



## Savannah Historic District Board of Review

---

VIRTUAL Meeting  
May 13, 2020 - 1:00 P.M.  
MINUTES

### MAY 13, 2020 SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Members Present: Dwayne Stephens, Chair  
Nan Taylor, Vice-Chair  
David Altschiller  
Stephen Bodek  
Kevin Dodge  
Stan Houle  
Ellie Isaacs  
Becky Lynch  
Melissa Memory

MPC Staff Present: Leah Michalak, Director of Historic Preservation  
Ryan Jarles, Cultural Resources Planner  
Alyson Smith, Historic Preservation  
Planner  
Bri Morgan, Administrative Assistant

#### I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

#### II. SIGN POSTING

#### III. CONSENT AGENDA

[1. Approve All Items on the Consent Agenda](#)

[2. Petition of VerdeSol, Keith Freeman | 20-001106-COA | 649 West Jones Street | Freestanding Solar PV System](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[☞ Staff Recommendation 20-001109-COA.pdf](#)

#### **Motion**

Approval to install a pole mounted solar PV system for the Garrison Elementary property at 649 West Jones Street with the following condition because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Provide the material and color selection for the system supports.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: David Altschiller

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[3. Petition of LS3P Associates LTD. | 20-001503-COA | 110 Ann Street | Amendments to New Construction Hotel](#)

- [☞ Staff Recommendation - 20-001503-COA.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Narrative.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Material and Color Samples.pdf](#)
- [☞ Previously Approved Drawings.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approval for amendments to the previously approved new construction hotel for the property located at 110 Ann Street as requested because the proposed changes are visually compatible and meet the standards.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: David Altschiller

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[4. Petition of LS3P Associates LTD. | 20-001510-COA | 111 Ann Street | Amendments to New Construction Apartment Building](#)

- 📎 [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 📎 [111AnnSt\\_20200312\\_HDBRAMD2 \(19-004727-COA\).pdf](#)
- 📎 [Material Samples.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approval of the amendments to the previously approved new construction multi-family building at 111 Ann Street because the revisions are visually compatible and meet the design standards.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: David Altschiller

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[5. Petition of Array Design | 20-001834-COA | 201 East Charlton Street | Alterations](#)

- 📎 [map.pdf](#)
- 📎 [APP 20-001834 201 E Charlton.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Staff Recommendation 20-001834-COA - Copy.pdf](#)
- 📎 [PIX 20-001834 201 E Charlton.pdf](#)

Steven Bodek recused himself from this item as he is the General Contractor on this project.

**Motion**

Approval for alterations to 201 East Charlton Street with the following condition because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that the door is inset not less than 3 inches from the facade.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: David Altschiller

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye

David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Abstain

[6. Petition of Signs By James, LLC | 20-002076-COA | 112 West Broughton Street | Sign](#)

[📎 Staff Recommendation 20-002076-COA.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approval for a principal use projecting sign for the property located at 112 West Broughton Street as requested because the proposed sign is visually compatible and meets the sign standards.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: David Altschiller

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

**IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

[7. Adopt the May 13, 2020 Agenda](#)

**Motion**

Approve the May 13, 2020 Historic District Board of Review Agenda as presented.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Stan Houle

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye

Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

## V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### 8. Approve March 11, 2020 Briefing Minutes and March 11, 2020 Regular Meeting Minutes

📎 [march-11-2020-savannah-historic-district-board-of-review-minutes.pdf](#)

#### **Motion**

Approve March 11, 2020 Briefing and Regular Meeting Minutes as presented.

#### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: David Altschiller

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

### 9. Approve March 19, 2020 Special Called Meeting Minutes

📎 [03.19.20 SPECIAL CALLED MEETING MINUTES.pdf](#)

#### **Motion**

Approve March 19, 2020 Special Called Meeting Minutes as presented.

#### **Vote Results ( Not Started )**

Motion:

Second:

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

## VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

### 10. Continue All Items on the Continued Agenda

#### **Motion**

Continue as requested.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[11. Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 16-006852-COA | 630 East River Street | New Construction Parking Garage: Part II, Design Details](#)

**Motion**

Continue.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[12. Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, Shay | 17-002122-COA | 602 East River Street \(Hotel Anne\) | New Construction Part II: Design Details](#)

**Motion**

Continue.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[13. Petition of Ethos Preservation | 19-004724-COA | 219 East Charlton Street | Amendments and Alterations](#)

**Motion**

Continue.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

**VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION**

[14. Petition of SHEDDarchitecture | 18-006336-COA | 514-524 East Liberty Street | New Construction Part II Design Details - 12 Month Extension](#)

- 📎 [Staff Recommendation - 12 Month Extension.pdf](#)
- 📎 [COA Extension Request 4-9-20.pdf](#)
- 📎 [COA - 514-524 East Liberty Street 18-006336-COA.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approval of a 12-month extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) issued on April 10, 2019 for New Construction Part II: Design Details for six, two story townhouses/carriage houses along Liberty Lane at 514-524 East Liberty Street to expire on April 10, 2021.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs  
Second: David Altschiller  
Becky Lynch - Aye  
Dwayne Stephens - Abstain  
Melissa Memory - Aye  
David Altschiller - Aye  
Nan Taylor - Aye  
Kevin Dodge - Aye  
Stan Houle - Aye  
Ellie Isaacs - Aye  
Steven Bodek - Aye

[15. Petition of SHEDDarchitecture | 18-006335-COA | 504 East Liberty Street | New Construction Part II: Design Details - 12 Month Extension](#)

- 📎 [COA Extension Request 4-9-20.pdf](#)
- 📎 [COA - 504 East Liberty Street 18-006335-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Staff Recommendation - 12 Month Extension.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approval of a 12-month extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) issued on April 10, 2019 for New Construction Part II: Design Details of a new three story building at 504 East Liberty Street to expire on April 10, 2021.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs  
Second: David Altschiller  
Becky Lynch - Aye  
Dwayne Stephens - Abstain  
Melissa Memory - Aye  
David Altschiller - Aye  
Nan Taylor - Aye  
Kevin Dodge - Aye  
Stan Houle - Aye  
Ellie Isaacs - Aye  
Steven Bodek - Aye

**IX. REGULAR AGENDA**

[16. Petition of Greenline Architecture | 17-002904-COA | 63 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. | New Construction Part II: Design Details](#)

- 📎 [17-002904-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Narrative, Materials, and Specifications.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Renderings.pdf](#)



- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Supplemental Awning and Trellis Information.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Mass Model.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Public Comment.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previous Material Samples.pdf](#)

**Ms. Leah Michalak** presented the petitioner's request for approval of amendments to New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass and for Part II, Design Details for a six (6) story hotel at 63 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. The project is classified as Large-Scale Development and the petitioner is requesting one bonus story above the Height Map (this is a 5-story height zone).

Per the petitioner, the Part I amendments (and conditions of the previous approval) include: a room size change that has affected the exterior façade. The previous submissions had smaller rooms at the east side of the building, and these have been revised to now have larger rooms more consistent through all floors. This change caused revisions to all elevations in window spacing and tower element placements, the project still meets all the requirements of Part 1. As follows: 1.) Tower placement has shifted slightly to the west approximately one bay. 2.) All windows have shifted to adjust to the new room layouts. 3.) Curtain wall on the north façade has been reduced due to symmetry and tower placement. 4.) Added natural stone to the west façade (Ann Street) to meet the 2% shortage as previously submitted and to the north and south façade at towers to be consistent in design approach. All facades meet the 30% minimum natural stone and no variance is being requested. 5.) A fifth primary entrance has been added to the south (Zubley, west corner) façade. 6.) Interior floor plan at ground and roof level also modified to meet new placement of elevators.

Per the petitioner, with regard to Part II Design Details: revisions per the previous Staff and Board recommendations were made as follows: 7.) The brick color revised to be lighter, and have a less monotone, warmer finish as per the request of the Board. 8.) The mortar color to better blend with the brick. 9.) Revised the design of the metal panels to be consistent over the entire façade, with panels at towers to be accented differently, a cleaner style, making the panels constructible. 10.) Color selections, materials for: doors, storefront, vehicular gates, refuse gates, stone sill under storefront have been provided. 11.) Windows are to be Marvin Modern casement window series or equal. Operable windows as shown on the elevations enlarged window details. 12.) Awning details and section are included in the document, A5 sheets. Awning is +/- 13' above grade 13.) Drawings and details of proposed trellis included. Top of trellis is 11' maximum or less. 13.) All windows and doors, all floors, to be inset 4" minimum, and is reflected in the revised drawings.

The proposed building was originally reviewed under a previous version of the Historic District Ordinance (2015-2018 version); therefore, the prior version still applies.

### **PETTITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Keith Howington** stated he is in agreement with Staff comments and appreciates the Board's previous recommendations. He stated the project looks better.

### **BOARD COMMENTS**

There were no Board comments or questions.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay**, HSF, stated his organization supports the project. Stated would like to see more embellishment under the facades facing Martin Luther King, Jt. Blvd.

**Mr. Howington** responded that they were trying to create a simple design.

One letter of opposition was submitted and is on record in the file. The citizen expressed concern regarding the darkness of the building.

#### **Motion**

Approval for amendments to New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass and for Part II, Design Details for a six (6) story hotel at 63 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. as requested because the proposal is visually compatible and meets the standards.

#### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

#### [17. Petition of Lott Barber | 18-006769-COA | 145 Montgomery Street | New Construction: Part I Amendments and Part II Design Details](#)

- 📎 [18-006769-COA Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Closed Streets and Lanes Map.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Liberty Ward.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Previously Approved 2.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet 2.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet 1.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Narrative.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Previously Approved 1.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Public Comment.pdf](#)

**Ms. Leah Michalak** presented the petitioner's request for approval of amendments to New Construction: Part I Height and Mass and New Construction: Part II, Design Details of the Chatham County Courthouse Expansion building on the south end of the property at 145 Montgomery Street. The new building is a monumental structure and the principal entrance

is located on Oglethorpe Avenue. The proposed site consists of two titling blocks and York Lane. This is the 45-day notification for HDBR comment, pursuant to the Georgia Historic Act of 1980.

Amendments to Part 1, Height and Mass are: 1) The south façade and portico have been redesigned to create a symmetrical façade along Oglethorpe. The portico, “previously angular, is now a curve”; 2) “All four elevations have been revised”; 3) The building height “has been reduced slightly”; and 4) Landscape has been revised (not in HDBR’s purview). Regarding the Part II, Design Details: Although materials were not reviewed with Part I, information regarding the intended materials were provided to the Board by the applicant during the meetings. “As a cost savings measure the County has replaced all marble, limestone and granite surfaces with precast.”

**This project, because the review process began prior to the adoption of NewZO on September 1, 2019, will continue to be reviewed under Section 8-3030 (the previous zoning ordinance).**

The existing historic context is extremely eroded. There are small scale contributing residences along York Street and more commercial buildings on Broughton Street. The only contributing monumental building within the context is the former BPA Synagogue (now owned by SCAD) at 120 Montgomery Street. The only large-scale development are the Slotin Building at 101 MLK and 217 MLK Blvd., both built as commercial warehouses.

It is important to note that with the 2018 historic district ordinance revisions, monumental buildings are now subject to the streets and lanes provisions, which they were not subject to when the project was initially approved in 2012.

It is four stories and is in five story height zone. The previously approved building height was approximately 77 feet tall plus mechanical equipment. The height at the highest parapet is now 75'-8" with mechanical screening at 76'-2" and the stair tower roof at 77'-3". The revised height is visually compatible. The front façade (south) and portico have been redesigned. The portico and front entry have been relocated to the center of the façade; the façade is not symmetrical. The revised proportions are visually compatible. The majority of the opening proportions have remained the same. New windows have been added in the recesses of the north façade which are vertical in nature. The proportion of openings is visually compatible. The location of openings have been revised on all facades due to the redesign of the south wing. All windows on the east, west, and south shifted slightly and new windows (as described above) were added on the north. The revised rhythm of solids to voids is visually compatible. The entire building footprint moved to the north so that the new design of the south wing could be within the property lines. However, the building still does not protrude into the former location of York Street. The project still proposes the restoration of York Street, to the extent possible given the physical location of the building to the north which encroaches into the street.

The atrium is the same width and depth but colonnades were added spanning the width of the atrium on the east and west. While the historic context is very limited, the colonnades are not visually compatible. They are not a feature found on visually related contributing buildings and they break up the clear void of the glass atrium which is intended to represent the missing York Lane. Staff recommends that they be removed in their entirety.

“The Courthouse has been redesigned to create a symmetrical entrance elevation (south). The primary building entrances were moved to the west along the south elevation and the portico itself centered on the south elevation. The sunscreen was removed, the project of

the portico around the corner to offer clues to the entrance from the parking garage was removed. The columns, capitals, and cornice were revised. The two secondary exits along both the east and west facades remain unchanged. The revised rhythm of entrances and porch projection are visually compatible.

The roof is flat with parapet which is visually compatible. Roof elements have been simplified and lowered creating an even more compatible design. The cornice of the building was redesigned and enlarged “and decorative features added, including balustrades” within the parapet wall with open decorative balusters in a classical design. Staff recommendations that the design of the parapet balusters be simplified to be more in keeping with the simplistic design of the portico columns and as to not create a false sense of historical development with the classical design. The design of these balusters is also in conflict with the almost “Prairie” style decorative window panel design.

The building itself still forms a wall of continuity. The historic context is very limited and given the building’s civic use, the scale is visually compatible. The building is very horizontal in character, punctuated with vertical bays. The directional expression is visually compatible. The site is within the Oglethorpe Plan Area and does not reconstruct the historic ward pattern of streets and lanes. York Lane is not reconstructed. York Street is proposed to be reconstructed to the extent possible given the physical location of the building to the north which encroaches into the street. Both York Street and Lane are identified on the Closed Streets and Lanes Map within the Ordinance. The petitioner has received a variance from the ZBA for this standard. The lane is proposed to be bridged by development. The petitioner has received a variance from the ZBA for this standard. The building is greater than two stories. The basement does not count as a story. Only mechanical and access structures are proposed on the rooftop. The height of the ground floor is 16 feet, eight inches (which has not changed from previous approval). The height of the second story is 16 feet, eight inches (which has not changed from previous approval). The height of the third story is 16 feet, eight inches and height of the fourth story is 16 feet, 8 inches (which has not changed from previous approval). The building is subdivided horizontally into a base, middle and top; the height of the first story is the tallest, and the top story is distinctive. The property line is at a sharp angle and the south building façade is now straight and the portico is curved and at the center of the façade, whereas, previously it was angled to mimic the property line as did the portico. There is not a historic setback along the block front. There are significant utilities in the right of way which do not allow for encroachment.

The following PART II standards from the Historic District Section (8-3030) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance apply:

The proposed materials, textures, and colors are as follows and are visually compatible:

1. ROOF SYSTEM: Low-slope PVC, 60 MIL membrane (white in color) over lightweight insulating concrete.
2. COPING: Cast Stone Coping: Color: PC-1 “Limestone” architectural cast stone at high roof areas  
Color: PC-2 “Marble” architectural cast stone atop beams at east and west elevations  
Metal Gravel Stop: PAC-CLAD fully adhered extended fascia at top edge of Atrium exterior glass.  
Color: Match PPG “Duranar Sunstorm Bronze”
3. EXTERIOR WALL MATERIALS: Architectural Precast Concrete: Colors: PC-1 “Limestone” color to mimic natural limestone  
PC-2 “Marble” color to mimic GA white marble  
PC-3 “Honed Granite” color to mimic GA granite  
PC-4 “ Flamed Granite” color to mimic GA granite with rough texture
4. WINDOWS/STOREFRONT/CURTAINWALL OPENINGS: Glazing: Vitro Architectural Glass, color: Solarban 60 ACUITY + ACUITY 1-5/16” thick (all impact-rated

glazing)Spandrel: Insulated metal panel with embossed design; Color: PPG “Duranar Copper Penny”Framing: YKK-AP YHC 300 OG impact resistant, outside glazed curtain wall, color: PPG “Duranar Sunstorm Bronze”

5. DOORS:Glazing: Vitro Architectural Glass, color: Solarban 60 ACUITY + ACUITY 1-5/16” thick (all impact-rated glazing)Framing: YKK-AP 50H Door; Color: PPG “Duranar Sunstorm Bronze”

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDED COMMENTS:**

**Staff recommends the following comments be provided for considered related to the proposed Courthouse at 145 Montgomery Street to be more compatible with the surrounding historic context:**

1. **Remove the colonnades on the exterior of the atrium in their entirety;**
2. **Simplify the design of the parapet balusters.**

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Todd Naugle**, of Lott Barber stated the staff review is appreciated. The decision of the County to opt out was not taken lightly. Financial factors were the basis of the current decision to use precast rather than actual materials. Will do their best to adhere to staff comments, but cannot promise.

**Ms. Memory** asked if any of the Department of Transportation funding include federal dollars.

**Mr. Naugle** stated he's not aware of the project using an federal funds; E-SPLOST through the tax system, not a DOT funded project.

**Mr. Houle** stated he liked the height on the southside, but it appears that the County is moving away from the York Lane. Asked about removal of the columns to be a cost savings.

**Mr. Naugle** agreed. The feature was a request of the owner. There will need to be discussion with the client.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Ms. Bridget Lidy**, City of Savannah, states it is regrettable that the petitioner chose to exercise the option to not obtain a COA. The petitioner was committed to the process at its start in 2012 by obtaining previous approvals. With the City's Historic District designation status threatened in 2018, the City believes it is imperative for all to adhere to its integrity. The City is expecting the petitioner to adhere to staff recommendations and adhere to the process. They would like the petitioner to continue to its original commitment and not opt out of the review process. The City is dedicated to preserving its Landmark District.

**Nick Palumbo**, Alderman, stated he is appalled and insulted that the petitioner would not adhere to the process. He believes this a timely strategic move, in that the City allowed the County to build over York Lane. The City let the County use their bonding authority. The County should not put the City in this position. He states he holds all parties accountable. He would like for the City to reconsider the bond, as the County is not working with the City. It works against the goal of growing the Landmark District. He looks forward the petitioner opting back in.

**Bob Rosenwald**, Downtown Neighborhood Association, stated he is disappointed of the decision to opt out of the COA process especially after acquiring approval to use the City's bonding authority to help finance the project. He believes it to be a slap in the face to the

City, particularly with the status of the fragile Landmark District being threatened. The Federal government adhered to their agreement to follow the COA process when building on President Street. He hopes the county will do the same, even at this late stage in the game. The petitioner's building is at the main entrance of the Landmark District, which will now be a large looming structure. A glass walkway is not restoration of a lane. This is a big step backwards for the Landmark District with the precast materials as cost savings.

**Ryan Arvay**, of the Historic Foundation of Savannah, agrees with the City that the County's decisions are a mistake and makes the motivations questionable. It seems to have a post-modern style; gives the building a dated look in a negative way, particularly with the balusters. The treatment of the lane and the materials degrades the design. He hopes the petitioner will reconsider, and adhere to staff comments.

**Deidrich Leggett**, Alderman, agrees with previous public comments. He stated many things were done in good faith, but not adhered to. The entire second district protests against the current options. He stated it is not a good look for the County using the City to gain funding and not do as agreed. It does not show that the City and County can work well together. The City would like a return on a good investment, as the City upheld their end.

**Clinton Edminster**, business owner and second district resident, stated he is disappointed but not shocked; indicative of prior County actions. Would like to build the relationship between the two entities, to encourage the respected process. The process is what makes Savannah known.

**Mr. Naugle**, appreciated all of the comments and passion. He stated he does not have authority to commit to any recommendations. The County directed to proceed with current process.

**Marlena Shade** of the County stated she has no comments. Parveez Yousef, Chatham County Architect/Project Manager stated they will respond later; not at this time.

#### **BOARD COMMENT**

**Ms. Lynch** stated she agrees but does not want to get in to political disagreement. She agrees strongly with staff recommendation; the columns are inappropriate and visually incompatible. The balusters on the parapet are also inappropriate.

**Ms. Taylor** stated she agrees with staff recommendations. She feels fake history is being presented and regret's the County opting out of the COA process.

**Ms. Isaacs** agrees with staff and public comments. The previous part one was better than current presentation. Inquired as to whether federal dollars are being used. **Ms. Michalak** responded federal dollars are not being used.

**Mr. Altschiller** stated the opt-out at this point is inappropriate. The materials are inappropriate.

**Mr. Dodge** agreed with previous comments.

**Ms. Memory** agrees with staff recommendations and is concerned with opt-out and materials. The threatened status should be the main reason the County has a responsibility to adhere to the statute.

**Mr. Bodek** asked if there was a document that supports the County's original intent adhere to the COA process.

**Mr. Houle** stated it's disappointing the County is pulling out and all should play fair. The south façade does look better than the original, but someone has decided not to do the homage to the lane.

**Ms. Isaacs** stated the goal of the City is to restore. The current change will be irreversible in plans to restore.

**Ms. Memory** stated as a civic building, it belongs to the public. This process allows the residents to have input in civic architecture.

**Ms. Michalak** stated the original application and consultation minutes do not state their intent to adhere to the COA process. She stated all of the meetings she attended indicated there was initial intent to adhere to the process, but nothing was put in writing to do so.

**Mr. Stephens** stated he finds it troubling that the two entities are not working together, particularly with the threatened status with the National Register. He supports staff comments.

**Ms. Melanie Wilson**, MPC, stated she wants to be sure that all understand that the County has been listening to City, staff and HDBR comments and concerns. The historic status importance is recognized.

#### **Motion**

Staff recommends the following comments be provided for considered related to the proposed Courthouse at 145 Montgomery Street to be more compatible with the surrounding historic context:

1. Remove the colonnades on the exterior of the atrium in their entirety;
2. Simplify the design of the parapet balusters.

#### **Vote Results ( Not Started )**

Motion:

Second:

#### [18. Petition of J. Elder Studio, LLC | 20-000312-COA | 5 E Perry Street | Signs with Variance Request](#)

📎 [Description of Signage request.pdf](#)

📎 [Map.pdf](#)

📎 [signage cover letter March 11 Meeting.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Rec 20-000312 - May 13.pdf](#)

📎 [Variance \(2nd\) Newspaper Ad 20-000312 5 Perry St \(004\).doc](#)

📎 [CBT\\_ Variance Request Application.pdf](#)

📎 [CBT\\_ Variance Request Checklist.pdf](#)

📎 [20-000312-COA Drawings for Variance](#)

📎 [Board Decision March 11.pdf](#)

**Mr. Ryan Jarles** presented the applicant's request for approval of two illuminated incidental signs, one vinyl window sign, and one principal use projecting sign at 5 East Perry Street. The illuminated incidental signs are proposed to be 7.2 square feet in size each, the vinyl

window sign is proposed to be 10 percent of the window, and the principal use projecting sign is proposed to be 7.1 square feet. The applicant provided historic photographs of the building with signage located within the same space as where the incidental signage is proposed. The signage appears to be bronze plaques installed directly to the brick façade on either side of the main entryway with no internal illumination. This signage has since been removed from the building's façade; therefore, any new signage would be required to adhere to the current sign standards.

All mounting locations are proposed to be made within pre-existing mounting joints created within the façade. The installation of the proposed signage will not damage the historic façade of the building. All mounting locations are proposed to be made within pre-existing mounting joints created within the façade. The installation of the proposed signage is reversible. The vinyl lettering is proposed to be white; the projecting sign is proposed to be painted bronze with a red logo on either side; the lightbox incidental signs are proposed to be painted bronze. These colors and materials are visually compatible.

No information for material specifications of the projecting or incidental signs were provided; provide staff with the manufacturer's specifications for the materials proposed to construct the projecting sign; and if the Board is to approve the incidental signs, provide staff with the material specifications. The vinyl lettering proposed to be installed on the transom window above the primary entryway, and the projecting sign are visually compatible with contributing buildings and structures to which this one is visually related.

The two proposed incidental signs are larger than the ordinance allows and, therefore, are not visually compatible. The vinyl lettering to be installed within the transom window is proposed to be 10 percent of the window area and therefore is allowed without a permit. The two proposed incidental signs are to be back-lit utilizing cut out letters; this type of illumination is permitted within the district, however the incidental signs proposed do not meet the incidental sign standards.

The petition two proposed incidental signs are 7.2 square feet each. There is only one principal use utilizing the entire business frontage and there is only one entrance providing public access, therefore, only one incidental sign is permitted, at a maximum of 4 square feet. The window sign does not exceed 10% of the window area.

There is only one projecting sign proposed. The sign will be located above the entryway to the principal use and will not be installed within 2 feet of a curb line. The principal use maintains 60 linear feet of lot frontage along East Perry Street and therefore is permitted a projecting sign with a maximum of 30 square feet. The projecting sign is proposed to be 7.1 square feet in size. The sign projects from the building's façade approximately 4'-0". The projecting sign is proposed to be mounted to the building's façade upon a large keystone feature, which is a distinctive architectural feature, located above the primary entrance; however, the applicant proposes to utilize existing mounting joints created by a sign that was previously mounted to the keystone feature. The location is appropriate. The projecting sign is proposed to exceed 8 feet above the pedestrian walkway.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval for (1) vinyl window sign and (1) projecting sign at 5 East Perry Street with the condition that the material specification for the projecting sign be provided to staff for review and approval because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.**



**Denial for (2) illuminated incidental signs because the work is not visually compatible and does not meet the standards for incidental signs.**

**Note: This recommendation could change subject to new information provided at the Historic District Board of Review meetings. Final decisions will be made by the Historic District Board of Review at the public hearing based on information provided at the meeting, as well as information submitted for the staff recommendation.**

**Mr. Jerome Elder**, petitioner, stated Berkshire Hathway recently acquired Cora Bett Thomas Realty, though they operate as separate entities. They are requesting the size of the original signs, with illumination to modernize. They are open to bronze plaques without illumination. Two signs were requested for symmetry and to accommodate verbiage requirements.

**Mr. Dodge** asked if consideration was given to use the larger sign on the top, rather than the two lower signs.

**Mr. Elder** stated they wanted eye-level signs facing the street.

**Mr. Autschiller** stated he does not understand the redundancy of the signs.

**Mr. Elder** stated the top sign is recessed and the will be changed to the street number.

There was no Public Comment.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Houle** stated he agrees with staff recommendation.

**Ms. Memory** stated she has concern regarding the redundancy of signs.

**Ms. Isaacs** stated she may be more inclined with the signs without the lighting.

**Mr. Dodge, Ms. Taylor and Ms. Lynch** both stated they are in agreement with staff recommendation.

#### **Motion**

Denial for (2) illuminated incidental signs because the work is not visually compatible and does not meet the standards for incidental signs.

And

Denial for the request of a variance from Sec. 9.9.17, g.v.(1) & (5). of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance as follows: (1) such sign shall be permitted adjacent to each entrance, each business shall be permitted (1) such sign &hellip; The maximum aggregate sign area shall not exceed the following: 4 sq. ft. per principal use &hellip; to allow for (2) illuminated incidental signs for one principal use and to allow for the individual signs to be 5.8 sq. ft. each because the variance criteria are not met.

#### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Steven Bodek

Second: Stan Houle

Becky Lynch

- Aye

Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[19. Petition of Array Design | 20-001220-COA | 513 East Jones Street | New Construction Accessory Building Parts I and II](#)

📎 [SUPP INFO COA 20-001220 513 E Jones.pdf](#)

📎 [APP COA 20-001220 513 E Jones.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Rec - 20-001220 513 E Jones St.pdf](#)

**Mr. Ryan Jarles** presented the applicant's request for approval of a fence and New Construction Parts I and II for a 2-story carriage house at the rear of the property located at 513 East Jones Street. The carriage house is to be 28'-0" in height, 22'-0" in width along the lane and extend 40'-0" into the property. The proposed lot coverage is 65%

The carriage house is proposed to be approximately 28'-0" in height. This is subordinate in height to the historic main structure and is visually compatible. The carriage house is proposed to be 22 feet in width along the lane. All window openings are proposed to be taller than they are wide and are visually compatible. The dormers on the lane facing façade do not align vertically over the garage doors on the first story. Revise the dormers to align vertically over the garage doors.

The relationship of the structure to the open space between it and the adjacent structures is visually compatible with the spaces between contributing structures to which this one is visually related. The second story porch projection on the courtyard facing façade is not visible from the public right of way.

The proposed materials are visually compatible and include: Sierra Pacific Premium Series clad wood windows, Clopay Coachmen Collection – Design 11 smooth finish garage doors, Sierra Pacific clad wood human doors, smooth finish Hardie Board siding, Hardie Board trim and finishes, standing seam metal roof, aluminum railing, and wood fence.

The roof is proposed as a side gable with dormers on the front and rear. The two dormers on the lane facing façade of the second story extend beyond the façade of the first story. This feature is not common within the district and is not visually compatible. Staff recommended revising the second story dormers to not project beyond the first story façade. The awning feature projects past the property line and over the public right-of-way. Remove the awning feature which is not visually compatible.

The carriage house creates a wall of continuity along the lane. The two dormers on the lane facing façade of the second story extend beyond the façade of the first story. This feature is not common within the district and is not visually compatible. Staff recommended revising the second story dormers to not project beyond the first story façade.

The height standards are met. This is an accessory building fronting a lane and is proposed to be two stories. The proposed setbacks are as follows: 5'-0" on the east side yard and 0'-0" on the west side yard.

The doors are proposed to be Sierra Pacific clad wood doors. The exterior siding is proposed as smooth fiber cement siding. The windows are proposed to be double glazed simulated divided light and are to have muntins no wider than 7/8 inch. The dormers on the lane facing façade do not align vertically over the garage doors on the first story. Revise the dormers to align vertically over the garage doors. The proposed windows are to be Sierra Pacific Premium Series clad wood windows. The awning/canopy over the garage door entrances is proposed to be standing seam. Awnings and canopies shall be integrated structurally and architecturally into the design of the façade. The standard is met. Staff is recommending the awning be removed; if the Board approves the awning ensure that an encroachment license is obtained from the City of Savannah.

The supports are to be constructed of wood. The roof is proposed to be gable with a 6:12 pitch. The skylight is located on a non-historic building and is only visible from the lane. The roof is proposed to be standing seam. The balcony does not extend beyond 3 feet from the façade. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between balusters shall not exceed four inches. For one and two family dwellings the height of the railing shall not exceed 36". The standards are met. The fence is proposed to be 6'-0" in height. Wood fences shall be painted or stained. Ensure the wood fence is painted or stained.

The carriage house first story has a setback from the lane of 1'-6", and the garage openings do not exceed 12 feet in width. The roof is a side gable. The carriage house is located to the rear of the property and the sloped apron is not proposed within the public right-of-way. The electrical, HVAC, and refuse locations are all provided and are all screened from the public right-of-way.: Access to parking shall be from lanes or north-south service streets.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval for a fence and New Construction Parts I and II for a 2-story carriage house at the rear of the property located at 513 East Jones Street with the following conditions because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.**

**1. Revise the dormers to align vertically over the garage doors. 2. Revise the second story dormers to not project beyond the first story façade. 3. Remove the awning feature over the garage doors.**

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Shauna Kucera**, Array Design, stated they are under development standard, at 65% lot coverage. She compared area carriage houses to her project, as being less than others. There are no windows on the western side of the structure, highlighting awareness of future development. The height of the roof is 17.4 feet above grade. The roof recedes away from the lane. She state they are happy to comply with the requested changes and the fence will be painted.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay**, HSF, stated they are not in favor of the carriage house as designed. It is almost the same size of the main structure; it is too large and not visually compatible. They believe the owner is trying to use as a short-term rental.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Houle** asked is the building too large for the property. **Mr. Jarles** stated it meets the previous ordinance under which the application was submitted, but would not be acceptable under the new ordinance.

**Ms. Isaacs** and **Ms. Lynch** agreed. It should not be compared to a carriage house that services two properties although it meets the letter requirements of the ordinance.

**Ms. Taylor** stated HSF's comments should be heavily considered.

### **Motion**

Approval for a fence and New Construction Parts I and II for a 2-story carriage house at the rear of the property located at 513 East Jones Street with the following conditions because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

1. Revise the dormers to align vertically over the garage doors.
2. Revise the second story dormers to not project beyond the first story facade.
3. Remove the awning feature over the garage doors.

### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: David Altschiller

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Nay
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Nay
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Nay
Steven Bodek	- Aye

## [20. Petition of LS3P Associates LTD. | 18-006314-COA | 2 Whitaker Street | Demolition and New Construction Part II: Design Details](#)

- 📎 [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)
- 📎 [EXHIBIT A - Project Narrative.pdf](#)
- 📎 [EXHIBIT B - Bay Street Perspective.pdf](#)
- 📎 [EXHIBIT B - Whitaker Street Perspective.pdf](#)
- 📎 [2 WHITAKER ST\\_ PART 2 HDBR SUBMITTAL\\_.pdf](#)
- 📎 [EXHIBIT C - Materials List.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Material Samples.pdf](#)

**Ms. Alyson Smith** presented the petitioner's request for approval of New Construction, Part II: Design Details at 2 Whitaker Street. The seven-story tall apartment building features retail and commercial at the ground floor and will feature a full basement. The project is *Large Scale* and is seeking to earn a bonus story.

This petition is part of a larger development that includes the rehabilitation of the adjacent historic building at 21 West Bay Street. The rehabilitation is under a separate project number, File No. 20-001516-COA. The buildings are proposed to be internally connected. Limiting loss of historic material, the interior connections will be made at the upper floors. In 2012 the HDBR approved the construction of a one-story addition to the adjacent building (Moon River) at the rear of this site (12-00823-COA). The remainder of the site was approved to be fenced. On December 12, 2018, the HDBR approved the demolition of the non-contributing building and Part I: Height and Mass for the new building at 2 Whitaker Street with conditions to be submitted with Part II: Design Details. The HDBR recommended approval to the ZBA for a variance from the recess standard as requested because the variance criteria were found to be met. On December 11, 2019, [File No. 18-006314-COA] The project received a 12-month extension issued on December 12, 2018, for the demolition of a non-contributing building and Part I: Height and Mass.

The petitioner has provided the following comments highlighting accomplished HBR's conditions for the approval for the demolition of the non-contributing building and Part I: Height and Mass for a new seven story building:

1. A demolition permit will not be issued until a COA for the new construction is approved. "We will not apply for a Demolition Permit until a COA for the new construction is approved."
2. Provide additional accentuation/prominence to the Bay Street entrance. "In an effort to further accentuate the Bay Street Entrance, we have raised the natural quarry stone to the second floor for a more prominent primary entrance bay. This is similar to the original bay accentuation that is articulated along the Whitaker Street façade."
3. Ensure that a sill is incorporated into the storefront where a base is not utilized. "We have raised all storefront sills that are not an entry point to 18" above the ground and will be incorporating a stone base as the differentiating design to the storefront sill."
4. Revise the bay spacing to meet the 15-20 standard. "We have revised the Bay spacing along Whitaker Street to meet the 15-20 standard. However, given the property width along Bay Street is greater than 60'-0" we are over the bay spacing standard if we divided into 3 bays; inversely we are under the Bay spacing standard if we divide the Bay Street façade into 4 bays."

The petitioner has not indicated if they've received the variance for the bay spacing from the Zoning Board of Appeals. The building features entrances on both Bay and Whitaker Streets. Staff previously noted that the Whitaker Street entrance was more prominent and recommended additional accentuation of the Bay Street entrance. The petitioner has revised the Bay Street entrance to accentuate it by raising the natural quarry stone to the second floor for a more prominent primary entrance bay. The rhythm of the entrances and solids to voids is visually compatible. The following materials and colors are proposed:

- Brick & Mortar: General Shale, Cascade White Velour, Modular Size, Cleveland County Plant, Extruded Style, Wirecut
- Natural Stone Cladding: CME Brick, Stonebrooke Natural Stone Veneer, Limestone, Lightsmoke, Honed
- Aluminum Clad Wood Windows/ Storefronts: Windsor Pinnacle Select Aluminum Clad Windows, Bronze. All windows and storefront assemblies to have 3.5" flat casing by manufacturer.
- Canopy: Mapes Architectural Canopies, Super Lumideck Flat Soffit, Mapes Bronze
- Cast Stone Headers, Sills & Coping: Arriscraft International, Montecito Color, Renaissance

#### Masonry Unit, Satin Finish

- Cast Stone Cornice and Stringers: Advanced Architectural Stone, Dry Cast Stone, Dove Grey, Smooth Veneer Finish
- Aluminum Storefront System at Ground Floor: YKK AP Commercial Storefront Systems, YES 60 TU, YB5N Dark Bronze
- Stucco at Stair Tower and Elev. overrun above roof: Sto White w/ Fine Finish
- Metal Railings – Balconies:
- Hollow Metal Doors- Service Doors, Egress Doors: Curries Series 707. Painted to match window color, "Dark Bronze"
- Overhead Coiling Service Door at West Bay Lane: Overhead Door Model 610S, Brown Color

The proposed materials are visually compatible.

The windows will be casement. Glazing extends from an 18 inch stone base. Cast stone will be used at the base of the storefront and the storefront will be constructed of aluminum. The canopy will be constructed of aluminum. The roof material will not be visible.

The massing and height standards were met in Part: I. The petitioner previously proposed the following active uses on the ground floor: restaurant, beer garden, and lobby. The beer garden has been omitted and the restaurant has grown in size, while the lobby has reduced in size. The active uses continue to span all street fronting elevations. The standard continues to be met. The lobby occupies less than 30% and 60 feet on Bay Street; there is no lobby on Whitaker Street. All proposed uses have primary entrances accessed from the exterior. Street fronting facades will include a minimum of 30% natural quarried stone and modular masonry and non-street fronting facades will include 100% modular masonry. Staff previously stated that some bays exceeded 20 feet in width, and some were less than 15 feet in width and recommended that the bay spacing be revised to meet the standard.

The bay spacing along Whitaker Street was revised to meet the 15-20 standard. However, given the property width along Bay Street is greater than 60 feet, the bay spacing would exceed 20 feet if the building was divided into three bays and be under the 15 minimum bay spacing standard if the façade is divided into four bays. Two bays are slightly under 15 feet at 14'-4" and 14'-8" with the four bay configuration. Given the site constraints, staff recommends approval because the intent of the standard is met.

#### Materials

Glazing along Bay Street is 56% and is 56% along Whitaker Street. The upper levels contain 25-30% glazing at the upper levels. Aluminum clad wood windows and storefronts will be used.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval of New Construction, Part II: Design Details at 2 Whitaker Street with the following condition because the design is otherwise visually compatible and meets the design standards:**

- 1. Ensure that window sashes and door frames are inset not less than four inches (4") from all façade surfaces.**

**Note: This recommendation could change subject to new information provided at the Historic District Board of Review meetings. Final decisions will be made by the Historic District Board of Review at the public hearing based on information provided at the meeting, as well as information submitted for the staff recommendation.**

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Michael Garcia**, LS3P, stated the color and material palette to selected complement the Moon River building. They are open to suggestions.

**Ms. Isaacs** stated she feels the building is too tall and the top story cornice is lacking detail; not enough detail. More contrast is needed from Moon River and should contrast. She likes the arched windows.

**Ms. Memory** stated she agrees with Ms. Isaacs; the building dwarfs Moon River. Suggests contrast between the two buildings to make it more distinguishable.

**Mr. Houle** suggests making the building less bland.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Mr. Kyle Niccola**, HOA of 5 Whitaker Street, stated the domineering height of the building concerns the next door residents. Their building was disallowed an additional story, an inset not going to the edges of the top of the building. There is a lack of fair treatment. The building looks too modern, it does not fit in with the existing structures.

**Mr. Ryan Arvay**, HSF, stated they like the traditional approach with the window and materials. They would like more contrast with Moon River, and it needs a proper cornice. They do feel it is visually incompatible due to height, whether its allowable by ordinance or not. The bonus story is inappropriate and within the Board's rights to deny.

**Mr. Garcia** responded that the height is to incorporate a mezzanine and bring prominence to the ground floor. Regarding the materials, he stated there is more contrast than visible on a screen.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Ms. Lynch** stated the top appears heavy and undefined. The material of the cornice is the same on the bottom; the current design makes the parapet seem that much taller. She feels it needs more resolution. **Ms. Isaacs** agreed with Ms. Lynch.

**Mr. Altshiller** stated the bonus story is the problem. It's too large for its environment.

**Mr. Bodek** stated he thinks the building is too tall.

**Mr. Houle** stated he would support a continuance because there needs to be more discussion about this project.

**Ms. Isaacs** feels she has concerns about the bonus story and cornice area, and lack of detail on the balcony.

### **Motion**

Continue to June 10, 2020 HDBR Meeting for additional study/consultation with staff.

### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Becky Lynch - Aye

Dwayne Stephens - Abstain

Melissa Memory - Aye

David Altschiller - Aye

Nan Taylor - Aye

Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[21. Petition of LS3P Associates LTD. | 20-001516-COA | 21 West Bay Street | Rehabilitation & Alterations](#)

📎 [Drawings\\_.pdf](#)

📎 [EXHIBIT A - Project Narrative.pdf](#)

📎 [Historic Imagery.pdf](#)

📎 [21 W BAY - Historic Timeline.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

**Ms. Alyson Smith** presented the petitioner's request for approval to rehabilitate a historic building located at 21 West Bay Street. Several original architectural elements are proposed to be restored and reconstructed. These elements include:

- Reconstructing the original full-width front porch along the building's second level.
- Reopening original historic openings which have been infilled over the years. Four historic openings have been infilled along Bay Street at the third and fourth floors. Custom wood double hung, single paned, divided lite windows will be installed to match the configuration of existing windows. Wood shutters at the second through fourth floors will also be introduced.
- Infilled/non-historic windows on the second floor of the lane side of the carriage house will be reopened and custom wood windows will be installed. The non-historic second floor double doors and first floor doors will be removed and replaced with new wood doors.
- The asphalt shingle roof on the carriage house will be replaced in-kind.
- Existing stucco will be repaired and repainted.
- An existing awning will be removed.

This petition is part of a larger development that includes the request for new construction of a six-story building at 2 Whitaker Street. The new construction is under a separate petition, File No. 18-006314-COA. The buildings are proposed to be internally connected. Limiting loss of historic material, the interior connections will be made at the upper floors.

The existing storefronts on Bay Street date to at least the 1970s. The petitioner proposes to maintain the storefront as-is, in lieu of restoring the storefront using historic context. The carriage house was constructed as part of the property as early as 1833. The lane façade of the carriage house features a door at the second level. Documentation from 1822 suggests that the owner at that time petitioned the City to construct a bridge over West Bay Lane to connect to 18 West Bay Street. The bridge is not proposed to be reintroduced.

The rehabilitation is a tax credit project. The petitioner has determined the building's period of significance falls between 1817 and 1865. The building's historic character will be maintained. A false sense of history will not be created with any of the proposed changes. The petitioner has chosen to maintain the existing storefront windows, though they are not original. Distinctive features will be preserved. Non-historic windows and doors will be replaced in-kind to match existing historic features. The original configuration of the porch is documented in the 1837 aerial painting by Joseph Cerveau. The proposed



reconstruction seeks to match the configuration and design of the porch as documented in the historic painting. Staff requests a conditions assessment for the existing stucco along with a detailed plan illustrating where repairs will be made, and a list of products that will be used. The proportions of existing openings will not change. The original solid to void pattern will be restored. The rhythm and projection of the proposed porch reconstruction is visually compatible. The porch will project approximately 8 feet into the right-of-way.

All proposed materials and colors are visually compatible. Replacement double hung windows will be custom made of wood and feature single paned glass. Replacement doors and wood shutters will be constructed of wood and will be painted a green color called, "Rock Garden" by Sherwin Williams to match the color of the window trim. All porch elements will be constructed of wood and painted, "Creamy" by Sherwin Williams. The porch will feature eight custom turned wood Doric columns. The wood balusters will be custom turned and will have a height of 2'6". The building's façade will be painted to match the color of the porch trim. Staff requests a specification for the stucco that will be used to repair the stucco façade. In terms of the scale, the scale of the proposed reconstructed porch aligns with the second floor and is visually compatible. All other visual compatibility factors are met.

The stucco façade will be repaired and repainted with a historically appropriate paint color. Staff requests a conditions assessment on the existing stucco along with a detailed plan illustrating where repairs will be made, and a list of products that will be used. The two non-historic doors at the carriage house will be replaced with contextually appropriate new wood doors to fit within the existing openings. The existing wood transom at the second floor is historic and will be preserved. A transom at the ground level will be reproduced to match the historic transom above.

Non-historic windows will be replaced with custom made wood double hung, single paned windows to match the configuration of existing historic windows. The shutters will be constructed of wood. Ensure the shutters are hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening. The placement of the horizontal rail(s) shall correspond to the location of the meeting rail(s) of the window.

The original configuration of the porch is documented in the 1837 aerial painting by Joseph Cerveau. The proposed reconstruction seeks to match the configuration and design of the porch as documented in the historic painting. The reconstructed portico will be built using only wood products. The asphalt shingle roof will be replaced in-kind.

No changes are proposed with the mechanical equipment and refuse. Ensure the standards continue to be met.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval of the rehabilitation at 21 West Bay Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval because the proposed rehabilitation is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:**

- 1. Ensure the shutters are hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening. The placement of the horizontal rail(s) shall correspond to the location of the meeting rail(s) of the window.**
- 2. Submit a conditions assessment on the existing stucco along with a detailed plan illustrating where repairs will be made, with a list of products that will be used.**

**Ms. Taylor** asked if there were other forms of documentation regarding the original columns.

Ms. Smith stated what was presented as all that the petitioner presented as available.

**Mr. Michael Garcia**, LS3P, stated they are in agreement with staff recommendation. He stated the reference material for the period of significance was the best source guide.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay**, HSF, complimented the portico and balcony. They would have liked more detail and articulation for the upper level.

**Mr. Garcia** stated the balusters are square, and the doric columns on the bottom are circular.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board was complimentary of the project and support staff recommendation.

#### **Motion**

Approval of the rehabilitation at 21 West Bay Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval because the proposed rehabilitation is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

Ensure the shutters are hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening. The placement of the horizontal rail(s) shall correspond to the location of the meeting rail(s) of the window.

Submit a conditions assessment on the existing stucco along with a detailed plan illustrating where repairs will be made, with a list of products that will be used.

#### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Steven Bodek

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[22. Petition of Wubbena Architects | 20-001934-COA | 224 East Liberty Street | Rehabilitation/Alterations](#)

📎 [Staff Site Photos.pdf](#)

📎 [Applicant Photos.pdf](#)

📎 [Sanborn Map.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

**Ms. Alyson Smith** presented the applicant's request for approval to restore the front stoop at 224 East Liberty Street. The existing non-historic steel columns, steel stairs and handrail will be removed and replaced with wood columns, stairs and handrail. The original wood staircase was replaced with steel stairs, columns, brick and concrete elements sometime after 1973. The removal of the existing non-historic stoop and construction of a contextually appropriate stoop restores the building's historic character. The removal of the existing front stoop and construction of the proposed stoop does not create a false sense of historical development because the design is simple in nature and compatible with adjacent historic buildings.

The proposed front elevation drawing includes a second window, furthest from the garden entry, that does not currently exist on the building. The lite pattern in all of the windows within the drawings is also different from the actual lite configuration within the existing windows. Staff is unable to assess and review the proposed rhythm, projection and proportion of the portico and stairs because of the inconsistencies in the drawing.

There is a discrepancy with the proposed paint colors. The wood stair treads, and stoop floor will be painted "Charcoal" by Benjamin Moore. The columns and risers will be painted, "Linen White" by Benjamin Moore. However, the notes on the drawings state that the wood handrail and balusters will be painted "Charcoal" but then there is another note that says the balusters will be "Linen White." Staff requests confirmation regarding the intended color of the balusters. No detail drawings with dimensions were included for the balusters, handrail, column capital, column base and stairs. Staff requests detail drawings of these features including dimensions for review.

There is a note stating that the existing roof will be braced during the alterations, but then there is another note that states that the GC will verify flashing and roof conditions and that any damage or worn areas will be "repaired". The application and submittal packet include no other information about the roof being repaired or replaced. If the portico roof needs to be repaired or replaced a COA must be submitted for review.

It's also unclear to staff whether the stoop piers are proposed to be removed or not, from looking at the drawings, the piers appear to be identified with a dashed line to indicate removal; however, there are no notes for the removal as identified by the applicant with every other element proposed to be removed. There are no other notes in the rest of the proposed elevations to allude to a change in material or dimension of the piers.

The proposed paint colors are visually compatible. Ensure the stucco wall, where the steel stairs are, is repaired and patched upon removal of the existing stairs. Requested a stucco specification for review. The existing front portico's stair and handrail have been altered. The proposed design of the stair, square balusters and portico columns are simple in design and the material and configuration are based on historic context.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Continue the rehabilitation of the front portico at 224 East Liberty Street to the June 10, 2020 HDBR Meeting so that the petitioner can address the following items:**

- 1. Correct the errors and inconsistencies within the drawings as outlined in this report and submit a demolition plan along with a proposed plan. Staff also requests a demolition elevation for the front façade.**
- 2. Provide confirmation regarding the intended color of the balusters.**

3. **Submit detail drawings with dimensions for the balusters, handrail, column capital, column base and the risers and treads.**
4. **If the portico roof needs to be repaired or replaced, a COA must be submitted for review, or the application and drawings must be updated to include a conditions assessment of the existing roof with a roof plan and proposed roofing material.**
5. **Confirm whether the stoop piers are proposed to be removed or not, with notes and dimensions of the existing piers and proposed, along with material and color specifications if new piers are proposed.**
6. **Ensure the stucco wall where the steel stairs are, is repaired and patched upon removal of the existing stairs. Submit a specification for review.**

**PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Jim Wubbena**, of Wubbena Architects, stated the interior is currently being worked on, but it is in terrible disrepair. The stoop needs to be repaired and is currently a hazard. There is window work being done, the lower columns are staying as they are and not moving the stoop. The notes for the roof are because things keep falling and they are not sure what will happen next. They are trying to replicate the stoop to the west of the building, the square columns. Replace the second story columns and put in wood stairs and railing. Willing to provide details but a decision from the Board is needed to continue working as the crew is waiting to proceed.

**Ms. Memory** asked is staff comfortable moving forward and avoid continuance.

**Ms. Smith** stated there is a great deal of question, therefore staff still stands by its recommendation for continuance.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay**, HSF, stated they are excited that the structure is receiving attention in a historic manner. Their major concern is lack of detail, particularly in relation to the balustrade coming down the stairs: posts, handrails. The roof should be repaired to keep historic precedent. He recommends continuance with the amount of questions and yield to confusion and liberties taken.

**Mr. Wubbena** stated the roof is to be braced: scrape it on the trim. There is only so much detail needed for a stair, railings, and a set of columns. If this is pushed back another month, it probably won't get done and hopes all enjoy steel staircases.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Ms. Lynch** stated she supports the project and believes more information is needed.

**Ms. Taylor** supports staff recommendation.

**Ms. Isaacs** stated if the details were done properly the first time, the continuance would not be necessary and supports staff recommendation.

**Mr. Altshiller** stated though he is sympathetic with the petitioner, there is not enough information to move forward. He asked if approval could be provided in less than a month.

**Ms. Smith** stated there is no expedited process for the petitioner. It cannot come back to the Board if Board approves with conditions, unless petitioner refuses to meet conditions.

**Mr. Bodek** stated he does not feel it is appropriate for the Board or staff to deviate from protocol. It is the responsibility of the petitioner to provide adequate drawings.

**Ms. Isaacs** stated if deviation from protocol is done, the conditions need to be extremely detailed and made sure to be done.

**Ms. Memory** stated precedent being set should be considered as well.

### **Motion**

Continue the rehabilitation of the front portico at 224 East Liberty Street to the June 10, 2020 HDBR Meeting so that the petitioner can address the following items:

Correct the errors and inconsistencies within the drawings as outlined in this report and submit a demolition plan along with a proposed plan. Staff also requests a demolition elevation for the front facade.

Provide confirmation regarding the intended color of the balusters.

Submit detail drawings with dimensions for the balusters, handrail, column capital, column base and the risers and treads.

If the portico roof needs to be repaired or replaced, a COA must be submitted for review, or the application and drawings must be updated to include a conditions assessment of the existing roof with a roof plan and proposed roofing material.

Confirm whether the stoop piers are proposed to be removed or not, with notes and dimensions of the existing piers and proposed, along with material and color specifications if new piers are proposed.

Ensure the stucco wall where the steel stairs are, is repaired and patched upon removal of the existing stairs.

Submit a specification for review.

### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye

## X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

[23. Petition of Coastal Canvas, Andrew Barber | 20-001225-COA | 309 W ST. JULIAN ST | Awnings](#)

☞ [COA 20-001225 309 W St Julian.pdf](#)

[24. Petition of Lynch Architects, Elizabeth Shmenke | 20-001418-COA | 719 E BROAD ST | Amend 19-002968-COA, alterations](#)

☞ [COA 20-001418 719 E Broad AMEND.pdf](#)

[25. Petition of Taavo Roos | 20-001532-COA | 328 Price Street | Color Change](#)

☞ [COA 20-001532 328 Price St.pdf](#)

[26. Petition of Metalcrafts. T. Allen Lancaster | 20-001533-COA | 229 MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. BLVD. | Replace roof](#)

☞ [COA 20-001533 229 MLK.pdf](#)

[27. Petition of Homeline Architecture, Josh Bull | 20-001568-COA | 111 E JONES STREET | Amend 19-005939-COA: Alterations to Height and Mass](#)

☞ [COA, 111 E. Jones St, 20-001568.pdf](#)

[28. Petition of NewGround, John Stewart | 20-001569-COA | 339 MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. BLVD. | New lighting fixtures and chimney caps](#)

☞ [COA 20-001569 339 MLK.pdf](#)

[29. Petition of South Coast Contracting Group | 20-001672-COA | 510 E McDONOUGH ST | Remove and replace stucco](#)

☞ [COA 20-001672 510 E McDonough.pdf](#)

[30. Petition of Christina McClimans | 20-001679-COA | 224 E OGLETHORPE | Color Change](#)

☞ [COA 20-001679 224 E Oglethorpe.pdf](#)

[31. Petition of Paderewski Construction | 20-001715-COA | 202 W BROUGHTON | Color Change](#)

☞ [COA 20-001715-COA.pdf](#)

[32. Petition of Justin Van Hecke | 20-001754-COA | 49 BARNANRD ST | Repair window sashes.](#)

☞ [Staff Decision 20-001754-COA.pdf](#)

[33. Petition of Justin Van Hecke | 20--001764-COA | 301 W BROUGHTON ST | Repair window sash.](#)

☞ [Staff Decision 20-001754-COA.pdf](#)

## XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

## XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

## XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

## XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

## XV. ADJOURNMENT

[34. Next Chair Review Meeting - TBD](#)

[35. Next Pre-Meeting - TBD](#)

[36. Next Regular Meeting - Wednesday, June 10, 2020 at 1:00pm. Location TBD.](#)

[37. Adjourned](#)

There being no further items to present before the Board, the May 13, 2020 Virtual HDBR Meeting adjourned at 5:28 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Leah Michalak  
Director of Historic Preservation

/bm

***The Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission provides meeting minutes which are adopted by the respective Board. Verbatim transcripts of minutes are the responsibility of the interested party.***