) façades of the commercial building at 143 Houston Street because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the design standards, with the following conditions: - PASS

1. All signage be submitted to the Board for review and approval prior to installation.
2. The electric meter location be submitted to staff for final review and approval prior to installation.

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Justin Gunther	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

10. [Adoption of Agenda for July 13, 2016 Meeting](#)

Board Action:	
The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby adopt the July 13, 2016 Meeting Agenda.	- PASS
Vote Results	
Motion: Debra Caldwell	
Second: Kellie Fletcher	
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

11. [Approval of June 8, 2016 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [06-08-2016 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:	
The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve June 8, 2016 Meeting Minutes.	- PASS
Vote Results	
Motion: Jennifer Deacon	
Second: Tess Scheer	
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain

Tess Scheer	- Aye
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

12. [Continue All Items to Next Regular Meeting](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petitions as requested. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther
Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

13. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 15-001384-COA | 600 East Bay Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther
Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Nay
Tess Scheer	- Aye

14. [Petition of Ryan Benjamin Kelly | 16-001156-COA | 111 East President Street | Signs](#)

Board Action:	
The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition at the petitioner's - PASS request.	
Vote Results	
Motion: Justin Gunther	
Second: Debra Caldwell	
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

15. [Petition of Ken Brown | 16-001649-COA | 615 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Alterations and Additions](#)

Board Action:	
The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition at the petitioner's - PASS request.	
Vote Results	
Motion: Justin Gunther	
Second: Debra Caldwell	
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

16. [Petition of Barnard Architects | 16-002725-COA | 202 East Gaston Street | Alterations and Addition](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review
does hereby continue the petition at the petitioner's - PASS
request.

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

17. [Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 16-002753-COA | 606 Abercorn Street | Addition](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review
does hereby continue the petition at the petitioner's - PASS
request.

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

18. [Petition of SignArt | 16-002781-COA | 10 Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review
does hereby continue the petition at the petitioner's - PASS
request.

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Andy McGarrity - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

19. [Petition of Gary Sanders | 16-003487-COA | 305 West Wayne Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review
does hereby continue the petition at the petitioner's - PASS
request.

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Andy McGarrity - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

20. [Petition of Paul Cobet | 16-002724-COA | 24 East Liberty Street, Unit 83/73 | After-the-fact Door Replacement](#)

Attachment: [16-002724-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Cobet was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval to replace three existing non-historic sliding glass doors on units 83 (eight floor) and 73 (seventh floor); two doors face Liberty Street and one door (on the eight floor) faces the courtyard. The replacement doors are Andersen A-Series Frenchwood Hinged Patio Doors. The doors on the Liberty Street façade have grilles while the doors on the courtyard façade do not.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends denial of the petition for after-the-fact replacement of three sets of double doors because the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are not met and the replacement doors are not visually compatible.

Ms. Deacon asked if the petition (for an after-the-fact request) is not approved, would the petitioner be required to replace the doors with something compatible?

Ms. Harris answered that this would be an option for the petitioner; also he would have the option to appeal the decision to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cobet showed the Board pictures pertaining to his request. He said the door is more than three inches inset from the face of the building. The balconies are on the seventh and eighth floors and if you stand on the balcony of the seventh floor and look down, you cannot see the doors anywhere from the north side of Liberty Street. You would have to go to the south side of Liberty Street. If you stand on the balcony looking towards the Hilton Hotel, you have to get to a certain point before the doors are seen. If you turn to the west, the doors are hidden by the trees.

Mr. Cobet showed the Board a picture that was included in his submittal packet. If you stand at the same spot and look upward towards the building, you will see the seventh and eighth floors. They measured the distance from the seventh floor which is the closest balcony to the sidewalk. It is 70 1/2 feet. It is 81 feet to the eighth floor balcony. They measured across the street to that spot by the Hilton Hotel and the distance is 126 feet. Therefore, 144 feet is the closest spot that the doors could be seen. Mr. Cobet said he believes they did the right thing because the doors they replaced were Pella swing glass doors installed in 1996. They were rotten. They purchased the units last year and the previous owner had potted plants on the balcony and vines were actually growing through the doors. Rain water was actually coming into the units. As an owner of the property, when they went to replace the doors, the whole process of going through the permitting was not a concern of theirs, nor did they know about the historic review process.; they are not from Savannah.

Mr. Cobet explained that they went to four different door companies. Two of the companies would not come and look at the doors when they found out that they were in the Historic District. The Pella Company came because these were his failed doors that did not last 20 years. He was happy to sell them doors, but his company would not send anyone to install the doors in the Historic District. They were at a loss and his realtor suggested that they contact Graco which they did. The doors that are installed there now were presented to him as approved doors. At no time in their discussions they had with these vendors that they

were told the doors needed to be wood. Once they were presented with approved doors as they had an issue with rainwater that they needed to solve, they purchased the doors. Mr. Cobet said they have approximately \$27,000 invested here that the Board would be asking him to tear out and replace with wood doors. The question he has is from 144 feet would someone actually be able to tell that wood doors were installed. He said actually the doors would only be seen from the spot he marked on Liberty Street is were the doors can only be seen on the seventh and eighth floors. If you want to get a visual comparison of the doors, you would have to go halfway down the block of Drayton Street. This would be several hundred feet of distance.

Mr. Cobet said if the Board went down Drayton Street and looked at the doors, he believes they would conclude that they did the right thing by removing sliding glass doors, replacing them with French doors that are compatible with the rest of the doors in the building. He said regarding the question of the divided light, could you really tell from that distance if the visual standard was violated.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board sympathized with the petitioner, but they must uphold the Secretary of Interior's Standards. This is an historic building and if they approved this request, they would be setting a precedent. The replacement doors are not visually compatible. The Board is in agreement with the staff's recommendation.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the petition for after the fact replacement of three sets of double doors because the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are not met and the replacement doors are not visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Debra Caldwell

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Justin Gunther	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

21. [Petition of Homeline Architecture | 16-002757-COA | 509 1/2 Tattnall Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial - Facing West.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Fenestration Comparison.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Gaston Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Mass Model.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Material Samples.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Part I Photographs and Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Part II Materials and Specifications.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Part II Photographs and Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Renderings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [A Letter to the Members of the Board.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Fenestration Comparison.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Part II Photographs and Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Supplemental Photographs - Bay Windows.pdf](#)

Mr. John Deering was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details for the construction of a two-story, single-family home on the vacant parcel located at 509 ½ Tattnall Street. Formally the side yard for the historic building located at 509 Tattnall Street, these parcels have recently been subdivided. The two car garage is within the footprint of the main building and is accessed from Jefferson Street.

Ms. Michalak said that at the June 8, 2016 HBDR Meeting, the Board approved Part I, Height and Mass with conditions as follows:

1. Redesign all of the fenestration on the front façade to be more compatible with visually related contributing buildings; this includes ensuring that each window meets the 5:3 ratio and add more voids to either side.
2. Increase the height of the second story to 10 feet minimum.
3. Ensure that the door frames are inset not less than 3 inches.
4. Redesign the front handrails to have balusters and a bottom rail and ensure that the height does not exceed 36 inches.
5. Ensure that the sloped apron to the garage doors is not on the public right-of-way and that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval the petition for New Construction: Part I and Part II for the construction of a two-story, single-family home on the vacant

parcel located at 509 ½ Tattnell Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Redesign all of the fenestration on the front façade to be more compatible with visually related contributing buildings; this includes adding more voids to either side.
2. Redesign the front handrails to have balusters and a bottom rail and ensure that the height does not exceed 36 inches.
3. Ensure that the sloped apron to the garage doors is not on the public right-of-way and that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.
4. Change the fence facing Jefferson Street to brick.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Deering stated that they addressed three of the comments. They have sent new drawings to address numbers 2, 3, and 4. He showed the Board a picture showing their design of the front handrails, which meets the ordinance. They have noted that the sloped apron to the garage occurs within the garage. Their topography on the site is flat; therefore; they do not have a challenge. What actually prompted this introduction into the ordinance was/is that there is some new construction on the west side where the driveways were built steep. This looks awful and interrupts the sidewalk. Their topographic elevations are not that steep, so they can accomplish the slope within the garage and the slope and apron within the width of the wall and that the sidewalk would be uninterrupted. Mr. Deering said they changed the wall back here to brick. It is a brick wall with the wood gate.

Mr. Deering said responding to the first condition of Part I, they altered the front façade more than what is stated by staff. He pointed out the old section where they had somewhat a vertical situation. It is not a two-story window. The old version had casement windows that looked like one large opening, but they have spandrels here with muttons in them that looks like the windows. They then went back and studied other things in the neighborhood such as bay windows. They decided to come up with a modern interpretation of the bay window. Mr. Deering stated that they changed the windows. The sizes of the windows were changed slightly. They made them double hung windows instead of casement so that they would relate more easily and readily to the historic structures across the street. They took out the detail that identifies it as a window. Consequently, this becomes a pair much like the ones seen in the other bay windows of the historic district. However, they are not intentionally copying those things and doing a modern interpretation of it.

Mr. Deering explained that the bay window sticks out six or eight inches and does not have glass on the side. However, this is a part of their modern interpretation of the bay window. They have taken out the paired windows on the south elevation and created punched openings to help the structure relate more easily to the surrounding historical visually related structures. He explained that the voids on either sides of the windows are not much different than the adjacent townhouses. They tried very hard to align the buildings horizontally to follow the same double hung window-type. The three part window with the larger double-hung in the center and the two on either side is like the house across the

street, which has the same type windows. Consequently, he believes they have met the visual compatibility factors with the windows. There are many examples of bay windows in Savannah.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that they agree with the staff's comments. They hear the explanation from the petitioner about the contemporary interpretation about the bay windows. They are open to this as well as the contemporary sort of porch entrance. Ms. Meunier said the HSF also likes the changes on the south façade with the punched openings. However, they question how the two relate.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board found that the petitioner's solution as presented today for the projection of the bay resolves the issue of the fenestration and the redesigning of the windows. They discussed that the front handrails shall have balusters and a bottom rail and that the height does not exceed 36 inches; the sloped apron to the garage doors not be on the public right-of-way and that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height; and that the fence facing Jefferson Street be changed to brick.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for New Construction: Part I and Part II for the construction of a two-story, single-family home on the vacant parcel located at 509 ½ Tattall Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Redesign the front handrails to have balusters and a bottom rail and ensure that the height does not exceed 36 inches. - PASS
2. Ensure that the sloped apron to the garage doors is not on the public right-of-way and that the sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.
3. Change the fence facing Jefferson Street to brick.

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther
Second: Andy McGarrity
Debra Caldwell - Aye
Jennifer Deacon - Aye
Kellie Fletcher - Aye
Justin Gunther - Aye
Becky Lynch - Aye
Andy McGarrity - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain
Tess Scheer - Aye

22. [Petition of Wissmach Architects | 16-003483-COA | 114 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Brick Wall Replacement](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Image of the Wall.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Mortar and Brick Samples.pdf](#)

Mr. Rick Wissmach was not present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sara Farr gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to demolish and rebuild the rear wall at 114 East Oglethorpe Avenue. The existing wall is constructed mostly of Savannah Grey brick, but there are several areas of “patchwork” that include different types of brick and mortar. In addition, Portland cement mortar has been used over the years to repoint, resulting in damage to the Savannah Grey brick. There is also rust jacking occurring at the original door and window openings which will require replacement of the steel lintels. Some of the existing brick may be able to be cleaned and reused in the new wall.

Ms. Farr explained that new wall is proposed to be constructed using Savannah Grey bricks that have been salvaged from a wall at 116 East Oglethorpe and any Savannah Grey bricks able to be salvaged from the existing wall. The new mortar is proposed to be Holcim Mortamix Rainbow Custom Color Masonry Cement in Holcim 200N, a slightly off white.

Ms. Farr stated that a previous COA (13-002614-COA) was approved on June 12, 2013. It included replacing all windows and doors and general rehabilitation. The work was not completed. Another COA was approved for the property on October 14, 2015 (15-003894-COA). This included the construction of a carriage house and alterations to the rear of the house. The problems with the existing brick were discovered after the approval of this COA.

Ms. Farr reported that staff recommends to continue the removal and rebuilding of the rear wall at 114 East Oglethorpe Street to address the following:

1. Find a more historically sensitive approach than removing the entire wall;
2. Use a Type N mortar with the recommended mix of Cement – 1; Hydrated Lime of Lime Putty – 1; Sand - 5-6 for repointing.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

The petitioner was not present. Ms. Harris explained that the petitioner has provided some

information that the Board may review. Mr. Thomson stated that if questions surface from the public that is not included in the petitioner's submittal, the Board could continue the application.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board found that they could approve the petition and allow the applicant to work with staff since the previous COA approval meant a significant amount of the wall was being removed for alterations already. The Board also wanted a structural engineer to provide more information about the condition of the existing wall.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition the removal and rebuilding of the rear wall at 114 East Oglethorpe Street with the following conditions:

1. Find a more historically sensitive approach than removing the entire wall working with staff;
2. Use a Type N mortar with the recommended mix of Cement – 1; Hydrated Lime of Lime Putty – 1; Sand - 5-6 for repointing; - PASS
3. Provide a structural engineering letter assessing the condition of the wall to staff;

Because otherwise the petition meets the standards and is visually compatible.

Vote Results

Motion: Andy McGarrity

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Andy McGarrity - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

23. [Petition of Rich Sioufi | 16-003485-COA | 501 East Charlton Street | Siding Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Petitioner Presentation.pdf](#)

Mr. Rich Sioufi was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for alterations to the building located at 501 East Charlton Street as follows:

1. Remove all exterior wood siding; salvage reusable siding for reinstallation.
2. Inspect and repair/replace structural elements as required.
3. Install ¾ inch thick sheathing and weather protection on the entire exterior of the building.
4. Reinstall salvaged wood siding. Finish with new wood siding to match the existing in thickness, profile, and design.
5. Install shutters on the 3rd floor. A board-and-batten style shutter is proposed.
6. Color changes are proposed as follows:
 - Siding: Behr, Pale Green Grape
 - Trim, columns, stairs, railings, window and door frames: Behr, Unwind
 - Doors, corbels, stair treads, shutters: Behr, Midnight Blue

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends:

1. Approve alterations, color change, shutters, and repairs for the building located at 501 East Charlton Street with the following conditions because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards:
 - a. Remove the minimum siding necessary to inspect and repair/replace damaged structural elements.
 - b. Repair/replace only siding that has deteriorated beyond repair with siding to match in materials, thickness, and design.
 - c. Ensure that the new shutters are hinged, operable and sized to fit each window opening. Also ensure that the shutters will be constructed of durable wood.
2. Deny the installation of ¾ inch thick sheathing on the entire exterior of the building located at 501 East Charlton Street because the proposed work does not meet the preservation standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Sioufi thanked the staff and Board for working with them and hearing their petition. He stated that there is no sheathing. He made a compromise that instead of having the sheathing coming over, they could put the sheathing inside between the beams. They have a written report coming from the civil engineer, but they want to reiterate it by having a second engineer that the structure needs to be reassessed. This building is more than 170 years old and water infiltration has been coming inside. Initially, an inside gutter system was here; much damage has been on the inside of this building. They really do not have an idea of what is going to really happen with this building. He showed the Board a deteriorated area above

the porch.

Mr. Sioufi pointed out damage inside the roof and attic. They put in a 2 x 6 piece of wood to replace the rotten wood. Some of the beams have collapsed. As you enter into the building, you will see that the floor is dipped from the beam collapsing. The inside walls have mildew; water comes in through the columns. The siding has many cracks in it. Substantial rot is present to the main beams and studs. Because of this, a complete inspection of the framing is needed. The siding that they want to remove is coded in the red color. Whatever siding they can salvage, they will do so. The siding that they will replace will be flush. Therefore, they are not imposing another thickness to the wall. They will keep the trim where they are which will allow them to still protect and reinforce the structure.

Ms. Deacon asked the petitioner if he was only planning to install the sheathing between the studs, could it be done from the inside to prevent the removal of all the siding?

Mr. Sioufi said he would be removing all of the sheetrock on the inside of the house. This will be a lot of work.

Mr. McGarrity applauded Mr. Sioufi for the effort that he will go through to restore the building. The pictures show that there is a substantial amount of damage to the siding. He also applauds the petitioner's option to install wood inbetween each floor. This will be a tremendous amount of work.

Ms. Deacon asked staff if they have an opinion on the installation of the sheathing in between the studs.

Ms. Michalak stated that it appears to be a good compromise if it achieves the goal.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said the HSF has an easement on this property. They have met with Mr. Sioufi regarding the proposed changes. They agree with the staff's recommendation. Mr. Sioufi has proposed to the HSF his compromise proposal to put the sheathing on the inside. They believe a lot of the project work will be evolving as the siding comes off and then a determination could be made as to actually what will be involved. The HSF is working with the petitioner and he has consented to work with them to ensure that the building is repaired.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the petitioner's willingness to compromise on the sheathing, work with staff, and the HSF is great. They discussed that only the removal of minimum siding necessary to inspect and repair/replace the damaged structural elements be done; repair and replace only the siding that has deteriorated beyond repair with siding that matches in materials, thickness, and design; redesign the shutters to be either panel or louver style and the shutters be hinged, operable and sized to fit each window opening and that the shutters be constructed of durable wood.

They discussed the sheathing thickness. The Board agreed with the staff's recommendation to deny the installation of $\frac{3}{4}$ inch thick sheathing on the entire exterior of the building

located at 501 East Charlton Street because the proposed work does not meet the preservation standards.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

1. Approve alterations, color change, shutters, and repairs for the building located at 501 East Charlton Street with the following conditions because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards:
 - a. Remove the minimum siding necessary to inspect and repair/replace damaged structural elements.
 - b. Repair/replace only siding that has deteriorated beyond repair with siding to match in materials, thickness, and design.
 - c. Redesign the shutters to be either panel or louver style shutters. Ensure that the new shutters are hinged, operable and sized to fit each window opening. Also ensure that the shutters will be constructed of durable wood.
2. Deny the installation of ¾ inch thick sheathing on the entire exterior of the building located at 501 East Charlton Street because the proposed work does not meet the preservation standards.

- PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Jennifer Deacon

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

24. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects |16-003492-COA | 607 Drayton Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [16-003492-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Forsyth Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Photos.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
Attachment: [West Elm Bonus Story - Zoning Administrator Determination.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- revised model photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Fire Marshall Interpretation- Stair access.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of Part 1: Height and Mass of a new five story building facing Forsyth Park on a vacant lot with Drayton Street to the west, Huntingdon Street to the north, and Goodwin Street to the east. Two floors of parking are located underground beneath the building. The building forms an “L” shape, wrapping a courtyard along Goodwin Street. A smaller three story building is located on the southeast corner of the parcel which also serves as the entrance to the underground parking. The petitioner has drawn from nearby Mid-Century Modern buildings within the vicinity for architectural inspiration, including the Chatham Apartment Building to the east and the additions to the Candler Hospital Building (now the Savannah Law School) to the north.

Ms. Harris stated that a similar petition (16-002196-COA) was reviewed by the Board on May 11, 2016 and was continued at the request of the petitioner in order to address the following; revisions are in italics:

1. Eliminate the sixth story to be consistent with the Height Map and visually compatible in terms of height and scale;

The sixth story has been eliminated.

2. Reduce the height of the tower element to be visually compatible in terms of height and scale;

The tower element has been eliminated.

3. Add additional voids to the north, Huntingdon Street façade, to be visually compatible and meet the standard which requires that the distance between windows is not greater than two times of the width of the windows;

Additional voids have been added.

4. Add additional voids to the east, Goodwin Street, façade to be visually compatible and meet the standard which requires that the distance between windows is not greater than two times of the width of the windows;

Additions voids have been added.

5. Incorporate additional voids in the upper floors of the south façade, which will be very visible from Drayton Street above the adjacent building, even if that means setting this portion of the building back further from the property line to be visually compatible;

Additional voids have been added.

6. Incorporate voids on the east and north façades of the three story building at the southeast corner of the parcel to be visually compatible and meet the standard which requires a minimum of 20% voids;

Additional voids have been incorporated.

7. Increase the height of the second story to 12 feet to meet the standard;

The height of the second story has increased to 12 feet.

8. Ensure that the parapet has a string course to meet the standard;

A string course has been added to the parapet.

9. Ensure that the height of the wall on the east (Goodwin) elevation does not exceed 11 feet;

The height of the wall on the east elevation is 11 feet.

10. Incorporate an additional massing standard to meet the requirement that a minimum of two massing elements be utilized;

The roofline variation massing standard has been incorporated.

11. Incorporate an additional horizontal element at the southern third of the west façade of the building, between the fourth and fifth stories, in order to meet the massing standard requiring a base, middle and top;

An additional horizontal element has been incorporated on the west façade.

12. Incorporate additional height variation to meet the standard requiring roofline variation if continuous rooflines are greater than 120 linear feet;

Height variations have been incorporated into the rooflines along Drayton and Huntingdon Streets.

13. Locate the elevator overrun within the bonus story to meet the standard;

The elevator overrun is located within the bonus story.

14. Incorporate two additional entrances along Huntingdon Street to access the dining area and the lobby in order to meet the intent of the criteria for the bonus story and meet the standard which requires one entrance for every 60 linear feet of frontage;

The ground floor entrances have been redesigned.

15. Redesign the window groupings to form bays of not less than 15 feet nor more than 20 feet wide to meet the standard.

The bays have been redesigned to meet the standard.

Ms. Harris said, additionally, that tree lawns have been incorporated along the north, Huntingdon Street façade. A planting area has been incorporated within the setback along Drayton Street. A more prominent entrance has also been incorporated along Drayton.

Ms. Harris said a revised petition was reviewed by the Board on June 8, 2016 (16-002196-

COA) and was denied by the Board “due to the lack of sufficient information regarding the zoning and whether the project qualifies for a bonus story.”

Ms. Harris stated that staff has subsequently requested and received an official determination from the Zoning Administrator that the RIP-D zoning district is considered “all other districts,” as referenced in the Historic District Ordinance and, therefore, qualifies for a bonus story.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval of Part I: Height and Mass with the following conditions to be resubmitted with Part II: Design Details because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Restudy the roofline variation elements on the Huntingdon and Drayton Street facades to not give the appearance of an additional story.
2. Reduce the height of the bonus story to be visually compatible and less than that of the first story.
3. On the north, Huntingdon Street façade, on the ground floor, continue the consistent storefront pattern at the area of solid reserved for signage.
4. Incorporate two additional entrances along Huntingdon Street to access the hybrid areas, and one additional entrance along Drayton Street to access the dining area.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay said they have carefully reviewed the staff's recommendations. They agree with condition 1. They will restudy the roofline variation elements on the Huntingdon and Drayton Street facades to not give the appearance of an additional story; they will reduce the height of the bonus story to be visually compatible and less than that of the first story; they will continue the consistent storefront pattern at the area of solid reserved for the signage; and will incorporate two additional entrances along Huntingdon Street to access the hybrid areas, and one additional entrance along Drayton Street to access the dining area. These conditions will be addressed along with their Part II - Detail Designs presentation.

Mr. Shay said they are not asking for a variance for the bonus story; a variance is not needed.

Ms. Meunier said regarding the height, the HSF disagrees with the Zoning Administrator's determination. They do not believe that a bonus story is appropriate in this location. She said that the Historic District Ordinance clearly states that in all "R" zoning districts, the maximum of one story above the Historic District Height Map may be permitted for properties located on Oglethorpe Avenue, Liberty Street, and trust lots." Ms. Muenier said they do not believe that a new Zoning Administrator's stroke of a pen should undo the 18 months of work by staff, experts developers, preservationists, and the public who amended the ordinance for large scale development. Although the petitioner may be meeting all the criteria for the bonus story, that only makes them eligible for the bonus story. However, it is the Board's determination to ensure that it will be visually compatible as proposed. Consequently, the petitioner may be eligible for the bonus story, but is not entitled to the bonus story.

Dr. Roland Summers of the Georgia Medical Society said they are adjacent neighbors to this proposed project. As he has pointed out in previous meeting, their building is a little

building next door to a large building. Their objection is the height is overwhelming to the Georgia Medical Society building.

Mr. William Rhangos stated that he is one of the four owners of the property. All four of them have lived in Savannah all their lives. They have resisted some offers on this property as they did not feel compatible with what was being proposed. Mr. Rhangos said he was reared one block from this property. Consequently, he has a vested interest in this project which started more than one year ago. While he does not discount the concerns, he believes they have had two different zoning administrators whose profession is defined by being able to interpret the ordinance on the qualifications for a fifth floor. He is hopeful that the Board will accept the updated letter confirming that liability.

Attorney Harold Yellin stated that at the June, 2016 meeting, fifteen issues were raised and 15 issues were responded to. This included issues of height - where height was reduced from 5 stories, plus a bonus to four stories, plus a bonus. Attorney Yellin said there was no issue of height until the morning of the hearing. A group of persons present at that meeting said they should not be allowed to have a bonus floor in the RIP-D zoning district. He said in fact, the attorney for HSF said this is much too important of an issue for the Board to rely on an email. This seemed to be the sentiment at that time, let's not rely on an email; let's wait for an official ruling of the Zoning Administrator. Well, today, this is what the Historic District Review Board has - an official ruling of the Zoning Administrator. Now, what he hears now is they don't want that ruling because it is did not go the way they wanted it. So let's do it a different way. Let's wait for a text amendment; let's change the rule.

Attorney Yellin stated that the Zoning Administrator is charged with the responsibility of interpreting the ordinance. There has been times when he has received a ruling that he did not like, but the Zoning Administrator is the person charged with this responsibility. Therefore, to ignore a ruling of Zoning Administrator is like ignoring the ordinance itself. This is what's before the Review Board. Consequently, he is hopeful that this issue has been resolved. They would like very much for the Board to decide today the issue of height and mass so that Mr. Shay will be able to return on the issue of design details.

Mr. Shay, in response to the public comments, said he wanted to assure Dr. Summers and the Georgia Medical Society that they are doing their best to be very differential to the existing building. The Georgia Medical Society's building is a four-story building and theirs is a five-story building and the ordinance does allow one-story higher than an adjacent historic building. They have also incorporated several elements into the massing of the building to be differentiated. Therefore, they will continue to explore this when doing their design details to ensure that they are not doing anything that is overwhelming to the four-story building that is next to their five-story building.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board's discussion centered around the the roofline variation elements on the Huntingdon and Drayton Street facades to be restudied so as not to give the appearance of an additional story, the height of the bonus story needs to be visually compatible and less than that of the first story, continue the consistent storefront pattern at the area of solid reserved for signage, incorporate two additional entrances along Huntingdon Street to access the hybrid areas, and one additional entrance along Drayton Street to access the dining area.

They discussed that all roof access structures be contained within the bonus story and the need to redesign the Drayton Street elevation to be more sensitive to the height of the adjacent historic building at 612 Drayton Street.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for Part I: Height and Mass with the following conditions to be resubmitted with Part II: Design Details because the project is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Restudy the roofline variation elements on the Huntingdon and Drayton Street facades to not give the appearance of an additional story.
2. Reduce the height of the bonus story to be visually compatible and less than that of the first story.
3. On the north, Huntingdon Street façade, on the ground floor, continue the consistent storefront pattern at the area of solid reserved for signage. - PASS
4. Incorporate two additional entrances along Huntingdon Street to access the hybrid areas, and one additional entrance along Drayton Street to access the dining area.
5. All roof access structures must be contained within the bonus story.
6. Redesign the Drayton Street elevation to be more sensitive to the height of the adjacent historic building at 612 Drayton Street.

Vote Results

Motion: Jennifer Deacon

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye

Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

25. [Petition of LS3P Dawson | 16-003490-COA | 10 East Broad Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [16-003490-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Signed Application.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- model photos.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Narrative.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Renderings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet- St Julian St detail.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Trustees' Garden.pdf](#)
Attachment: [16-003490-COA SPR Comments.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Petitioner Response to Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Deacon recused from participation in this petition. She is an employee of LS3P Dawson.

Mr. James Gallucci and Mr. Neil Dawson were present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of Part I: Height and Mass of a new, three story parking garage and event space on a vacant lot within the Trustees' Garden area. The building is located on an internal portion of the site and is significantly setback from any public right-of-ways, though it will be visible from East Broad Street, East Bay Street, Randolph Street, General McIntosh Blvd., East Broughton Street and St. Julian Street. Access to the site will be through a drive on the north side of the Pirate's House Restaurant parking lot, an easement drive from East Broughton Street, and a private drive which extends East St. Julian Street.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends a continuance to address the following:

1. Incorporate additional voids into the ground floor of the west and south facades to be visually compatible.
2. Redesign the west façade entrance configuration to provide a more substantial and compatible view shed from St. Julian Street with less focus on the automobile entrance and more focus on the pedestrian entrances.
3. Divide the one large, 31-foot wide automobile entrance into two smaller entrances on the west façade.
4. Reduce the automobile entrance width on the east and north façades to the minimum allowed or break into two smaller entrances.
5. Reduce the number of parking access points to the building.
6. Add an additional pedestrian entrance into the event space on the north façade;
7. Incorporate gates at all automobile entrances to better form a consistent wall of enclosure.
8. Increase the height of the second story to 12 feet to meet the standard.
9. On the south, east and west facades, redesign the roofline to meet the standard requiring a one-half story variation no less than every 60 linear feet of continuous

height.

10. Reduce the width of one bay on the north elevation, and one bay the west elevation to meet the standard requiring bay width to be between 15 and 20 feet.
11. Ensure the following standards are met:
 - a. The storefront glazing extends from a sill;
 - b. Storefront glazing, doors and windows are inset a minimum of four inches from the face of the building;
 - c. The parapet has a stringcourse and coping;
 - d. HVAC units shall be screened from the public right-of-way;
 - e. Refuse storage areas are located within a building or screened from the public right-of-way;
 - f. The curb cut at East Broughton Street is limited to 20 feet wide; and
 - g. The sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveways in materials, configuration, and height.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Gallucci said they have addressed the staff's recommendations and based on the information that they are going to show the Board today, they are asking the Board to grant Part I approval with the conditions that they can present at the Part II - Design Details review. He said regarding the staff's recommendations, they have added green screen to the lower levels. They have continued the architectural sod treatment down to the lower level to create the solid to void relationship. They agree with staff's recommendation on number 2 and 3. They believe making the change makes this area more pedestrian friendly by reducing the scale of the opening. They have also extended the canopy to the north and south to cover the pedestrian access points. Mr. Gallucci said that regarding staff's recommendations for number 4 and 5, currently they have three access points and have already reduced the width of the entrance point. He said in order to accommodate service trucks and emergency vehicles with their turning radius that the width of the opening is at extent that it could be. In addition to two-way traffic, he believes they are just over 24 feet. Additionally, they want to be able to pull the service through here and exit out on the east façade in order to keep the trucks off of St. Julian Street and maintain it as a pedestrian area. For these reasons, they want to maintain these openings as they are.

Mr. Gallucci said regarding staff's recommendation #10, this is directly above the entrance point. He showed the Board the north elevation plan view. The entrance point is setback approximately a football field length away to the public right-of-way about 300 feet. He said they agree with staff regarding the west façade. They will further investigate this and create a different bay rhythm along the west façade. In this case, they have divided their bay spacing from approximately 35 feet. Currently, it now fits within the ordinance as the bays are under 16 feet. He said regarding the staff's recommendation for #6, is a design oversight. This was intended to be a door and they have corrected this as a part of their revisions. He explained that regarding staff's recommendation for #8, their red line represents the top of the second floor; pertaining to the spandrel, they will continue to work with staff during Part II to better express the 13'-3" expression where the second floor is located. In areas of the building where there are no openings, they will probably express this through some other architectural feature, such as scoring, in the precast concrete or something else that will express this. The floor-to-floor height is ten feet, but they are trying to get the second floor expression to read as 13'-3" to meet the ordinance requirement.

Mr. Gallucci said that staff's recommendation #9 concerns the roofline variation to meet large scale. He explained that they have outlined in red their bay spacing. They feel that what they have put forth does, in fact, meet the standard for large scale development. The different bay spacing passing the roofline basically shows the intent. Problematically, they feel this works with parking structures and any other protrusions up off the roof may feel forced. Furthermore, they feel that the intention here is for the setback standard for the façade. The ordinance reads that a four feet setback is needed every 30 feet minimum; in this case they have bays within the 30 feet minimum. They are stepping back and in these locations they cannot get four foot setback to work for the parking deck. It will not work with this design. But, they do feel the intent is there. He wants to make sure that the bricks and roofline and the variation created by the bays are sufficient and are meeting the standards. Mr. Gallucci said that their landscape architect was present to talk about the pedestrian path leading up to St. Julian access point.

Mr. Eric Wasnovich, Landscape Architect, said they understand the comments as far as St. Julian Street being a terminal street. They agree with the ideas in the guidelines as far as complete streets are concerned. They would love to see this happen as a pedestrian mall. They will incorporate plantings.

Mr. Gallucci said they are asking the Board for approval of Part I - Height and Mass today along with the conditions to be presented in Part II - Design Details review. He said if the Board prefers, they will ask for a continuance, but that they be able to present Part I and Part II together.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said the HSF has concerns about the overall height and prominence of the building. They understand what is allowed and that the building is setback within the site; however, they do not think the scale fits in with the surrounding context. This will be the biggest and tallest building in this area. Based on the street views that have been shown, it can be seen from all vantage points rising above the historic buildings. The HSF does not believe that it is appropriate that a parking garage should be the focal point. Therefore, they believe this building overwhelms the historic buildings. They would like to see the height restudied.

Ms. Meunier said character areas may not have specific standards, they believe it was made a character area because there are specific contexts that should be considered. She believes the character area is a low scale context and they believe this is something that should be considered. If it is a matter of meeting the park requirements for these sites, it certainly is understandable. However, they recall that a proposed hotel and parking garage north of this site, north of Bay Street which included substantial parking made assurances that it would provide public parking and also could provide parking for Trustees Garden. Therefore, they question whether it is necessary to have this big structure. In addition, although it is being proposed to reopen a part of St. Julian Street, they feel that the parking structure is creating a visual and a pedestrian barrier on St. Julian Street. It is somewhat cutting off the view and now the view will essentially be into the parking garage.

Ms. Meunier said while they agree with a lot of the pedestrian improvements and landscaping that they are going to make on St. Julian Street, they are not sure where this is

encouraging the pedestrian to go because they will just be walking to the parking garage as it cuts off access to the Kehoe Ironworks which is a part of the site. Therefore, they believe this should be included as well. They agree with staff regarding making St. Julian Street more pedestrian accessible. They have seen some of the changes that the petitioner has made and they agree with adding the entrances and making two automobile entrances. They also believe that the open stairway on the northwest corner of the building should be restudied. As proposed, it seems to be placing a utilitarian and functional part of the building on one of the most visible spots.

Mr. Neil Dawson, in response to public comments, said the issues stated were issues that they thoroughly considered when they were looking at the overall master plan. Mr. Dawson said he would review the site plan to give the Board the context to why they chose the site for a parking deck. He said although it is cutoff, but the Board will recall that Kehoe building is along Broughton Street coming down to the metal building. It forms a south edge to the Trustees Garden. An amphitheater is proposed and the Morris Center is here. Therefore, their thought was the parking structure which is required by the ordinance that they have 255 spaces in order to meet the requirements. They have a significant variance already. They felt this area creates a focal point where the people could park. This is really envisioned for pedestrian access and cars. They felt the entrance boulevard which currently serves is where everybody would walk into the Morris Center would give them the opportunity to create that same type of complete street.

Mr. Dawson said the parking deck would form into an interior edge on the west side of Trustees Garden for the amphitheater, the historic Fort Wayne wall, the beautiful green space that will be used for events, Morris Center, and for the other events that will spill out of Kehoe. He said this was really not intentionally. Where do you put 255 cars on Trustees Garden that does not have some type of dramatic impact. They felt there was no better place than the existing surface parking lot to do this. This gives them an edge that they can control and brings the patrons to Trustees Garden where there is easy access to all of the buildings, the amphitheater, Kehoe Center and the Morris Center.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that there were too many conditions in Part I - Height and Mass for approval with the conditions to be presented in Part II - Design Details. They also discussed that the revisions were submitted to staff today, but should have been submitted in a timely manner in order for the Board to review them. Mr. Gunther said he agreed with the HSF. The massing is overpowering and to change the focus in this character area from an industrial heritage and a Trustees Garden heritage to an auto centric parking garage heritage does not seem appropriate. Mr. Gunther said while he understands the need for parking, but believes there are more sensible ways to accomplish it. A building should be able to express itself and not be wrapped in vegetation.

Mr. Merriman asked the petitioner if they were asking for a continuance for Part I.

Mr. Dawson answered yes; however, they are requesting that the Board give them some feedback on two specific items. They are: (1) the width of the openings on the north and east which they cannot change because of loading dock requirements for trucks, and (2) the height variation. They believe they have met the intent of the standard for large building ordinance, but they do not know if the Board wants them to add towers on the corners, etc.

to more fully engage this. Mr. Dawson said if the Board feels a variance is appropriate, they will be willing to ask for it.

The Board discussed that the petitioner needs to meet the standards. Staff suggested that one entrance be made one way and the other entrance the opposite way.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition in order to address the following:

1. Incorporate additional voids into the ground floor of the west and south facades to be visually compatible.
2. Redesign the west façade entrance configuration to provide a more substantial and compatible view shed from St. Julian Street with less focus on the automobile entrance and more focus on the pedestrian entrances.
3. Divide the one large, 31-foot wide automobile entrance into two smaller entrances on the west façade.
4. Reduce the automobile entrance width on the east and north façades to the minimum allowed or break into two smaller entrances.
5. Reduce the number of parking access points to the building.
6. Add an additional pedestrian entrance into the event space on the north façade;
7. Incorporate gates at all automobile entrances to better form a consistent wall of enclosure.
8. Increase the height of the second story to 12 feet to meet the standard.
9. On the south, east and west facades, redesign the roofline to meet the standard requiring a one-half story variation no less than every 60 linear feet of continuous height. - PASS
10. Reduce the width of one bay on the north elevation, and one bay the west elevation to meet the standard requiring bay width to be between 15 and 20 feet.
11. Ensure the following standards are met:
 - a. The storefront glazing extends from a sill;
 - b. Storefront glazing, doors and windows are inset a minimum of four inches from the face of the building;
 - c. The parapet has a stringcourse and coping;

- d. HVAC units shall be screened from the public right-of-way;
- e. Refuse storage areas are located within a building or screened from the public right-of-way;
- f. The curb cut at East Broughton Street is limited to 20 feet wide; and
- g. The sidewalk serves as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveways in materials, configuration, and height.

Vote Results

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Kellie Fletcher

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Abstain
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

26. [Petition of Gary Sanders | 16-003488-COA | 535 East Charlton Street | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Survey Card.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Visually Related Buildings.pdf](#)

Attachment: [1973 Sanborn Map.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Shingle Specification.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Paint Colors.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. McGarrity left the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

Mr. Gary Sanders was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sara Farr gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations at 535 East Charlton Street. The work includes color changes, new shingles, roof repair, new windows, and relocating the front door. The foundation will also be repaired, but this work will not be visible. The proposed colors are "Morning on the Moor," a mint green, and "Welcoming White," but the locations are not specified. The roof work includes new metal flashing, new fascia, new soffits, and new shingles. The fascia and soffits will match the existing. The shingles will be asphalt Supreme Shingles in "Estate Gray" manufactured by

Owens Corning.

Ms. Farr stated that the window on the north façade will be replaced within the existing opening; however, the existing window is a double window and the new window is proposed to be a triple window. A new opening is proposed on the porch for a relocated entrance. The new door will be a wood paneled door with four lites at the top. On the east façade all the windows will be replaced in the existing openings. One new opening will also be created for a window, but it is not shown on the elevation. In addition, two window openings are proposed to be blocked in. On the south façade a new window is proposed in the existing opening. The existing door will be removed and a larger opening created for the rear door. On the west façade the windows will be replaced in the two existing openings. One window opening is proposed to be blocked in. The existing front entrance door located off the front porch will be removed and the opening blocked in. On the south façade all windows are proposed to be Anderson 400 series double hung windows. The changes proposed for the rear façade of the building will not be visible from the public right-of-way, so they are not included in the review.

Ms. Farr explained that previous COAs (H-19860601-361-2 and H-19860501-365-2) did not include any structural changes to the exterior of the house. They were for color changes, in-kind repairs, and a fence. The historic resources survey card indicates that the windows were double hung, flat-headed, 6/6, and rectangular. These windows have been changed, but there is no COA record of this. The visually related houses of a similar construction period have a variety of window types, but all are double windows in the front. It is unclear if the windows on the historic resources card were original to the building and no material is specified. Overall, the house is an intact example of mid-century architecture that has had minor modifications.

Ms. Farr reported that staff recommends denial of the following alterations:

1. Relocation of the front entrance;
2. Infill of existing windows on the east façade;
3. The new window opening on the east façade;

Because the work does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Ms. Farr additionally reported that staff recommends approval for the remaining alterations to 535 East Charlton Street with the following conditions:

1. Indicate where the proposed paint colors will be used;
2. The front window remains a double window;
3. Single pane, true divided lite, wood or metal windows are used;
4. Windows are inset a minimum of three inches;

Because otherwise the work meets the standard and is visually compatible.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Sanders explained that the little house is one of six that are in a row. Four of the houses are almost identical. Their house has the side entryway; all the other houses have front entryways. The floor plan is being reworked and it is difficult with the side entryway. Their primary purpose is for them to be able to move the front door. The windows, without altering the openings, can be single pane. They prefer the Anderson 400 windows; these

windows have prior approval to be used in the Historic District. The width of the house is the primary reason they want to remove the door. The side window on the front is visible, but the window behind the chimney is not visible. As far as the openings, whether they remain where they are or move, there is no rhythm that is preserved.

Mr. Sanders showed the Board where the existing door was located. They are willing to replace the door with a window if this pleases the Board. He would rather have it closed. They are extremely flexible with whatever the Board wants them to do. Single pane is fine, double window is fine; they just went to the trouble for them to meet the three-over-five standard. The window on the front is a metal, aluminum awning window. If there is an assumption about what is original, it is likely to be the metal window and not the six-over-six window. Therefore, if a six-over-six window is put here, the false history would come from this, rather than what they would have.

Mr. Sanders stated that they will submit the colors to staff. Their primary reason is to be able to remove the front door. They would rather have the insulated windows, but this is not that important to them. But, as he said, removing the front door is important to the project. They want the house to have character. Consequently, they want to be able to move the door from the side to the front.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the door removal. The door is the defining character of the house. They were in agreement with the staff's recommendation.

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the petition for the following alterations:

1. Relocation of the front entrance;
2. Infill of existing windows on the east façade;
3. The new window opening on the east façade;

Because the work does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the remaining alterations, which include window replacement, roof repair, new shingles, and color changes, to 535 - PASS East Charlton Street with the following conditions to be submitted for staff approval:

1. Indicate where the proposed paint colors will be used;
2. The front window remains a double window;
3. Single pane, true divided lite, wood or metal

windows are used;

4. Windows are inset a minimum of three inches;

Because otherwise the work meets the standard and is visually compatible.

Vote Results

Motion: Justin Gunther

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Kellie Fletcher - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Andy McGarrity - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

27. [Petition of Christian Sottile | 16-003171-COA | 316 East State Street | Staff Approved - Iron Gates](#)

Attachment: [COA - 316 State Street 16-003171-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 316 State Street 16-003171-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Loretto Lominack for St. Vincent's Adademy | 16-003196-COA | 207 East Liberty Street | Staff Approved - Demolish and Rebuild East Wall](#)

Attachment: [COA - 207 East Liberty Street 16-003196-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [S1.0-Layout1.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Amended Petition of Luis Burgos for Hansen Architects, P.C. | 16-003223-COA | 25 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 25 East Broughton Street 16-003223-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 25 East Broughton Street 16-003223-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Barbara Treadwell | 16-003280-COA | 11 Houston Street | Staff Approved - Color Change and Lamps](#)

Attachment: [COA - 11 Houston Street 16-003280-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 11 Houston Street b16-003280-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of David Cutlip for Savannah Seafood Shack | 16-003281-COA | 116 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Change](#)

Attachment: [116 East Broughton Street 16-003281-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 116 East Broughton Street 16-003281-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Donnie Rushing for Coastal Canvas Products | 16-003282-COA | 32 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 32 East Broughton Street 16-003282-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 32 East Broughton Street 16-003282-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Donnie Rushing for Coastal Canvas Products | 16-003284-COA | 319-321 West Congress Street | Staff Approved - Awnings](#)

Attachment: [COA - 319-321 West Congress Street 16-003284-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 319-321 West Congress Street 16-003284-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Amended Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 16-003286-COA | 412 Williamson Street | Staff Approved - Amendments](#)

Attachment: [COA - 412 Williamson Street 16-003286-CCOA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 412 Williamson Street 16-003286-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of John and Kelley Tarr | 16-003288-COA | 221 West River Street | Staff Approved - Replace Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 221 West River Street 16-003288-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 221 West River Street 3288-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Trinity United Methodist Church | 16-003294-COA | 225 West President Street | Staff Approved - Window Replacement](#)

Attachment: [COA - 225 President Street 16-03294-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 225 West President Street 16-003294-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Patrick Phelps for Hansen Architects | 16-003296 | 245 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 245 Bull Street 16-003296-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 245 Bull Street 16-003296-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 2 - 245 Bull Street 16-003296-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Eric O'Neill for Homeline Architecture | 16-003349-COA | 417 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 417 East Broughton Street 16-003349-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 417 East Broughton Street 16-003349-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Amended Petition of Marcie Hill for City Market Partners Limited Partnership | 16-003421-COA | 219 West St. Julian Street | Staff Approved - Footbridge](#)

Attachment: [COA - 219 West St. Julian Street 16-003421-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [City Market Pedestrian Footbridge \(HDBR 06-10-16 AMENDED\).pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Petition of Jimmy A. Paiz | 16-003443-COA | 501 Hartridge Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 501 Hartridge Street 16-003443-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 501 Hartridge Street 16-003443-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. [Amended Petition of Patrick Phelps for Hansen Architects | 16-003453-COA | 255 East Perry Street \[South Building\] | Staff Approved - Revisions](#)

Attachment: [COA - 255 East Perry Street 16-003453-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [1496 - Perry Lane Hotel South Building - COA Amendment Application - 6-14-16.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Drawings - 255 East Perry Street 16-003453-COA \(South Building\).pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. [Amended Petition of Patrick Phelps for Hansen Architects | 16-003454-COA | 256 East Perry Street \[North Building\] | Staff Approved - Revisions](#)

Attachment: [COA - 256 East Perry Street 16-003454-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [1496 - Perry Lane Hotel North Building - COA Amendment Application - 6-14-16 \(00000002\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [Drawings - 256 East Perry Street 16-003454-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. [Petition of Ryan R. Murphy | 16-003481-COA | 314 West Jones Street | Staff Approved - Gate Repair and Modifications](#)

Attachment: [COA - 314 West Jones Street 16-003481-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. [Petition of Clegg Ivey | 16-003500-COA | 518 MLK Jr. Blvd. | Staff Approved - Window Decal Signs](#)

Attachment: [COA - 518 MLK Jr. Blvd 16-003500-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 518 MLK Jr. Blvd 16-003500-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

45. [Petition of James F. Reardon for Reardon Design, LLC | 16-003543-COA | 223 West Broughton Lane | Staff Approved - Alterations and Screening](#)

Attachment: [COA - 223 West Broughton Lane 16-003543-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 223 West Broughton Lane 16-003543-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

46. [Amended Petition of Gretchen Callejas | 16-003559-COA | 641 Indian Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 641 Indian Street 16-003559-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [COA - 641 Indian Street 16-3559-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

47. [Petition of Gordon Taylor for Whitlow Construction Co., Inc. | 16-003697-COA | 15 East Jones Street | Staff Approved - Brick Repointing](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 15 East Jones Street 16-003697-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [COA - 16 East Jones Street 16-003697-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

48. [Petition of Laura Mayers for Verizon Wireless | 16-003756-COA | 2 West Bay Street and 28 West Bay Street | Staff Approved - Install Concealed Wireless Cellular Communications Equipment](#)

Attachment: [COA - 2 West Bay Street and 28 West Bay Street 16-003756-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 2 West Bay Street 16-003756-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

49. [Petition of Scott Hinson | 16-003766-COA | 419 East Taylor Street | Staff Approved - Color Change, Alterations, Demolition and Fence](#)

Attachment: [COA - 419 East Taylor Street 16-003766-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 419 East Taylor Street 16-003766-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

50. [Petition of Donnie Rushing for Coastal Canvas, LLC | 16-003789-COA | 216 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 216 West Broughton Street 16-003789-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 216 West Broughton Street 16-003789-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 7-13-16.pdf](#)

Mr. Merriman explained that staff has given the Board the report on the work performed with a Certificate of Appropriateness.

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

52. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, July 14, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

53. [Next Regular Meeting - Wednesday, August 10, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

54. [Review Proposed Revisions to the Historic District Ordinance](#)

Attachment: [SHD Large Scale Development Archaeology Policy - DRAFT 5-9-16.pdf](#)

Attachment: [SHD Large Scale Development Public Art Policy - DRAFT 5-9-16.pdf](#)

Attachment: [5-11-16 HDBR Version- for discussion.pdf](#)

New Business

55. Discuss Potential Text Amendment Related to Zoning Administrator's Interpretation Regarding RIP-D District

Attachment: [Savannah Local Historic District Zoning Map.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Savannah Historic District Zoning Definitions.pdf](#)

Attachment: [West Elm Bonus Story - Zoning Administrator Opinion.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Future Land Use Map - Overall.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Future Land Use Map - Detail.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Option 1- Text Amendment.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Option 2 - Text Amendment.pdf](#)

Ms. Michalak reported that after the Board's hearing of 607 Drayton Street at last month's meeting concerning whether or not RIP-D was considered an "R" zoning district or "all other zoning" district. She stated that the Board asked: (1) to receive the Zoning Administrator's interpretation and (2) asked the staff to propose a text amendment to clarify the issue based on the Zoning Administrator's determination.

Ms. Michalak said the staff has prepared a proposed text amendment for the Board to review. They have two options. After the Board approves the proposed text amendment, it will be sent to the Metropolitan Planning Commission with a recommendation to send it to City Council.

Ms. Michalak said Option 1 was done to primarily strike the confusing parts of the ordinance in the Large-Scale Development standards which reads "the base zoning district determines if the property if an "R" zoning district (~~"R" zoning districts have the word "residential" in the zoning district nomenclature~~) (See ~~Section 8-3025, Development Standards~~). For the purposes of this subsection, ~~R-B-C and RIP-C follow the standards for "R" zoning districts.~~ the following are classified as "R" zoning districts:

- R-B-C, R-B-C-1, RIP-A, RIP-A-1, RIP-B/P-RIP-B, RIP-B-1, RIP-C, R-M-25, R-B-1

and the following are classified as "All Other Zoning Districts:"

- RIP-D, B-B, B-C/P-B-C, B-C-1, B-G, P-BG-1, P-BG-2, I-L, C-R, B-N, P-BN-1,

PUD-IS-B.

Ms. Michalak said, however, RIP-D was not mentioned.

Ms. Michalak explained that staff came up with Option 2 to read as "the base zoning district determines if the property is in an "R" zoning district ("R" zoning districts have the word "residential" in the zoning district nomenclature) (See Section-3025, Development Standards) with the exception of the RIP-D district which is considered non-residential for the purpose of this section. ~~For the purposes of this subsection, R-B-C and RIP-C follow the standards for "R" zoning districts.~~

Ms. Lynch stated she believes Option 2 is clearer. She asked Ms. Michalak to give some background on what differentiates the RIP-D from all the other districts. She asked, did the Zoning Administrator consider any of the other "R" Districts as applying as well?

Ms. Michalak explained Ms. Harris and the Zoning Administrator spent several hours going through the history, etc. before coming up with this determination. She believed that all the zoning districts were looked at to see what was ultimately the difference.

Mr. Thomson, MPC Executive Director, stated that the compelling thing for him is that in the draft of the New Zoning Ordinance the area of RIP-D was classified as a D-C which is a new designation and means "Downtown Commercial." Therefore, we have a D-C, D-R, D-X. Mr. Thomson said there are at least four different "Ds" downtown. Consequently, this was anticipated and also the Future Land Use Map shows this as a commercial (red area versus yellow on the map). This was recognized as a higher density mixed-use district.

Ms. Harris explained that she pulled up the Future Land Use Map. The challenge for the Zoning Administrator when looking a head at the New ZO (The New ZO has not been adopted). The Future Land Use Map has been adopted. She explained, therefore, as the Board sees this shows more intensive commercial uses. RIP-D of the "R" districts is more intensive than RIP-A, B, or C in terms of the uses that it allows. Ms. Harris said she believes this is where the Zoning Administrator felt that in this particular case, he pushed it into the more commercial category rather than the residential category. This is certainly a grey area and there is a scale of residential versus commercial, but this was pushed over into the commercial side.

Ms. Michalak gave some background on RIP-D. She explained that between some other staff members of MPC and her they narrowed down that RIP-D was created in early 2000's. This was done specifically to add an alcohol use to RIP-A. In 2010, a text amendment for RIP-D was created to increase the density from 70 residential uses per acre to 100 residential uses. These are the two major differences.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation stated she understood the proposed text amendment that the Board is discussing now is to fast forward to MPC and then to City Council to get clarification. Ms. Meunier believes this is great. She commented that Option 1 is clear as it lists all the districts, but hesitation is if a new zoning district is added, they would end up with the same problem they have now. Ms. Meunier explained, however, that her hesitation with Option 2 is it specifically points out RIP-D as a nonresidential district. Although, she realized that this was just explained, but being an "R" district in the sentence before saying that "R" districts are residential districts and then saying that RIP-D is not residential, she suggested this wording be looked at some more. Ms. Meunier agreed that it is more specific to say with the exception of this district.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board agreed that Option 2 be recommended to the MPC as the proposed Text Amendment for the RIP-D pertaining to Large-Scale Development pertaining to the Height Standards in Section (n)(2).

Board Action:

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby recommend to the Metropolitan Planning Commission the proposed text amendment be approved and forward to the Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Savannah:

e. Height.

i. Large-Scale Development shall be subject to the Height standards in Section (n)(2) and the provisions of Table 1. The base zoning district ("R" zoning districts have the word "residential" in the zoning district nomenclature). (See Section 8-3025, Development Standards) [with the exception of the RIP-D which is considered all other zoning districts for the purposes of this section](#) - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Becky Lynch

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Kellie Fletcher	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

XV. ADJOURNMENT

56. [Adjournment](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, Mr. Merriman adjourned the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Leah G. Michalak
Historic Preservation Planner

LGM::mem