



## Savannah Historic District Board of Review

---

Virtual Meeting  
September 9, 2021 1:00 PM  
MINUTES

### September 9, 2021 Savannah Historic District Board of Review

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

**MPC Staff Present:** Pamela Everrett, Assistant Executive Director  
Leah Michalak, Director of Historic Preservation  
Olivia Arfuso, Assistant Planner  
Aislinn Droski, Assistant Planner  
Monica Gann, Assistant Planner  
Bri Morgan, Administrative Assistant

#### I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

#### II. SIGN POSTING

##### [1. Site Visits - September Report](#)

[📎 September 2021 - REPORT.pdf](#)

#### III. CONSENT AGENDA

##### [2. Petition of Ward Architecture and Preservation | 21-004634-COA | 457 Tattnell Street | Rear Deck and Rooftop Pergola](#)

[📎 Staff Recommendation - 21-004634-COA 457 Tattnell St.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

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

#### **Motion**

The Historic Board of Review motioned for approval of the new deck and rooftop pergola for the property

located at 457 Tattnall Street as requested because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

**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	- Not Present
Steven Bodek	- Aye

**IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

[3. Adopt the September 9, 2021 Agenda](#)

**Motion**

Adopt the September 9, 2021 HDBR agenda as presented.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

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

**V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

[4. Approve the August 11, 2021 Meeting Minutes](#)

📎 [08.11.21 MEETING MINUTES.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approve the August 11, 2021 HDBR Meeting Minutes as presented.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Steven Bodek

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

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

**VII. CONTINUED AGENDA**

[5. Petition of Sottile & Sottile, Christian Sottile | 20-005548-COA | 336 Barnard Street | New Construction: Part II \(Design Details\)](#)

**Motion**

Continue.

**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

[6. Petition of David Thompson Architect | 21-003551-COA | 215 East Congress Street | Alterations and Additions](#)

**Motion**

Continue

**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

[7. Petition of J. Elder Studio, Jerome Elder | 21-004050-COA | 37 Whitaker Street | After-the-Fact Alterations and Signage](#)

**Motion**

Continue.

**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

[8. Petition of David Lerch | 21-004661-COA | 503 East Saint Julian Street | Fence](#)

**Motion**

Continue.

**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

[9. Petition Doug Bean Signs | 21-004436-COA | 300 Drayton Street | Sign](#)

**Motion**

Continue.

**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

**VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION**

**IX. REGULAR AGENDA**

[10. Petition of GM Shay Architects | 15-001384-COA | 600 East Bay Street | Amendments to New Construction Hotel](#)

- 📎 [Staff Recommendation 15-001384-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Narrative and Material List.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Public Improvements.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Continuity and Connectivity Study.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Previous Drawings, Renderings, and Photographs.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Previous Specifications and Materials.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

**Ms. Leah Michalak** presented the applicant's request for approval to amend the previous approval for 600 East Bay Street (AC Hotel) and adjacent areas in order improve public safety and public access at the request of the City of Savannah.

Per the applicant:

*The City of Savannah has requested that Northpoint Hospitality co-develop the proposed improvements during the construction of the AC Hotel for the following public benefits:*

- Connectivity from the existing Savannah Riverwalk to River Street at the foot of the East Broad Street Ramp, and from the corner of Bay Street and East Broad Street to Emmet Park.
- Public accessibility for the district as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
- Public safety to eliminate the dangerous pedestrian bottleneck at Bay Street and East Broad Street that now results in people walking in Bay Street to reach Emmet Park.

*The proposed solutions to the above public concerns are as follows:*

- Sidewalk from Riverwalk to River Street, crosswalks at River Street and the lower range of the East Broad Street Ramp, and a pedestrian bridge across East Broad Street Ramp.
- Installation of a public-access elevator with stops at the level of Bay Street and River Street, similar in function to those at Montgomery Street and at the Bull Street Ramp.
- Installation of a pedestrian footbridge that will connect the historic Harbor Light and Emmet Park, and Trustees Garden to the public elevator and River Street safely.

*In terms of the impact on the previously approved AC Hotel, the design has been crafted to have a minimal impact on the open “valley” and granite-stepped stairway. The elevator shaft and access vestibules will be similar or same materials as the previously approved designs. The pedestrian bridge has been carefully designed to be a visually compatible “cousin” of the existing pedestrian bridges over Factor’s Walk and the Abercorn Ramp, while at the same time being clearly differentiated from those historic bridges. Pedestrians moving along River Street or the Riverwalk will see the pedestrian bridge and be guided with appropriate wayfinding signage up through the valley and back to the Harbor Light and Emmet Park, which are currently inaccessible from the east. The existing historic stone walls will be carefully protected, and the steep curved historic stairway preserved, but closed to pedestrians. The result will be a safe and pedestrian-friendly place for the public to enjoy.*

City Council adopted a series of changes to the Historic District ordinance at their July 5, 2018 meeting. Because this project was under review prior to the changes, the project can continue its review under the previous ordinance; however, the applicant stated in a previous submittal packet that “...where possible, we will try to comply with the 2018 guidelines.” Under the previous ordinance, new construction on Factors Walk is exempt from commercial and large-scale development standards.

The walls, stairs, paving, and other appurtenances associated with Emmett Park and the East Broad Street ramp are historic structures. The proposed work maintains these elements in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior architectural features of the historic structures and appurtenances. Although the historic masonry stair adjacent to East Bay Street will no longer be accessible for human use, it is proposed to remain intact and unaltered; the new sidewalks, bridge, sidewalk café elements, stairs are reversible. The new elements, particularly the bridge, are compatible with but differentiated from the historic bridges in the vicinity and do not create a false sense of historical development.

No elements (historic or otherwise) are proposed to be repaired or replaced. Ensure that any physical disruptions to the historic elements, when installing the new elements (particularly the bridge), do not cause damage. If historic elements must be temporarily removed to installed new elements, ensure that they are reinstalled in their current configuration.

The following materials, textures, and colors are proposed and are visually compatible:

1. Brick – Modular and Pavers (Basket Weave or Running Bond Pattern) - Taylor Clay

Products, INC, Color: French Gray, Smooth Texture

2. Exposed Aggregate 'Tabby' Concrete (Sidewalk).
3. Granite (2" Stair Treads) - Color: Charcoal
4. Typical paving at crosswalks and on Bridge to match existing along River Street
5. Ornamental Metal – Color: Savannah Green – RGB: 2, 37, 2
6. Storefront - Color: EFCO Ultrapon, 2 Coat Mesa Brown, PNTKY2C35

The street and lanes standards are met.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Patrick Shay** introduced **Ms. LaToya Waters** and presented the petitioner's request. Mr. Shay stated the construction work for the AC hotel is underway; many utility improvements were done in conjunction with the development. They hope to get the public right-of-way improvements, the garage, and AC hotel under construction by January. They thanked Staff for guidance and agree with report presented and condition; they will be careful to not damage the stone walls. Archeological investigation will be done, if desired by the City. Navigational, maritime history, and industrial heritage will be recognized in every possible way.

**Ms. Bridget Lidy**, Director of Planning and Urban Design, City of Savannah, stated they will follow the archeology ordinance since it is on the public right-of-way. **Mr. Stephens** asked if the stair will be accessible on the River Street side and if there will be methods in place to prohibit inappropriate activity. **Mr. Shay** stated the stair heading to Emmett Park is already closed off; this one will be the same. There will be no access to Bay Street for safety issues, as the stairs are very steep. The stairs will be preserved.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay**, of Historic Savannah Foundation, stated HSF does not favor the project, even after a presentation from the petitioner. There are infrastructure concerns that need to be addressed, specifically at Broad and Bay Streets. The pedestrian bridge provides the most concern. HSF believes the project should have had more public input, as it is such large public infrastructure; it feels rushed. HSF asked if there was a foot-traffic study that showed the direction of the majority; it appears most are coming from the west through the observation of HSF. They feel there are design issues that are not visually compatible; no historic precedent, though not looking for false historicism but a softer transition between the new and old construction. The proposed splayed handrails are out of code and make the bridge look larger than it should be. A north/south access would preserve the view down to River Street. The bridge obscures the historic character and stairs that people are currently using with ease. Believes more study should have been done.

**Ms. Ellen Harris**, of the Downtown Neighborhood Association, stated they share many of the concerns regarding visual compatibility of the design. She stated this is the first time in recent history that a bridge of this scale is planned over one of the ramps; it can dramatically change one of the most unique areas in the Landmark District. A thoughtful and well-designed plan is essential. DNA also feels more public input should have been had. It appears the bridge is more relative to the new construction rather than the historical. The ornamentation is heavy handed rather than historically graceful. There is a need for the structure, but the design needs more consideration and a continuance is requested.

**Mr. Shay** thanked the HSF and DNA for their comments. He thinks there are things from their comments they can incorporate within the design. They request not to be continued to remain on the projected timeframe for completion.

**Ms. Lidy** stated this is a high-priority project for public access, in relation to current and coming residential and commercial projects. This is a public-private partnership; they felt going to the HSF, DNA and presenting to the HDBR was their avenue of public outreach.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Altschiller** stated he has concerns about the design of the bridge; it compares more to the new construction. The stair coming down toward the river seems close to the bridge, possible creating additional hazards. **Ms. Memory** is concerned about the visual compatibility of the project and is not comfortable approving. **Ms. Lynch** stated she has appearance concerns: the steel arch is distracting. The design could be refined and would like the stairs to be an introduction to the bridge. **Ms. Taylor** stated the design of the bridge should be softened and have it more complimentary to the historic staircase. Although it will be useful, more design work is needed. **Mr. Houle** agrees with the previous comments. **Mr. Dodge** stated he does not have an issue with the bridge design and agrees with Staff recommendations. **Mr. Bodek** stated he thinks the design needs to be reworked, as it is visually abusive to the environment. **Ms. Isaacs** stated the bridge is not visually compatible to the area and there is a better way to design. She is concerned that none of the recommendations proposed by HSF and DNA were incorporated into this presentation. Additionally, **Mr. Altschiller** stated the bridge should conform to what's there without duplicating what's already there; be more compatible. **Ms. Memory** stated the stairs should be usable and the bridge compatible with them. **Ms. Isaacs** stated the unobstructed view along Bay Street facing the river is the only one left; the bridge should be compatible.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval to amend the previous approval for 600 East Bay Street (AC Hotel) and adjacent areas in order improve public safety and public access at the request of the City of Savannah with the following condition because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the preservation and design standards:**

- 1. Ensure that any physical disruptions to the historic elements, when installing the new elements (particularly the bridge), do not cause damage. If historic elements must be temporarily removed to installed new elements, ensure that they are reinstalled in their current configuration.**

**Motion**

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to approve the amendments to the "valley" between the AC Hotel at 600 East River Street and the adjacent Homewood Suites, as requested, because the proposed changes are visually compatible and meet the standards.

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to continue to October 13, 2021 the request for installation of the pedestrian bridge adjacent to the AC Hotel at 600 East River Street to the October 13, 2021 HDBR Meeting in order for the bridge to be redesigned to reflect similar bridges within the historic context and maintain the public use of the historic stair with the following condition:

1. Perform a Phase 1 archaeological investigation.

**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

[11. Petition of Pantheon ADC | 21-002857-COA | Lot 6, Decker Ward Tything Lot | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

- 📎 [Staff Recommendation 21-002857-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Project Narrative.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Material Narrative.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- 📎 [HDBR Sample Panel Policy.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Sample Panel.jpg](#)
- 📎 [Board Decision - Part I, July 14th Meeting.pdf](#)

**Ms. Olivia Arfuso** presented the petitioner's request for approval of Part II: Design Details for a new five-story building on the east-west connecting street of Lot 6, tithing lot of Decker Ward. The New Construction will be approximately 4,800-square-feet and will be named, "The Digby."

On **July 14, 2021**, this project was approved for New Construction, Part I: Height and Mass, with the following conditions:

1. Provide evidence that the equipment will not be visible from the public right-of-way or submit a method of appropriate screening.
2. Ensure that the parapet height is appropriate and accurately depicted in the drawings.

The petitioner also received approval for the request for a Special Exception from the following standard:

Incorporate recesses within the wall plane. Building frontage shall be limited to 30 feet with recesses of at least 12 feet in width and four (4) feet in depth. Recesses shall extend to the ground or begin immediately above the ground floor.

To allow for 7'-2" wide recesses along the West Bryan Street frontage, as well as 2'-8" deep recesses along West Bryan Street and for 2'-0" deep recesses along Barnard Street.

During the review of Part II, Design Details, Staff determined that conditions 1 and 2 of the previous approval have been met.

Per the petitioner:

(Floor 4)

-South = 47% East = 48% North = 47% (Floor 5) East = 30% The standard is met.

**The following Part II standards from Sec 7.8 – Savannah Downtown Historic District Ordinance apply:**

**Visual Compatibility Criteria.** To maintain the special character of the Savannah Downtown Historic District as identified in the architectural survey and visual analysis, new construction and any material change in appearance shall be consistent with the standards, criteria and guidelines developed for the district. The applicable criteria below shall be used to assess new construction and material changes. These criteria shall not be the basis for appeal to any board, commission or administrator described in this Ordinance, or to the Mayor and Aldermen.

**Relationship of materials, texture and color.** The relationship of materials, texture and color of the facade of a building or structure shall be visually compatible with the predominate materials, textures, and colors used on contributing buildings and structures to which the structure is visually related.

The following materials, textures, and colors are proposed:

Exterior Walls:

**Brick 1-** Palmetto Brick, color is a blend of 1.25 Greystone (~60%) and 2.00 Greystone (~40%) with a smooth finish

**Pavers-** To match Brick 1

**Mortar 1-** Argos, in the color “Limestone”

**Brick 2-** Acme Brick, in the color “Steele Gray” with a smooth finish

**Mortar 2-** Holcim, in the color “Shelby Tan”

**Cast Stone 1-** Arris-Cast, Cast Stone, in the color “Olive” or closest match to Brick 2

**Glass Fiber Reinforced Concrete-** Moonlight Molds, in the color “Grey” (191004-1C) with a smooth integrated color finish

Curtain Walls:

**Frame-** YKK YCW 750 OG Thermally Broken Curtain Wall, factory finished anodized in the color “Black”

**Spandrel 1-** Glasskote, paint on interior face of glazing in the color “Black” to match curtain wall frame.

Windows:

**Frame-** Marvin Ultimate Push-Out Aluminum-Clad Casement / Storefront Frames, in the color “Ebony”

Canopy:

**Metal Canopy 1-** Mapes Super Lumideck Flat Soffit in the color “Black”

Metals:

**Metal 1-** Pac-Clad Break Metal Trim, in the color “Black”

**Metal 2-** UNA-Clad Flush Panel System Metal Soffit Panels, in the color “medium Bronze” or the closest match to Brick 1

Wood:

The first story of the building is currently designed as a storefront. The glazing will not be less than 55% of the surface area and will have a base that measures 18-inches. All storefronts are proposed to be inset a minimum of 4-inches. The base and storefront surrounds will consist of glass fiber reinforced concrete by Moonlight Molds in the color "grey" (191004-1C). The storefront framing will be Marvin Ultimate Push-Out Aluminum-Clad Storefronts, in the color "Ebony," as well as YKK YCW 750 OG Thermally Broken Curtain Walls, factory finished anodized in the color "Black."

Staff has determined that the proposed storefront base material appears darker in the physical sample provided to staff, than how it appears on the renders provided in the submittal packet. Revise the drawings to appropriately depict the color of all areas utilizing the glass fiber reinforced concrete by Moonlight Molds in the color "grey" (191004-1C). Although this material is not included under the standards for "Commercial Storefronts", Staff has determined that the proposed material is visually compatible and appropriate for use on New Construction.

The rooftop decks are proposed to be screened using parapet walls, to limit the visibility from West Bryan Street and Barnard Street. Therefore, the materiality of the decks will not be visible from the public rights-of-way. However, patio pavers are proposed for the decking and the parapet will consist primarily of Palmetto and Acme bricks, as well as Arris-Cast cast stone coping. The standard is met.

The proposed entrance awnings will have vertical clearance of 13-feet and will consist of Mapes Super Lumideck Flat Soffit in the color "Black" and IPE wood boards with no stain. The awnings will be integrated structurally and architecturally into the design of the façade.

Ensure that the wood boards are either painted or stained.

The New Construction is proposed to have a flat roof configuration with a parapet wall. Rooftop decks are proposed along the West Bryan Street and Barnard Street facades but will be screened using the parapet walls to limit the visibility from the public rights-of-way. The parapet is proposed to have a brick stringcourse and cast stone coping. Skylights are, also, proposed; however, they will be integrated into the roof design.

Lighting fixtures were not submitted to Staff for review. Ensure that any proposed lighting is submitted to Staff for review prior to installation.

The New Construction is proposed to have a brick parapet wall that encloses the outdoor leisure areas. A smaller parapet located above the 5th-floor will help to screen the proposed skylights, and mechanical rooftop equipment. The parapets will consist primarily of Palmetto bricks, as well as Arris-Cast cast stone and glass fiber reinforced concrete by Moonlight Molds in the color "grey" (191004-1C).

Staff has determined that the proposed glass fiber reinforced concrete appears darker in the physical sample provided to staff, than how it appears on the renders provided in the submittal packet. Revise the drawings to appropriately depict the color of all areas utilizing the glass fiber reinforced concrete by Moonlight Molds in the color "grey" (191004-1C).

**Mr. James Gallucci**, petitioner, stated they agreed with and made modifications based on Staff recommendations. They did not agree with the concern of brick color; there are a variety of brick colors and textures, as it is warm and contextual. They are willing to find materials that are acceptable to all, but would like to maintain original colors and textures. Would like to use a clear stain for IPE, as they don't prefer to have a color. If required, will use a different species. Lighting will be submitted in the future. Regarding the curtain wall, they are willing to have an operable curtain wall if necessary.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

There was no public comment.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Bodek** stated he agrees with the petitioner's brick colors, based on the variety of colors in Ellis Square. **Mr. Dodge** and **Mr. Houle** agreed. However, they agreed with Staff regarding the other issues. **Ms. Lynch** thinks the materials could be resolved at Staff level. The window issue needs to be addressed. **Ms. Memory** and **Mr. Altschiller** agreed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval for the revisions to New Construction, Part I: Height and Mass of a new five- story building on the east-west connecting street of Lot 6, tithing lot of Decker Ward as requested, because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.**

**AND**

**Continue the petition for Part II: Design Details to the October 13th HDBR Regular Meeting (or a maximum of 90 days), in order for the petitioner to address the following:**

1. **Revise the combination of exterior wall colors to a more cohesive, warmer color palette.**
2. **Revise the drawings to appropriately depict the color of all areas utilizing the glass fiber reinforced concrete by Moonlight Molds in the color "grey" (191004-1C).**
3. **Revise the painted glazing with an alternative, such as metal, so that the standards are met.**
4. **Ensure that the wood boards are either painted or stained.**
5. **Ensure that any proposed lighting is submitted to Staff for review prior to installation.**
6. **Ensure that a new sample panel is submitted to Staff for review that accurately reflects any changes in materials, workmanship and/or color palette of the proposed building's final design per the Sample Panel Policy (see attached).**

1. **Provide evidence that the equipment will not be visible from the public right-of-way or submit a method of appropriate screening.**

"We have worked with our engineering design team to provide accurate 3-dimensional models of all rooftop equipment and have provided site sections showing the views from the public right- of-way. The site sections will show that the equipment cannot be seen. Additional 3D views can be provided upon request."

2. **Ensure that the parapet height is appropriate and accurately depicted in the**

## **drawings.**

“After further investigation of our Part I design, it was made clear that the height of the parapet needed to be raised to accommodate the structure required to support the dropped slab at the 5th floor and to commiserate with the contextual buildings. The parapet was raised approximately 2'-2" to 43" as required by code.”

In addition to meeting the conditions as required, the following changes have been made to Part I, Height and Mass. The percentage of surface area of the windows and doors on the street fronting facades:

### **Ground Level (Commercial Uses):**

- South Elevation = From 55% to **63%**
- East Elevation = From 63% to **66%**
- North Elevation = From 55% to **63%**

### **Upper Levels**

- (Floors 2 and 3)
  - South = From 47% to **49%** East = From 49% to **50%** North = From 47% to **49%**
- (Floor 4)
  - South = From 47% to **36%** East = From 48% to **35%** North = From 47% to **36%**
- (Floor 5)
  - East = From 30% to **40%**

Staff has determined that these revised percentages still meet the standards.

The total height of the New Construction has increased from 71'-6" to 72'-7". The top expression is now approximately 11'-6 <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>" and the middle expression has increased to 41'-10 <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>". As part of these updates, the 5th floor has, also, been setback 4-inches from the primary brick façade along Barnard Street.

The New Construction is proposed to have an exterior expression of five-stories; 72'-7" in height (to the rooftop parapet). Per the Height Map, a maximum of six-stories is allowed in this zone. Hotel Indigo is situated to the North of Lot 6, while the Andaz Hotel is located to the immediate East. The Andaz Hotel is approximately 73-feet in height at its tallest point, and the Hotel Indigo is approximately 65-feet-tall (from the ground to the parapet) with an additional 12-feet tall penthouse bringing the total exterior expression to 77-feet. The proposed height of the New Construction will be visually compatible with the hotels to which it will be (directly) visually related. The standard is met.

Since the approval of Part I: Height and Mass, the parapet height has been raised approximately 2'-2" to 43" as required by code. Staff has determined that the proposed parapet height is now visually compatible with the contributing building and structures to which the New Construction will be visually related. The standard is met.

The New Construction is proposed to front a West Bryan Street and Barnard Street and will be five-stories in height. The first floor will have an exterior expression of 16-feet, and floors 2-5 will have an expression between 14-16 feet. Staff has determined that although

the pre-existing lot size is nonconforming, the New Construction is proposed to meet the Height standards for Commercial Buildings. The standard is met.

The facade will be subdivided into base, middle, and top by implementing two different styles of projecting horizontal brick bands. The base will be separated from the middle using a string course consisting of projecting rowlock courses, running bonds, and soldier courses. The top will then be distinguished from the middle by using a combination of soldier courses, rowlock courses, and a sawtooth course. The standard is met. Staff has determined that the visual expression of the first story is greater than that of any story above, and that the top story is distinctive from the stories below. The top expression is now approximately 11'-6 ¾" and the middle expression has increased to 41'-10 ¾". As part of these updates, the 5th floor has, also, been setback 4-inches from the primary brick façade along Barnard Street.

The New Construction is proposed to have a flat roof configuration with a parapet wall. Rooftop decks are proposed along the West Bryan Street and Barnard Street facades but will be screened using the parapet walls to limit the visibility from the public rights-of-way. Per the petitioner, "We have worked with our engineering design team to provide accurate 3- dimensional models of all rooftop equipment and have provided site sections showing the views from the public right-of-way. The site sections will show that the equipment cannot be seen. Additional 3D views can be provided upon request." Staff has determined that due to the height of the New Construction, and the proposed location of the roof mounted equipment, the units will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

Per the petitioner:

Ground Level (Commercial Uses):

- South Elevation = 55%
- East Elevation = 63%
- North Elevation = 55%

### **Upper Levels**

(Floors 2 and 3)

- South = 47% East = 49% North = 47%

IPE Wood Boards, no stain.

Staff has determined that the combination of the materials, textures, and colors (as proposed) will appear muted and visually "muddy," against the warmer palettes of the surrounding buildings to which the New Construction will be related.

Staff recommends revising the combination of materials, textures, and colors to reflect a more cohesive, warmer color palette.

Per the petitioner, "...All glazing will be clear except for the spandrels in the curtain wall, which will be painted to match. The upper floors will be aluminum clad wood operable casement windows with a GFRC smooth finish surrounds. Our head and sill details will show that all upper floor punched openings are set back a minimum of 3-inches..."

The main window type is proposed to be paired, Marvin Ultimate Push-Out Aluminum-Clad Casement windows, and the frames will be in the color "Ebony." Individually, the windows will have a vertical to horizontal ratio greater than 5:3. The windows are proposed to have a surround/trim that consists of glass fiber reinforced concrete by Moonlight Molds in the color "grey" (191004-1C). Staff has determined that the proposed

window surround material appears darker in the physical sample provided to staff, than how it appears on the renders provided in the submittal packet.

Revise the painted glazing with an alternative, such as metal, so that the standards are met, and revise the drawings to appropriately depict the color of all areas utilizing the glass fiber reinforced concrete by Moonlight Molds in the color “grey” (191004-1C).

Per the petitioner, “The building is comprised of modular masonry brick with horizontal and vertical brick detailing to emphasize different elements of the design. This material covers close to 100% of the building’s façade...The Digby’s field brick will be a blend of two different gray/brown bricks...The corner elements will have a contemporary brick color that speaks to the more contemporary feel of this elements. The contemporary brick choice will host our aluminum curtain walls and storefront systems.”

The exterior walls will consist primarily of Palmetto and Acme bricks, as well as Arris-Cast cast stone. The corner bays (containing the proposed curtain walls) will consist of only the lighter colored Acme bricks, while the body / core of the building will be primarily Palmetto bricks. Decorative surrounds / trim around the windows, curtain walls, and storefronts will be formed using glass fiber reinforced concrete by Moonlight Molds in the color “grey” (191004-1C).

Staff has determined that the cool, neutral color palette (of browns, taupes, and greys) on the exterior walls is incompatible and will appear muted and visually “muddy,” against the warmer palettes of the surrounding buildings to which the New Construction will be related. Staff recommends revising the combination of exterior wall colors to a more cohesive, warmer color palette.

A sample panel was submitted to Staff for Review. Staff has determined that the combination of materials, and the overall color palette (as proposed) will appear muted and visually “muddy,” against the warmer palettes of the surrounding buildings to which the New Construction will be related. Staff recommends revising the combination of exterior wall colors to a more cohesive, warmer color palette. Ensure that a new sample panel is submitted to Staff for review that accurately reflects any changes in materials, workmanship and/or color palette of the proposed building’s final design.

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

**Ms. Lynch** asked how the proposed curtain wall was addressed, regarding being an operable window or not. **Ms. Michalak** stated this has been handled differently based on the project. She referenced the one of the two different Indian Street projects as an example; a variance was required for the glass tower and window operability. She stated that would be a Board decision, whether it would be reviewed as a first floor storefront with operable glass doors. **Ms. Lynch** stated it should be addressed to be fair.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Motion**

The Historic District Board of Review motioned for approval for the revisions to New Construction, Part I: Height and Mass of a new five-story building on the east-west connecting street of Lot 6, tithing lot of Decker

Ward as requested, because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

AND

Approve the petition for Part II: Design Details to the October 13th HDBR Regular Meeting (or a maximum of 90 days), in order for the petitioner to address the following:

1. Revise the drawings to appropriately depict the color of all areas utilizing the glass fiber reinforced concrete by Moonlight Molds in the color ";grey"; (191004-1C).
2. Revise the painted glazing with an alternative, such as metal, so that the standards are met.
3. Ensure that any proposed lighting is submitted to Staff for review prior to installation.
4. Ensure that a new sample panel is submitted to Staff for review that accurately reflects any changes in materials, workmanship and/or color palette of the proposed building's final design per the Sample Panel Policy (see attached).
5. Make glass corner operable or apply for special exception.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Becky Lynch

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

[12. Petition of Hansen Architects, Erik Puljung | 21-004046-COA | 26 East Gaston Street | Addition to Carriage House](#)

- 📎 [Staff Recommendation 21-004046-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet- Application and Checklist.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Revised Narrative and Drawings.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Petitioner's Response to Conditions.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Board Decision - August 11 Meeting.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Staff Research.pdf](#)

**Ms. Olivia Arfuso** presented the petitioner's request for approval for one-story addition atop



the existing 1990s Carriage House structure at **26 East Gaston Street**. The proposed work also includes the alteration of a door opening on the historic Carriage House and the installation of an exterior staircase.

The one-story addition to the West-façade of the historic Carriage House is proposed to have a second story added. The vertical addition will follow the same footprint as the existing, non-historic Carriage House addition. However, a recessed bay will now be evident along the lane (North-facing) elevation. The recessed bay will be approximately 12-feet, 10 ½ -inches-wide and 5-feet in depth. The first story has a recess, but it is currently being used to house mechanical equipment and, therefore, is screened from the public right-of-way. The existing concrete slab is proposed to be removed and the condensers will be relocated to a new elevated mechanical pad aligned with the second floor.

The existing louvered mechanical gate along the lane of the 1990s addition is proposed to be replaced with new louver panels measuring 8-feet in height and 8 ½ -feet-wide. The louver style and color will match the principal building. *Per the petitioner*, these panels will be inclusive of an access gate.

The addition will join the existing parapet wall on the attached, two-story, historic Carriage House by utilizing a single slope, low-pitch roof form with a parapet wall on all sides. A new metal parapet cap is, also, proposed to be installed. The window openings along the lane are proposed to be coordinated with the existing openings (below) on the 1990s addition.

On the courtyard side of the proposed addition, a porch and accompanying new French door openings are proposed directly above the existing first floor openings. Two, new 8-inch square wood columns located on the first floor will support the proposed second story porch. The existing first floor awning will be relocated to above the proposed second floor to create a “roof” for the porch.

A closed second floor doorway along the East-façade of the historic Carriage House is proposed to be reopened. *Per the petitioner*, the opening is currently shuttered. An existing wood service yard gate will be removed to allow for a new wood staircase and landing to accompany the restored doorway, and to provide access to the second floor. The stair will be approximately 7-feet, 9 ¼ -inches in height with a landing approximately 4-feet in depth. New lattice is proposed to be installed under the stairs and painted. A new composite bracket will also be installed and painted to match the existing trim. The principal building and the existing fence are proposed to conceal these alterations from any public right-of-way.

On **August 11, 2021**, the Board heard the petition for a one-story addition atop the existing 1990s Carriage House structure at **26 East Gaston Street**, as well as the alteration of a door opening on the historic Carriage House and the installation of a new exterior staircase. The Board voted to *continue* the petition to the September 9th HDBR Regular Meeting, in order for the petitioner to address the following:

1. Submit photographic evidence of the infilled doorway that is proposed to be re-opened, to ensure that no historic materials will be removed or altered.
2. Submit specifications for the proposed brick / mortar, and all doors.
3. Clarify whether historic door / opening dimensions are proposed to be modified or altered
4. Revise the height of the parapet on the addition to reduce the overall vertical expression of the non-historic Carriage House addition.
5. Provide additional information regarding the window specifications and details, including: Ensure that the muntin profile simulates traditional putty glazing, that the

- lower sash rail is wider than the meeting and top rails, and that all extrusions are covered with appropriate molding and framing members. Ensure that all window sashes are inset a minimum of (3) inches from the façade of the building.
6. Revise the second-floor balcony so that it does not extend more that (3) feet in depth from the face of the building and provide a form of architectural balcony support. Ensure that the balusters are painted or stained wood, or wood composite.
  7. Clarify if alterations / repairs are proposed for the West-facing side verandah.
  8. Contact the City of Savannah's Development Services Department for further clarification and guidance regarding the proposed use. Ensure that this issue is resolved before returning to the HDBR for review.

The petitioner provided Staff with updated drawings on **Wednesday, August 18th**, as well as a written response to each of the conditions of the *continuance*. Staff did note some inconsistencies in the revised drawings including an additional row of screening/lattice atop the rear masonry wall along Gordon Lane, and errors on the "Gordon Lane Elevation – Demo" drawing. Staff would like the petitioner to correct these errors in the drawing packet, or to provide clarification for the irregularities.

Staff would also like to mention the revision of the recessed bay along the Gordon Lane elevation. The windows on the recessed bay are now proposed to be  $\frac{1}{4}$  screened by a raised masonry half-wall that is proposed to create a wall of continuity between the West-side of the addition and the façade of the historic Carriage House's second floor. (Reference "Walls of continuity" under the *Visual Compatibility Criteria*)

The historic building was constructed in **1909** and is a contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District. On the *Savannah Historic Building Map*, all structures on the property (including the eastern and western portions of the rear Carriage House are considered "Contributing Resources." It was constructed in a Georgian Revival style and follows a central hallway floor plan. The house, itself, is two-and  $\frac{1}{2}$  stories in height and is constructed of brick. The first floor has a one-story front verandah and there is a matching two-story verandah along the side, West-facing facade. In 1910 there is a record of the expansion of a "rear automobile house" on the property. The **1916 Sanborn Map** depicts this two-story brick "auto garage" in the north-west corner of the property. By the **1954 Sanborn Map**, a one-story brick addition extends from the South-facing façade of the existing two-story auto garage. The configuration of the rear auto garage remains unchanged on the **1973 Sanborn Map**.

Staff studied the original petition for the existing, non-historic Carriage House addition. The drawings provided in the submittal packet show the previously existing "Garage House" that was demolished to construct the addition [File No. HBR 01-2719]. Therefore, Staff has determined that the existing "1990s Carriage House addition" actually dates to 2001 / 2002. Therefore, the existing Carriage House addition is non-historic.

The vertical addition is proposed to occur within the existing, non-historic Carriage House addition footprint that has a pre-existing covered porch; therefore, a second story porch will not impact the overall building coverage.

The proposed addition will occur vertically above the existing, non-historic Carriage House addition. However, a closed second floor doorway along the East-façade of the historic Carriage House is proposed to be reopened. *Per the petitioner*, the opening is currently

shuttered. The petitioner submitted additional photographic evidence of the opening. *Per the petitioner*, “The historic opening appears to measure 33-inches wide, it is our intent to continue with this same opening with no historic material being removed or altered.” The standard is met.

Ensure that all work is undertaken using the gentlest means possible to avoid damage to any historic materials.

The one-story, non-historic addition to the West-façade of the historic Carriage House is proposed to have a second story added. The vertical addition will follow the same footprint as the existing, non-historic Carriage House addition. A recessed bay will now be evident along the lane (North-facing) elevation. The first story recess is currently being used to house mechanical equipment and, therefore, is screened from the public right-of-way.

The addition will join the existing parapet wall on the attached, two-story, historic Carriage House by utilizing a single slope, low-pitch roof form with a parapet wall on all sides.

A closed second floor doorway along the East-façade of the historic Carriage House is proposed to be reopened. *Per the petitioner*, the opening is currently shuttered. An existing wood service yard gate will be removed to allow for a new wood staircase and landing to accompany the restored doorway, and to provide access to the second floor. Ensure that all work is undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired, and that no alterations are made to the historic Carriage House.

Staff has determined that the parapet roof form (as proposed) is not compatible with the massing, size, or scale of the historic Carriage House’s hip roof. The petitioner chose not to adjust the height of the parapet, per condition 4 from the August 11th HDBR Meeting, due to the affects it would have on the ceiling height. Instead, the petitioner has, “...reduced the overall height of the previously proposed design by 4” providing the minimal vertical distance. We have further addressed the connection or relationship of the new addition to the historic carriage house by recessing the connection from the lane by approximately 5’ – allowing the historic parapet to be expressed from the lane.” Therefore, Staff recommends that the petitioner revise the parapet roof so (*at least*) the portion adjacent to the historic Carriage House roof does not exceed the height of the existing historic parapet, or so that the addition has a flat roof shape with a low pitch to the rear.

On the courtyard side of the proposed addition, a porch and accompanying new door openings are proposed directly above the existing first floor openings. The openings will match the locations and the dimensions of the existing first floor French doors. Staff has determined that these proposed openings are harmonious and compatible with the existing openings on the non-historic addition to which the new openings will be visually related.

On the lane side of the proposed addition, five windows 2’9” x 4’11” in size are proposed to be installed. Three windows will be installed on the recessed bay, and two windows along the remaining façade.

On the courtyard side of the proposed addition, a porch and accompanying new French door openings are proposed directly above the existing first floor openings. The second story porch will be supported by the installation of two new square columns, below. The new

porch depth was not provided to Staff; however, Staff has determined that it is approximately the same depth as the existing first-floor covered patio.

On the lane side of the proposed addition, (5) "Marvin," *Ultimate*, double-hung, G2, 6-over-6 windows are proposed to be installed with 7/8-inch SDL and spacer bars. New 4x4 posts and louvers are proposed to replace the existing louvered mechanical gate. The replacements will match the style and color of the Main House.

On the courtyard side of the proposed addition, (4) pairs of French doors approximately 48-inches-wide by 79-inches-tall are proposed to match the type of doors on the existing addition's first floor. The existing patio awning will be relocated from the ground-level, and a new baluster / IPE wood floor will be installed on the proposed second story porch. Two, new 8-inch square wood columns will support the proposed second story porch.

An existing wood service yard gate will be removed to allow for a new wood staircase and landing to accompany the restored doorway, and to provide access to the second floor. New lattice is proposed to be installed under the stairs and painted. A new composite bracket will, also, be installed and painted to match the existing trim. All new masonry is proposed to match the existing parapet and a new metal parapet cap will be installed.

Condition 2 of the continuance from the August 11th HDBR Meeting requested that the petitioner submit specifications for the proposed brick/mortar and all doors. *Per the petitioner*, "We will submit these samples to Staff for review upon receipt of the requested samples that are intended to match the adjacent existing."

The proposed addition will join the existing parapet wall on the adjacent, two-story, historic Carriage House by utilizing a single slope, low-pitch roof form with a parapet wall on all sides.

Staff previously determined that while the roof's shape is compatible, the proposed height and mass is not. The petitioner chose not to adjust the height of the parapet, per condition 4 from the August 11th HDBR Meeting, due to the affects it would have on the ceiling height. Instead, the petitioner has, "...reduced the overall height of the previously proposed design by 4" providing the minimal vertical distance. We have further addressed the connection or relationship of the new addition to the historic carriage house by recessing the connection from the lane by approximately 5' – allowing the historic parapet to be expressed from the lane." Staff still has concerns regarding the visual impact of the parapet height in relation to the historic Carriage House's hip roof. Therefore, Staff recommends that the petitioner revise the parapet roof so (*at least*) the portion adjacent to the historic Carriage House roof does not exceed the height of the existing historic parapet, or so that the addition has a flat roof shape with a low pitch to the rear.

The proposed addition will occur vertically atop the existing, non-historic addition. The addition will join the existing parapet wall on the adjacent, two-story, historic Carriage House. A recessed bay will be implemented; however, the windows on the recessed bay are proposed to be ¼ screened by a raised masonry half-wall. This half-wall will create a wall of enclosure between the West-side of the addition and the façade of the historic Carriage House's second floor.

Although the intent of the standard is met, Staff has determined that the proposed masonry parapet will adversely impact the windows located on the recessed bay. Revise the masonry parapet (above the first floor of the recessed bay) so that it does not visually obstruct the windows.

Staff has determined that the mass of the addition is greater in scale than that of the historic Carriage House's second floor.

At the August 11th HDBR Meeting Staff recommended that the petitioner revise the height of the parapet to reduce the overall vertical expression of the non-historic Carriage House addition. The petitioner chose not to adjust the height of the parapet, per condition 4 from the August 11th HDBR Meeting, due to the affects it would have on the ceiling height. Instead, the petitioner has, "...reduced the overall height of the previously proposed design by 4" providing the minimal vertical distance. We have further addressed the connection or relationship of the new addition to the historic carriage house by recessing the connection from the lane by approximately 5' – allowing the historic parapet to be expressed from the lane." However, Staff still has concerns regarding the mass of the addition being greater in scale than that of the historic Carriage House's second floor. Therefore, Staff recommends that the petitioner revise the parapet roof so (*at least*) the portion adjacent to the historic Carriage House roof does not exceed the height of the existing historic parapet, *or* so that the addition has a flat roof shape with a low pitch to the rear.

All new exterior wall masonry is proposed to match the existing parapet.

Condition 2 of the continuance from the August 11th HDBR Meeting requested that the petitioner submit specifications for the proposed brick/mortar and all doors. *Per the petitioner*, "We will submit these samples to Staff for review upon receipt of the requested samples that are intended to match the adjacent existing."

On the courtyard side of the proposed addition, (4) pairs of French doors approximately 48-inches-wide by 79-inches-tall are proposed to match the type of the doors on the existing addition.

A closed second floor doorway along the East-façade of the historic Carriage House is proposed to be reopened. *Per the petitioner*, the opening is currently shuttered. An existing wood service yard gate will be removed to allow for a new wood staircase and landing to accompany the restored doorway, and to provide access to the second floor. The petitioner submitted additional photographic evidence of the opening. *Per the petitioner*, "The historic opening appears to measure 33-inches wide, it is our intent to continue with this same opening with no historic material being removed or altered." The standard is met.

On the lane side of the proposed addition, (5) "Marvin," *Ultimate*, double-hung, G2, 6-over-6 windows are proposed to be installed with 7/8-inch SDL and spacer bars. The windows will be setback 5-inches from the brick face, and will have appropriate head jamb, sill, and trim. The standard is met.

On the courtyard side of the addition, a porch is proposed directly above the existing first floor covered patio. Two, new 8-inch square wood columns located on the first floor will support the proposed second story porch. The columns will have, both, capitals and bases. The existing first floor awning will be relocated to create the roof of the proposed porch. The new balusters will be placed between upper and lower rails, and the railing height will be 36-inches. The second story porch's railing will be painted wood and the decking will be IPE wood boards.

An existing wood service yard gate will be removed to allow for a new wood staircase and landing to accompany the restored doorway, and to provide access to the second floor. New

lattice is proposed to be installed under the stairs and painted. A new composite bracket will, also, be installed and painted to match the existing trim.

Per the 7th condition of the August 11th *continuance*, the petitioner provided additional information / clarification regarding the repairs of the West-facing side verandah. “The caretaker for the home observed failure of a column on the verandah and has had the structure braced while a column repair can be scheduled. No changes are planned. They described this as an in kind repair for the column. The house manager has been advised that the replacement column and repair must be submitted for approval as an in kind repair.

The existing first floor awning will be relocated to create the roof of the proposed second floor porch. The deck of the second story porch will, then, create the new roof for the first floor verandah.

The proposed addition will join the existing parapet wall on the adjacent, two-story, historic Carriage House by utilizing a single slope, low-pitch roof form with a parapet wall on all sides. The roof will have a pre-engineered truss, membrane and new metal parapet cap. Staff has determined that the drawings appear to show a stringcourse and coping.

While Staff finds the roof shape to be historically appropriate, Staff has determined that it is not compatible with the massing, size, or scale of the historic Carriage House’s hip roof. The petitioner chose not to adjust the height of the parapet, per condition 4 from the August 11th HDBR Meeting, due to the affects it would have on the ceiling height. Instead, the petitioner has, “...reduced the overall height of the previously proposed design by 4” providing the minimal vertical distance. We have further addressed the connection or relationship of the new addition to the historic carriage house by recessing the connection from the lane by approximately 5’ – allowing the historic parapet to be expressed from the lane.”

Therefore, Staff recommends that the petitioner revise the parapet roof so (*at least*) the portion adjacent to the historic Carriage House roof does not exceed the height of the existing historic parapet, or so that the addition has a flat roof shape with a low pitch to the rear.

On the *Savannah Historic Building Map*, all structures on the property (including the eastern and western portions of the rear Carriage House are considered “Contributing Resources.” However, Staff determined that the western addition to the historic Carriage House dates to 2001 / 2002.

Therefore, the vertical addition that is proposed atop the original Carriage House’s non-historic western addition, will not affect the principal building in any way. The addition will still be subordinate in mass and height to the principal building and will not obscure any character-defining features of the principal building *or* the historic Carriage House. The addition is proposed to be attached to the historic Carriage House via an existing parapet wall and the only proposed alteration to the historic Carriage House is the restoration of a second-floor door opening that has been infilled.

Staff has determined that the intent of the standards are met.

The one-story, non-historic addition to West-façade of the original Carriage House is proposed to have a second story added. The vertical addition will follow the same footprint as the existing Carriage House addition. The new addition will join the existing parapet wall on the adjacent, two-story, historic Carriage House by utilizing a single slope, low-pitch roof

form with a parapet wall on all sides. A new metal parapet cap is, also, proposed to be installed. The window openings along the lane are proposed to be coordinated with the existing openings (below) on the existing, one-story addition.

On the courtyard side of the proposed addition, a porch and accompanying new French door openings are proposed directly above the existing first floor openings. The porch will be supported with two square columns and the existing first floor awning will be relocated to above the proposed second floor.

The existing louvered mechanical gate along the lane of the existing, one-story addition are proposed to be replaced with new louver panels measuring 8-feet in height and 8 ½ -feet-wide. The louver style and color will match the principal building. *Per the petitioner*, these panels will be inclusive of an access gate.

A closed second floor doorway along the East-façade of the historic Carriage House is proposed to be reopened. *Per the petitioner*, the opening is currently shuttered. An existing wood service yard gate will be removed to allow for a new wood staircase and landing to accompany the restored doorway, and to provide access to the second floor. The stair will be approximately 7-feet, 9 ¼ -inches in height with a landing approximately 4-feet in depth. New lattice is proposed to be installed under the stairs and painted. A new composite bracket will also be installed and painted to match the existing trim. The principal building and the existing fence are proposed to conceal these alterations from any public right-of-way.

Ensure that door / opening dimensions are not modified or altered in any way.

The existing louvered mechanical gate along the lane of the non-historic addition is proposed to be replaced with new louver panels measuring 8-feet in height and 8 ½ -feet-wide. The louver style and color will match the principal building. *Per the petitioner*, these panels will be inclusive of an access gate. The existing concrete slab is proposed to be removed, and the condensers will be relocated to a new elevated mechanical pad on the second floor.

Staff has determined the proposed mechanical area within the building will be screened from the public-right-of-way. No lighting specifications are included in the submittal packet. The parking garage is a pre-existing condition that is not proposed to be altered in any way.

The accessory dwelling unit is proposed to be added atop an existing accessory structure. The vertical addition will follow the same footprint as the existing, non-historic Carriage House addition. The addition will join the existing parapet wall on the adjacent, two-story, historic Carriage House by utilizing a single slope, low-pitch roof form with a parapet wall on all sides. The accessory dwelling unit will be designed in a similar architectural style as the principal building and will be compatible with the historic Carriage House and its one-story, non-historic addition.

Per condition 8 of the August 11th *continuance*, Staff requested that the petitioner contact the City of Savannah's Development Services Department for further clarification and guidance regarding the proposed use, and to ensure that this issue is resolved before returning to the HDBR for review. The petitioner responded to this condition in the re-submission by stating, "We have reviewed the use with Bridget Lidy and Tom Bolton with the City of Savannah. The uses were clarified and confirmed. There is currently not an accessory dwelling unit on this property. There are two accessory structure by definition of use – one being the existing pool room the other the existing guest room in the historic

carriage house. These two location will continue as accessory structures. The new addition does qualify as what would be considered an accessory dwelling and meets the requirements accordingly.”

**PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Eric Puljung**, petitioner, stated, regarding point two, the parapet is existing; top of the wall with a bond beam. It is to remain intact. The height from the lane is not easily perceived, as well as the relationship of the window and wall. They request for it to maintain as is. Regarding point one, the parapet is not a key component to the historic carriage house; a remnant to something that was previously there. It remains as it connects. He stated they are not opposed to the soffit, but they prefer the designed parapet to continue as a continuous detail for the new addition. Mr. Puljung showed pictures of the varying soffits and pitches. He stated the lattice screen was inadvertently left off; but intended to remain, not intended as an inconsistency. The balluster of the roofline of the non-historic area of the carriage house did have discrepancy: it has been adjusted and no longer visible from the lane. or the side of the addition. There is no work to the historic building outside of what is proposed (staircase and opening).

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

There was no public comment.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Lynch** stated she does not agree that condition 2 is necessary as it is an existing condition and the window wall is recessed a number of feet back. The lowered soffit condition is worth considering. **Ms. Taylor** stated condition 2 should be removed based on petitioner explanation. She stated she is having a hard time with the visualization of the soffit option, and agrees with the other Staff conditions. **Mr. Houle** agreed that condition 2 should be removed and agreed with the other Staff recommendations.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approve the petition for a one-story addition atop the existing 1990s Carriage House structure at 26 East Gaston Street with the following conditions, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:**

1. **Revise the parapet roof so (*at least*) the portion adjacent to the historic Carriage House roof does not exceed the height of the existing historic parapet, or so that the addition has a flat roof shape with a low pitch to the rear.**
2. **Revise the masonry parapet (above the first floor of the recessed bay) so that it does not visually obstruct the windows.**
3. **Correct the noted errors in the drawing packet or provide clarification for the irregularities.**
4. **Ensure that all work is undertaken using the gentlest means possible to avoid damage to any historic materials.**
5. **Ensure that all work is undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired, and that no alterations are made to the historic Carriage House.**
6. **Ensure that door / opening dimensions are not modified or altered in any way.**

**Motion**

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to approve the petition for a one-story addition atop the



existing 1990s Carriage House structure at 26 East Gaston Street with the following conditions, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the parapet roof so (at least) the portion adjacent to the historic Carriage House roof does not exceed the height of the existing historic parapet, or so that the addition has a flat roof shape with a low pitch to the rear.
2. Correct the noted errors in the drawing packet or provide clarification for the irregularities.
3. Ensure that all work is undertaken using the gentlest means possible to avoid damage to any historic materials.
4. Ensure that all work is undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired, and that no alterations are made to the historic Carriage House.
5. Ensure that door / opening dimensions are not modified or altered in any way.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Stan Houle

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

[13. Petition of Wubbena Architects | 21-004646-COA | 411 East Charlton Street | Alterations](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation - 21-004646-COA - 411 E Charlton St.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Materials.pdf](#)

**Ms. Aislinn Droski** presented the applicant's request for approval of alterations to the rear porch for the property located at 411 East Charlton Street. The existing stair, roof, railing, and decking is proposed to be removed and the new porch is to be extended to the width of the rear of the main building. A new stair, leading out from the floor of the porch to the courtyard, is to be installed. The bottom portion of the porch, including the decking, foundation, and bottom section of the stair, will not be visible from the public right-of-way. 411 East Charlton was constructed in 1882 and is a contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District.

The existing porch is not historic or original to the property and it has not acquired any

historical significance; the removal of its roof, columns, stairs, and decking will not alter or damage any historic or distinctive features of the property. The new porch is proposed to be in the same location as the existing and will remain subordinate to the historic one-story portion of the main building. The alterations to the porch include the installation of a new roof, columns, and railing, as well as the installation of new decking and stairs. The new porch will utilize the existing foundation piers and add an additional wood column for support, as the porch is proposed to extend to be the width of the building. The decking, bottom of stair, and new foundation piers will not be visible from the public right-of-way. Staff finds that the size of the balusters proposed for the new railing is not historically appropriate or compatible. **Staff recommends that the applicant to increase the dimension of the balusters and to submit to staff for final review and approval. Additionally, staff recommends correcting the inaccuracies in the drawings, particularly with the railings and balusters, and to submitting to staff for final review and approval.**

The preservation standards are otherwise met. The porch will not obscure or damage any historic or character defining features of the property. Additionally, the construction for the porch shall be undertaken in a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.

The height of the new porch will remain subordinate to the roofline of the historic one-story portion on the rear of the main building. The height of the porch is visually compatible.

Staff finds the spacing of the columns in context with the existing foundation to be visually incompatible. **Staff recommends revising the middle column of the porch to be centered above the existing foundation pier on the ground floor.** Additionally, staff finds the dimension of the wood balusters on the new railing to be visually incompatible with visually related porches on contributing buildings. **Staff recommends that the applicant to increase the dimension of the balusters, and to submit to staff for final review and approval. Additionally, staff recommends correcting the inaccuracies in the drawings, particularly with the railings and balusters, and to submitting to staff for final review and approval.**

Staff otherwise finds the scale and overall rhythm of the new porch to be visually compatible.

The following materials are proposed to be utilized on the new porch (only on portions that will likely be visible from the public right-of-way):

- Roof: 'ABC Metal Roofing' SL-16 standing seam metal roof in charcoal with Hardi-board trim
- Beam above Column: 2x10 beam with Hardi trim wrap, painted to match trim on main building (white)
- Columns: 10x10 rounded wood column, painted to match trim (white)
- Railing: Wood hand rails and balusters, top and bottom rails are to be painted charcoal, balusters are to be painted to match existing trim (white)
- Decking: *Enhance* composite decking in Mahogany

The applicant has indicated that the roof and paint color are to be in charcoal; however, in the material specifications provided for both the roofing material and paint, there was no charcoal color listed. **Staff recommends that the applicant provide updated and accurate color specifications for all new porch elements to staff for final review and approval.**

The roof of the new porch will appear relatively flat from the public right-of-way (East Charlton Lane). It is a low-slope, shed shaped roof. Staff finds the roof shape to be visually compatible with porches on contributing buildings to which 411 East Charlton is visually

related.

**Staff recommends that the applicant to increase the dimension of the balusters, and to submit to staff for final review and approval. Additionally, staff recommends correcting the inaccuracies in the drawings, particularly with the railings and balusters, and to submitting to staff for final review and approval.**

***Materials.***

*Porch elements shall be constructed of brick, painted or stained wood, wood composite, precast stone, marble, sandstone or slate.*

The standard is met.

The roof for the porch is to be a low slope, shed roof. Staff finds the intent of the standard to be met, **Ensure there is a metal drip edge covering all edges.** The new porch will be in the same location as the existing and will be clearly subordinate and distinguishable from the historic structure. It shall not obscure or damage any character defining features and shall be reversible with minimal damage to the contributing building.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

As the petitioner was not present, the Board continued the petition due to lack of detail on the drawings. They would like additional information. Mr. Bodek stated the petitioner should provide enough information so that they Board can determine how the project will be built.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval of the alterations to the rear porch for the property located at 411 East Charlton Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval, because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:**

- 1. Increase the dimension of the balusters.**
- 2. Correct all inaccuracies in the drawings, particularly with the railings and balusters.**
- 3. Revise the middle column of the porch to be centered above the existing foundation pier on the ground floor.**
- 4. Provide updated and accurate color specifications for all new porch elements.**
- 5. Ensure there is a metal drip edge covering all roof edges.**

**Motion**

The Historic Board of Review motioned to continue to October 13, 2021 HDBR - to address Staff conditions and request for petitioner presence. Provide updated drawings to reflect Staff conditions and details of project design.

**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

## X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

### 14. Petition of ROOFCRAFTERS, Kyle Conaway | 21-003766-COA | 4 WEST LIBERTY STREET | Roof repair and replacement

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 21-003766-4 West Liberty Street.pdf](#)

#### **Motion**

Approve of Staff-approved petitions.

Mr. Dodge recused himself for 21-003930-COA, 523 Perry Street.

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

Motion: Steven Bodek

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
Steven Bodek	- Aye

### 15. Petition of KEVIN DODGE | 21-003930-COA | 523 E. Perry St | Replace current out-of-compliance windows with Ordinance-compliant windows

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec 21-003930-COA 523 E Perry St.pdf](#)

### 16. Petition of GRAPHIC SYSTEMS INTERNATIONAL, Mandi Brabham | 21-004183-COA | 500 WEST RIVER STREET | Non-illuminated signs (east end of south facade) Atlantic Hotel

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 21-004183-COA 500 W River St PRW 13 & 14.pdf](#)

[☞ STAMPED PRW-13 & 14 - Delivery & Loading Graphics.pdf](#)

### 17. Petition of GRAPHIC SYSTEMS INTERNATIONAL, Mandi Brabham | 21-004184-COA | 500 WEST RIVER STREET | Canopy and projecting sign (south facade: parking garage) Atlantic Hotel

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-004184-COA.pdf](#)

[☞ STAMPED PRW-15 - Projecting Parking Sign.pdf](#)

### 18. Petition of DOUG BEAN SIGNS, Angela Bean | 21-004297-COA | 14 WEST HULL STREET | Non-illuminated sign

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec. 21-004297- COA 14 West Hull Street.pdf](#)

[19. Petition of ELLSWORTH DESIGN BUILD, Anderson Resende | 21-004299-COA | 315 EAST YORK STREET | AMENDMENT \(21-003763-COA\): addition of gutters](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff de. 21-004299-COA 315 East York Street.pdf](#)

[20. Petition of COASTAL CANVAS, Joseph Corbin | 21-004395-COA | 121 WEST CONGRESS STREET | Awning replacement](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 21-004395-COA 121 W Congress St..pdf](#)

[21. Petition of J.D. PAINTING/HANDYMAN SERVICES | 21-004396-COA | 418 EAST BROUGHTON STREET | In-kind repainting](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec. 21-004396- COA 418 East Broughton Street.pdf](#)

[22. Petition of KYLE VITALE | 21-004371-COA | 534 EAST JONES STREET | Gas lantern \(replacement of electrical lantern\)](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec. 21-004371- COA 534 East Jones Street.pdf](#)

[23. Petition of THE HOUSE DOCTOR, Charles Angell | 21-004618-COA | 219, 221, 223, & 225 EAST TAYLOR STREET | In-kind repairs, windows, doors, and brick repointing](#)

[☞ SIGNED 21-004618-COA Decison Packet.pdf](#)

[24. Petition of ROOFCRAFTERS, John Girard | 21-004621-COA | 512, 514, 516 EAST SAINT JULIAN STREET | Roof repair](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec 21-004621-COA 512, 514, 516 E St Julian St..pdf](#)

[25. Petition of SCOUT SERVICES, Emily Rudger | 21-004630-COA | 303 WEST SAINT JULIAN STREET | Sign Face Change on existing ATM](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-004630-COA - 303 W Saint Julian St.pdf](#)

[26. Petition of BETH WISE | 21-004643-COA | 621 - 623 JEFFERSON STREET | Gutters](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-004643-COA - 621 Jefferson St.pdf](#)

[27. Petition of SAVANNAH SEAFOOD SHACK, Christine Cutlip | 21-004661-COA | 116 EAST BROUGHTON STREET | Color change](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-004662-COA - 116 E Broughton St.pdf](#)

[28. Petition of THE PINYAN COMPANY, Ashley McGlohon | 21-004684-COA | 634 MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. BLVD | Roof replacement](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-004684-COA - 634 MLK Jr. Blvd..pdf](#)

[29. Petition of JOHN RANIVAND | 21-004706-COA | 402 EAST GASTON STREET | AFTER-THE-FACT: Fence replacement](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-004706-COA - 402 E Gaston St.pdf](#)

[30. Petition of ETHOS PRESERVATION, Ellen Harris | 21-004938-COA | 110 EAST GASTON STREET | Garage door infill with carriage-house style garage doors](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-004938-COA - 110 E Gaston St.pdf](#)

[31. Petition of ELLSWORTH DESIGN BUILD, Anderson Resende | 21-004798-COA | 216 EAST TAYLOR STREET | Gutter installation](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-004798-COA - 216 E Taylor St.pdf](#)

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

[32. Report on Work That Exceeds Scope of Issued COA for the September 9, 2021, HDBR Meeting](#)

[☞ Work That Exceeds Scope of Issued COA\\_September Report.pdf](#)

[33. Report on Work Inconsistent With Issued COA for the September 9, 2021, HDBR Meeting](#)

[☞ Work Inconsistent with Issued COA\\_September Report.pdf](#)

[34. Report on Work Performed Without a COA for the September 9, 2021, HDBR Meeting](#)

[☞ Work Performed Without a COA\\_September Report.pdf](#)

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

[35. Stamped Drawings - September Report](#)

[☞ September 2021 REPORT.pdf](#)

[36. COA Inspections - September Report](#)

[☞ September 2021 - REPORT.pdf](#)

[37. Stamped Drawings - September Report](#)

[☞ September 2021 REPORT.pdf](#)

[38. Items Deferred to Staff - September Report](#)

[☞ Items Deferred to Staff - September Report.pdf](#)

#### XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

#### XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

#### XV. ADJOURNMENT

[39. Next Regular HDBR Meeting - Wednesday, October 13, 2021 at 1pm](#)

[40. Adjourn](#)

3;32

***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.***