



Savannah Historic District Board of Review

Virtual Meeting
January 12, 2022 1:00 PM
MINUTES

January 12, 2022 Savannah Historic District Board of Review

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

MPC Staff Present: Pamela Everett, 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

III. CONSENT AGENDA

[1. Petition of Signarama, Andy Bonner, | 21-006783-COA | 1 West Broughton Street | Illuminated Signs](#)

🔗 [Staff Recommendation - 21-006783-COA - 1 W Broughton St.pdf](#)

🔗 [Submittal Packet - Drawings and Specifications.pdf](#)

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned for APPROVAL of two (2) internally illuminated projecting signs for the property located at 1 West Broughton Street as requested because the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Steven Bodek

Second: Stan Houle

Becky Lynch

- Not Present

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

[2. Petition of Barnard Architects | 21-006815-COA | 225 West Broughton Street | Alterations](#)

- [Staff Recommendation 21-006815-COA.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- [Staff Research.pdf](#)
- [Previous Board Denial Decision.pdf](#)
- [Previously Denied Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned for APPROVAL for alterations to the property located at 225 West Broughton Street with the following condition to be submitted to staff for review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1) Provide light fixture specifications for fixtures that have a metal housing and a white light source.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Steven Bodek

Second: Stan Houle

Becky Lynch	- Not Present
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
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

[3. Adoption of the January 12, 2022 Agenda](#)

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to ADOPT the January 12, 2002 agenda as presented.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Steven Bodek

Becky Lynch	- Not Present
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. Approval of the November 10, 2021 Meeting Minutes](#)

📎 [11.10.21 MEETING MINUTES.pdf](#)

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to APPROVE the November 10, 2021 Meeting minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: David Altschiller

Becky Lynch	- Not Present
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[5. Approval of the December 8, 2021 Meeting Minutes](#)

📎 [12.08.21 MEETING MINUTES.pdf](#)

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to APPROVE the December 8, 2021 Meeting minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: David Altschiller

Becky Lynch	- Not Present
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

[6. Petition of Patrick Johnston | 21-006811-COA | 23 West Broughton Street | Alterations and Repairs](#)

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to APPROVE to remove petition from January 12, 2022 HDBR Agenda.

Vote Results (Not Started)

Motion:

Second:

[7. Petition of Eli Lurie | 21-006813-COA | 113 East Gordon Street | New Construction Accessory Building \(Part 1 and 2\)](#)

Motion

Remove from January 12, 2022 HDBR Agenda.

Vote Results (Not Started)

Motion:

Second:

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

[8. Petition of Array Design | 21-006787-COA | 420 East Liberty Street | New Construction, Accessory Building \(Parts 1 and 2\) and Variance Recommendations](#)

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to CONTINUE the petition as requested by the petitioner.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Steven Bodek

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Becky Lynch	- Not Present
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

[9. Petition of Savannah Hotel Investors, LLC | 21-006808-COA | 9 Lincoln Street | Demolition of a Contributing Building](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation 21-006808-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Leah Michalak presented the applicant's request for approval for the demolition of a contributing building for the property located at 9 Lincoln Street. The demolition of this building was ordered in Recorder's Court on October 6, 2021; the court found that "9 Lincoln Street is not structurally sound and constitutes an immediate danger to persons on or about the premises". This assessment was supported by the findings of a registered structural engineer obtained by the owner; the engineer stated, "that the structure is dangerous and unsound in its present condition".

The historic building was constructed in 1853 and is a contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District. According to the court order, the building "constitutes an immediate danger to persons on or about the premises". A proposal for the replacement building has not been provided. Building permit drawings will not receive a COA stamp until the HDBR has approved a COA for the replacement building. The court order for demolition includes an assessment by a Georgia-licensed structural engineer and, per the applicant, the building has been determined to be unsafe by the City's Director of Inspections (City Manager's designee). The standards are met.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark Dana, petitioner, stated the building poses a public danger. He stated it can be deconstructed and historic items preserved. He stated that the City, through Code Enforcement, took them to Court. The building was purchased in 2017; nothing was done to aggravate its condition. The intent was to find the best way to use the shell of the building. **Ms. Michalak** stated a petition to relocate the building was submitted in 2019, but it was denied. **Ms. Memory** stated the structural report does not offer any stabilization

recommendations. **Mr. Dana** stated there was nothing that could be done.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Ryan Arvay, of the Historic Savannah Foundation, stated they object to the demolition of the structure. He stated for each property they are given multiple opportunities to rectify; Court is involved only when the owner repeatedly fails to bring the structure into compliance. The City does not want to demolish, but compliance of repair. In this instance, the petitioner requested relief by demolition. **Mr. Arvay** stated this course of action is on the rise. The engineering reports are not challenged and no one is there to challenge them; HSF and MPC are caught off-guard. He recommends relocation, then deconstruction only as a last option. He stated the plans made in 2017 showed no saving of the structure; for the proposed hotel to take up the whole lot, in addition to the lot where *Abe's on Lincoln* exists. Would like to see the relocation plans, if they exist.

Mr. Dana stated the HSF is not in the position to state the petitioner's intent: to demolish was never the petitioner's intent.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

The Board had questions as to how a building goes to court and receiving a condemned status without coming through the MPC first. **Ms. Everett** stated that because the Court has made a ruling to demolish, the Board is powerless to go against it. The City would have to appeal it, not the Board. She stated the Board can put conditions on the demolition. The Board stated they felt powerless and concerns about the process, as the properties are supposed to be maintained, yet neglect is being rewarded. **Ms. Michalak** stated there 175-year-old materials that should be salvaged. The Board hopes this is a wake up call to the City to communicate with HDBR rather than just repeatedly condemn. The Proactive Preservation portion of the Ordinance is supposed to aid with the reduction of demolition by neglect judgements. MPC made a presentation to assist the Court in these matters; this particular petition was presented as an improperly handled case, however the City would have to appeal the ruling.

Board had additional concern why the build wasn't properly retained if it was intended to be moved. As a Board, it is to preserve buildings, not just roll over and allow demolitions. There are many options to be explored. If demolition is the only option, the building needs to be documented. This is happening too frequently in recent times. However, the Board acknowledges the petitioner's intent cannot be assumed. The structure was purchased in a sound state, with the knowledge that it was historic. Precautions should have been taken to shore/protect the building. It does appear there was a strategic methodology to achieve a goal, stretching beyond the Board's purview. They're disappointed that the City did not do more to preserve this structure, as historicism is the main draw to the City.

The Board questioned if another engineering opinion would vary from what was presented, as they would assess only what was requested. The structure does not present imminent danger, as an emergency COA was not petitioned by the City. Have engineer provide preservation options.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval for the demolition of a contributing building for the property located at 9 Lincoln Street with the following conditions because, per a court order, the building "is not structurally sound and constitutes an immediate danger to persons on or about the premises":

1. **The owner shall retain a deconstruction contractor and the building be "demolished" in a manner as to salvage all historic materials.**

2. Building permit drawings shall not receive a COA stamp until the HDBR has approved a COA for the replacement building.

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to CONTINUE petition to the March 9, 2020 HDBR meeting, for the demolition of a contributing building for the property located at 9 Lincoln Street in order for the petitioner to provide the following:

- 1.The applicant's structural engineer shall provide recommendations on the stabilization of the building.
- 2.A second opinion from a structural engineer shall be provided regarding recommendation for demolition and/or stabilization methods.
- 3.A feasibility plan regarding relocating the building shall be provided.
- 4.Provide documentation of the existing conditions.
- 5.A Preservation Plan shall be provided.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Not Present
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[10. Petition of Ethos Preservation | 21-006806-COA | 406 East Hall Street | Alterations](#)

🔗 [Staff Recommendation - 21-006806-COA - 406 E Hall St.pdf](#)

🔗 [Submittal Packet - Project Description and Photos.pdf](#)

🔗 [Submittal Packet - Drawings and Materials.pdf](#)

Ms. Aislinn Droski presented the applicant's request for approval for alterations to the front and rear façade and the construction of a rear fence for the property located at 406 East Hall Street.

Per the applicant, the work includes the following:

Front Façade: *“The project proposes to replace the contemporary brick porch columns with round wood columns in the same location, installation of wooden handrail, adding a new second story handrail (as noted on the Cadastral Survey). The cast concrete porch floor and steps will be faced with a thin red brick (Tumbled Vee Brick from Marion Ceramics blend of Tavern flash, Sundance, Magnum flash).”*

Rear Façade: *“The project proposes to restore the second-floor porch to its original*

configuration and enclose with glass and shutters. The upper portion of the porch will be infilled with Victorbuilt Historic Series windows, single pane, putty glazed. The columns at the corners and center column will remain intact and the windows inset within. The lower portion of the porch will be enclosed with custom made solid wood shutters by Dallas Millwork. There will be a pronounced wooden handrail between the two elements. The first-floor porch will also be enclosed but will not be visible from the public right-of-way due to the fence (see sightlines)."

Fence: A nine-foot tall black composite fence with gate will be installed along the rear property line. The fence will be constructed of TimberTech Pro, a composite material, in Espresso.

General Repairs: "All windows will be restored to working order and the sashes will be painted SW 7069 Iron Ore. The metal roof will be coated with Hydrostop in the color Charcoal. The siding and trim will be painted SW 7551 Greek Villa. The openings between the piers will be infilled with ½" thick wooden lattice painted white."

The applicant provided several Sanborn Maps of the property, as well as a 1937 Cadastral Survey of the building. No historic photographs were able to be located.

With regards to the historic configuration of the front façade, the 1937 Cadastral survey provides the most information. This survey shows that there was a balustrade atop the front porch roof. The overall configuration (depth, width, etc.) of the porch appears to be intact. However, the existing brick columns and poured concrete floor appear to be non-historic. Based on the visual qualities of the brick and concrete, these elements are much newer than the surrounding elements. It is likely the brick columns were installed where the original columns once were, and the brick and columns were completed at the same time.

With regards to the historic configuration of the rear, the existing enclosed porches were likely once a two-story, open porch. The applicant has indicated that there is interior evidence of this as well, in addition to the Sanborn Maps showing the configuration as an open porch. The porches have been altered over time - infilled with wood siding in several locations, as well as to have windows installed on the side façade of the first floor porch and the rear façade of the second floor porch. The rear façade of the first floor porch will not be visible from the public right-of-way due to a new fence at the rear of the property.

406 East Hall Street was constructed in 1910 and is a contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District. Due to the lack of evidence of the original configuration of the front porch, staff finds the configuration and materials presented for the altered front porch to be historically appropriate, without creating a false sense of history. The Cadastral Survey provides evidence of the railing above the porch roof, which the applicant is proposing to install. No evidence of the design of the railing is available, and staff finds the simple railing to be appropriate. The alterations to the first floor porch on the rear will not be visible from the public right-of-way. The alterations to the second floor porch on the rear will retain the existing columns and present as windows enclosing the porch. The shutters on the bottom half will act as a handrail. These elements have been altered substantially in the past of the building, and staff finds the alterations to be appropriate.

The overall depth and proportions of the porch are not proposed to be altered with the installation of the new columns and railing. The openings on the front facade will not be altered. The second floor of the rear porch is currently enclosed, which is a non-historic

alteration. The porch is to be opened up and paired windows, which are taller than they are wide, are to be installed.

The following materials are proposed to be utilized:

- Porch Columns: Tapered rounded wood column, painted white
- First and Second Floor Porch Railing: Wood, painted white
- Windows (Rear Porch Enclosure): *VictorBilt* 6/6 double hung wood window, all sashes to be painted with *Sherwin Williams* 7069 Iron Ore (black)
- Shutters (Rear Porch Enclosure): *Atlantis* louvered wood shutter, color to be determined
- Fence: *TimberTech Pro* fence boards in Espresso (composite wood material), painted Tricorn Black by *Sherwin Williams*
- Exterior Walls: Trim and siding to be painted *Sherwin Williams* 7551 Greek Villa (white)
- Porch Floor and Steps: Thin red brick veneer (Tumble Vee brick by *Marion Ceramics*, custom blend of Tavern flash, Sundance, and Magnum flash)
- Standing Seam Metal Roof: Recoated with Hydrostop in charcoal

Staff recommends painting the trim with a glossy version of *Sherwin Williams* Greek Villa, in order to create more visual differentiation between the trim and the siding. Staff requests that the shutter color be provided to staff for final review and approval. Additionally, the material proposed for the fence is a material that the neither the Board nor Staff have previously seen. Based on a catalog of the product provided, staff does find the product to be visually compatible; however, staff requests that the applicant provide a physical sample of the fencing material to staff for final review and approval. Staff finds the remaining materials, colors, and textures proposed for this project to be visually compatible. The fence proposed for along the rear property line is to be 9'-0" in height along the lane. An adjacent neighboring fence is 10'-0" in height. Staff finds the overall scale and wall of continuity along the lane created by the new fence to be visually compatible. The primary building is a wood siding building, and the applicant is proposing a wood composite material for the fence.

The existing foundation material is not to be altered and does not have any existing infill between the piers. The applicant is proposing to install 1/2" thick wooden lattice painted white. Staff requests that the infill be recessed a minimum of three (3) inches behind the front edge of the pier.

The exterior siding and trim are to be painted *Sherwin Williams* Greek Villa. In order to differentiate between the trim and siding, staff recommends painting the trim with a glossy paint. Otherwise, staff finds the color change to be visually and historically appropriate.

The porch on the second floor of the rear is to be enclosed with paired *VictorBilt* Historic Series double hung windows in a 6/6 configuration, featuring appropriate trim. Staff finds the window enclosure to meet the standards. There is evidence of the railing above the porch on a 1937 Cadastral Survey. No other evidence of the original porch configuration was able to be located and the existing elements (columns and porch floor) are non-historic. Staff finds that the proposed configuration is based on historic context and is appropriate. The rear porch on the second floor has been altered substantially and has been enclosed with siding. The siding is to be removed and the porch is to be reopened and then re-enclosed with glazing and shutters. The glazing is to be *VictorBilt* 6/6 wood windows. The shutters are to be located at the bottom portion of the windows, where a railing will also be installed. The existing columns are to be retained, and the windows will be inset within the columns. Staff finds that the porch will continue to read as a porch and no character defining features will be removed or obscured.

The existing standing seam metal roof is to be recoated with Hydrostop in Charcoal, with no change in the configuration of the roof. The standards are met.

UPDATED INFORMATION:

The morning of the HDBR meeting, the applicant informed staff that they would be revising the fencing material to be painted wood, in the same configuration as proposed. The fence continues to meet all the standards, and as such staff removed a condition regarding providing a physical sample of the wood composite material.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Ms. Ellen Harris, of Ethos Preservation, stated they are in agreement with Staff recommendations.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There were no public comments.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

There was no Board discussion.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of alterations to the front and rear façade and the construction of a rear fence for the property located at 406 East Hall 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. **Paint the exterior trim with a glossy version of *Sherwin Williams* Greek Villa.**
2. **Provide the final color of the shutters.**
3. **Provide a physical sample of the *TimberTech* wood composite fencing material.**
4. **The foundation infill must be recessed a minimum of three (3) inches behind the front edge of the piers.**

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned for APPROVAL of alterations to the front and rear facade and the construction of a rear fence for the property located at 406 East Hall 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. Paint the exterior trim with a glossy version of Sherwin Williams Greek Villa.
2. Provide the final color of the shutters.
3. The foundation infill must be recessed a minimum of three (3) inches behind the front edge of the piers.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: Steven Bodek

Becky Lynch

- Not Present

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 Lynch Associates Architects | 21-006185-COA | 228 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Amendment to Previous COA](#)

- 🔗 [Staff Recommendation 21-006185-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Application.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Revised Drawings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Rundum Mier, Aluminum Vehicular Gate.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previous Board Decision 20-005066-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previous Submittal Packet 20-005066-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [November 12th Board Decision 20-005066-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [November 12th Drawing Packet 20-005066-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [228EOglethorpe_HDBR Presentation_2022-01-12.pdf](#)

Ms. Olivia Arfuso presented the petitioner's request of approval for an amendment to a previously approved COA [File No. 20-005066-COA] for a rear addition, and alterations, to the building located at **228 East Oglethorpe Avenue**; including a three-story rear addition an

A *Rundum Mier*, stained wood sliding vehicular gate in Oak was previously approved. A *Rundum Mier*, heavy extruded aluminum (16 mm) vehicular gate is now proposed in the color "Ral Granite Gray," to match the windows on the addition.

On **November 12, 2020**, the Board voted to **continue** the petition for an addition at 228 East Oglethorpe Avenue to the December 9, 2020, HDBR Regular Meeting, in order for the petitioner to address the following:

1. Revise the metal siding to a visually compatible material.
2. Revise the door type to be wood or clad wood.
3. Reduce the height of the grouped windows so that they align with the single window on the eastern portion of the addition.
4. Reselect a window series that has been previously approved by the Board for use on additions or submit a new product that meets the standards for evaluation. Ensure that the glass is transparent with no dark tints or reflective effects.
5. Ensure that the steel porch (excluding the balustrade) and stairs are screened from any public-right-of-way.
6. Test the existing mortar and finding a recipe that is compatible and appropriate for use on the contributing building. Ensure that a 4-foot by 4-foot test patch of the proposed repointing is completed and submitted to Staff for review and approval prior to full execution of the work.

On **November 19, 2020**, a revised drawing packet was submitted to Staff. On **December 9**,

2020, the Board **approved** a three-story rear addition, and alterations, at 228 East Oglethorpe [File No. 20-005066-COA] **with the following conditions:**

1. Ensure that the new mechanical units are not visible from any public-right-of-way.
2. Test the existing mortar and find a recipe that is compatible and appropriate for use on the contributing building.

The historic building was constructed in **1855** and is a contributing resource within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District.

The amendment is only proposed to impact the new, rear privacy wall and vehicular gate.

The proposed alterations will not lead to the removal of any historic materials or the alteration of features / spaces that characterize the property. The standard is met. The proposed vehicular door alteration will only impact the new rear wall, which is non-historic. The standards are not applicable.

Staff has determined that the proposed door is **not** compatible with the contributing resources along East York Lane, to which the vehicular gate will be visually related. Although the overall design has not changed, the modern vehicular door design, in addition to the extruded aluminum material, is not appropriate for this contributing resource in this specific location.

Staff also notes that horizontal metal panels were originally proposed as exterior siding for the rear addition, and were (similarly) determined by Staff to be incompatible with the principal building and the predominate materials and textures of the surrounding context. Aluminum is not listed as a permitted material for 'Entrances and Doors.' After studying the principal building, as well as the surrounding contributing resources, Staff has determined that the proposed aluminum door is **not** compatible with the historic buildings located along East York Lane. Although, the overall design has not changed, the modern vehicular door design, in addition to the extruded aluminum material, is not appropriate for this contributing property.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Ms. Elizabeth Schminke, petitioner, stated it is a vehicular access gate within a masonry fence, designed to resemble a fence enclosure. Aluminum is not presented in the Ordinance as approved or prohibited material. The heavy-gauge material selected is a high quality product, which is not to rust, and is indistinguishable from steel.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There was no public comment.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

The Board concurred that, once painted, the proposed aluminum gate looked visually compatible and appropriate for the area. There are other approved materials that are approved. The majority of the Board members had no reservations regarding the proposed change, since it will be matte painted and look like steel.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Deny an amendment to a previously approved COA [File No. 20-005066-COA] to allow for the heavy extruded aluminum vehicular gate at 228 East Oglethorpe Avenue because the gate is not visually compatible and does not meet the standards.

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to APPROVE the petition for an amendment to a previously approved COA [File No. 20-005066-COA] to allow for the heavy extruded aluminum vehicular gate at 228 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following condition, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the intent of the Standards.

1.Paint finish must be matte.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Melissa Memory

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Becky Lynch	- Not Present
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Nay

[12. Petition of Hallett & Co. | 21-006780-COA | 337 Tattnall Street | Alterations and Rear Addition](#)

- [☞ Staff Recommendation 21-006780-COA.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Narrative.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Material Specifications.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal - Additional Information \(Email\).pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Additional Drawings.pdf](#)

Ms. Olivia Arfuso presented the petitioner's request for approval for alterations to the rear façade openings and the construction of a rear addition for the building located at **337 Tattnall Street**. The historic building was constructed in **1895** and is a contributing resource within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District.

Per the petitioner, “The addition is designed to have as little impact on the original structure as possible. On the first floor we are restoring an original brick arch as the connection from the main house to the addition. On the second floor the only change will be expanding one brick window opening in the northwest bedroom down to floor level to become a door. Other window openings will remain expressed on the interior of the structure” (HALLETT & Co. 1).

Two existing windows on the rear of the building are proposed to be removed and stored on-site. One window, located on the second floor, is proposed to remain on the interior and sealed on the exterior. The existing rear entrance is proposed to have all modern infill

removed and the original brick arch will be exposed and restored. The archway will provide access from the principal building to the proposed addition.

The addition will measure 10-feet-deep, 22'-9 ½" in width, and 24'-5" in height. The addition's roof will be situated under the principal building's original corbels. The addition will consist of a solid, stucco extension, located towards the right of the West façade. The left-side of the addition will consist of an open screened porch on the first floor, and a sunroom/enclosed porch on the second floor. To allow for the proposed construction, a portion of the shared fence will be removed (as needed), as well as the brick rear steps and the existing pavers.

The pre-existing lot dimensions are not proposed to be altered in any way. Per the petitioner, the principal building is 1048-square-feet, and the proposed addition will be 227.9-square-feet in size. Therefore, the overall building coverage will increase to **1,275.9-square-feet, or 73.2%**. 75% of the existing lot (1,744-square-feet) is **1,308-square-feet**. The standard is met.

The petitioner provided Staff with information regarding the existing windows that are currently double-pane, and unoriginal to the building. However, Staff believes that the openings are original, and have remained relatively unchanged. **All openings shall be retained and preserved. The second floor window (that is proposed to be extended to allow for access to the addition) shall have all bricks salvaged and appropriately stored on-site.** The decorative corbels and arched rear entrance are, both, distinctive features that characterize this property. Therefore, the addition's roof will be situated under the principal building's original corbels. Also, the existing rear entrance is proposed to have all modern infill removed and the original brick arch will be exposed and restored. The archway will provide access from the principal building to the proposed addition. The standard is met. **All openings shall be retained and preserved, so that if the addition is to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.**

Staff has determined that while there is no addition/porch currently on the rear of the attached building, located at 339 Tattnall Street, the proposed addition is compatible with other contributing buildings located in the *Savannah Downtown Historic District*, including those located around Pulaski Square. The standard is met.

The solid portion of the addition will have a stucco finish. All windows are proposed to be from the *Sierra Pacific*, Monument, Double-Hung Series. Aluminum clad casement windows are proposed to be installed on the second floor, sunroom. A wood entry door with glass insert is, also, proposed on the first floor of the addition with an aluminum clad transom. Material specifications for the porch features / railing / trim, as well as the roofing material, were not provided to Staff. **Provide all material specifications to Staff for review prior to the commencement of any work.**

The addition's roof is proposed to be flat with a very low pitch to allow for water drainage. Staff determined that the proposed roof is compatible with the contributing buildings to which the addition will be visually related. The standard is met. The rear addition is proposed to be two-stories in height. The stories will align with the existing floors of the principal building. The intent of the standard is met. The foundation of the addition will not be visible from the public right-of-way due to an existing side yard / rear yard masonry wall. However, the foundation will be 2'-3" in height and appears to have a similar stucco finish to the solid portion of the addition. The solid portion of the addition is proposed to be finished in stucco; however, no material specifications or color samples were provided to Staff for review. **The**

exterior walls of the addition shall be finished in true stucco and the proposed paint color shall be submitted to Staff for review.

A wood entry door with glass insert is proposed on the first floor of the addition with an aluminum clad transom.

All windows are proposed to be from the *Sierra Pacific*, Monument Double-Hung Series. Aluminum clad casement windows are also proposed to be installed on the second floor, sunroom. **All framing members shall be covered with appropriate trim; trim shall feature a header, surrounds, and pronounced sill where appropriate. All window sashes shall be inset a minimum of three (3) inches from the façade of a building, and all glazing shall be transparent with no dark tints or reflective effects.**

The first floor of the addition, towards the left side, is proposed to be an opened, screened porch. The porch appears to have square columns with cap and base molding. The railing is also proposed to be 36-inches in height and the balusters appear to be placed between upper and lower rails. No detail drawings / sections of the porch or information regarding the materiality (of the porch features, railing, trim, screen, etc.) were provided to Staff for review. **All detail drawings / sections and material specifications must be provided to Staff for review. All porch elements must be painted, and the proposed color must be provided to Staff.**

The addition's roof is proposed to be flat with a very low pitch (1:12) to allow for water drainage. Material specifications were not provided to Staff for review. **Provide Staff with roofing specifications.** The proposed addition will be located on the rear façade. The standard is met. The addition is proposed to be subordinate in mass and height to the principal resource. The standard is met. The decorative corbels and arched rear entrance are, both, distinctive features that characterize this property. Therefore, the addition's roof will be situated under the principal building's original corbels. Additionally, the existing rear entrance is proposed to have all modern infill removed and the original brick arch will be exposed and restored. The archway will provide access from the principal building to the proposed addition. Although the character-defining archway will now be located internally, it will not be damaged. The intent of the standard is met. The proposed addition will be clearly an appendage and distinguishable from the contributing building. The standard is met.

The mechanical equipment and refuse locations are pre-existing conditions that (to Staff's knowledge) are not proposed to change. To allow for the proposed construction, a portion of a pre-existing, shared fence will be removed (as needed). **The addition shall not encroach on the adjacent property.** The proposed addition will be located on the rear façade and will be clearly differentiated from the principal building. The addition's design is proposed to be compatible with the architecture of the principal building.

'True stucco' was defined as layered traditionally in three parts, not just one layer over styro-foam or similar material.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Matthew Hallett, petitioner, stated they will abide by Staff recommendations and provide requested samples. Will add blind window at request of neighbor; will provide information to Staff.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Valerie Edgemon, neighbor, asked if the wall facing her property could be brick rather than stucco.

Mr. Hallett stated that decision was to be in adherence with preservation standards to not look like original main structure. Not opposed to doing brick.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

The owner of the attached property requested that a false window be integrated into the blank wall of the extension that is proposed to face her property. The Board supports the petitioner's decision to use stucco rather than brick.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approve alterations to the rear openings of the building located at 337 Tattnell Street, to allow for the construction of a rear addition, with the following conditions to be submitted to Staff, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1. All openings shall be retained and preserved, so that if the addition is to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired. The second floor window (that is proposed to be extended to allow for access to the addition) shall have all bricks salvaged and appropriately stored on-site.**
- 2. Provide all material specifications to Staff for review prior to the commencement of any work. All framing members shall be covered with appropriate trim; trim shall feature a header, surrounds, and pronounced sill where appropriate. All window sashes shall be inset a minimum of three (3) inches from the façade of a building, and all glazing shall be transparent with no dark tints or reflective effects.**
- 3. The exterior walls of the addition shall be finished in true stucco and the proposed paint color shall be submitted to Staff for review. All porch elements must be painted, and the proposed color must be provided to Staff.**
- 4. The addition shall not encroach on the adjacent property.**

Motion

The Historic Board of Review motioned to APPROVE alterations to the rear openings of the building located at 337 Tattnell Street, to allow for the construction of a rear addition, with the following conditions to be submitted to Staff, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1.All openings shall be retained and preserved, so that if the addition is to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired. The second floor window (that is proposed to be extended to allow for access to the addition) shall have all bricks salvaged and appropriately stored on-site.
- 2.Provide all material specifications to Staff for review prior to the commencement of any work. All framing members shall be covered with appropriate trim; trim shall feature a header, surrounds, and pronounced sill where appropriate. All window sashes shall be inset a minimum of three (3) inches from the façade of a building, and all glazing shall be transparent with no dark tints or reflective effects.
- 3.The exterior walls of the addition shall be finished in true stucco and the proposed paint color shall be submitted to Staff for review. All porch elements must be painted, and the proposed color must be provided to Staff.
- 4.The addition shall not encroach on the adjacent property.
- 5.A false window shall be added to the South-facing façade of the building addition.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Becky Lynch	- Not Present
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 Array Design | 21-006818-COA | 18 East Jones Street | New Construction, Accessory Building \(Part I and II\)](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation 21-006818-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)

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

📎 [Submittal - Mass Model.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Research.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Research - Surrounding Context.pdf](#)

****Mr. Steven Bodek recused himself from this petition.****

Ms. Olivia Arfuso presented the petitioner's request for approval for a New Construction, Accessory Building (Small Parts I and II) in the rear of the property located at **18 East Jones Street**. The historic building was constructed in **1847** and is a contributing resource within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District.

The accessory building is proposed to be a two-story carriage house that will be constructed against an existing masonry wall, located along the rear property line. The building is proposed to be 24-feet wide by 21-feet in depth, and 23'-5 ½" in height. The carriage house will have a brick veneer, and a parapet roof. The first floor will consist of an enclosed parking spot, refuse storage area, as well as stairs to access the upper accessory dwelling unit. Garage doors will be installed on, both, the North and South elevations. All new mechanical equipment will be located on the carriage house's roof. The equipment will be screened from the public right-of-way using the roof's parapet wall.

Staff determined that this building has never had an accessory building in the rear. A small one-story structure, located in the north-west corner of the property, does appear on the 1916 Sanborn Map, and remains in the approximate location on the 1954, and 1973, Sanborn Maps. However, Staff determined that the masonry wall adjacent to the existing shed's North-facing façade, appears to have been previously altered. Additionally, Staff does not believe that the existing, brick shed is a character defining feature of the overall property or has historic integrity worth preserving.

The lot dimensions are pre-existing conditions that are not proposed to be altered in any

way. The existing lot coverage is **53.5%** and is proposed to increase to **72.7%**. The standard is met. The construction of a rear, carriage house shall not impact the overall historic character of the property. However, the proposed New Construction does require the demolition of an existing brick shed. A small one-story structure, located in the north-west corner of the property, does appear on the 1916 Sanborn Map and remains in the approximate location on the 1954, and 1973, Sanborn Maps. However, Staff determined that the masonry wall adjacent to the existing shed's North-facing façade, appears to have been previously altered. Additionally, Staff does not believe that the existing, brick shed is a character defining feature of the overall property or has historic integrity worth preserving. **Any bricks removed (from the demolition of the brick shed) shall be salvaged and appropriately stored on-site, to be incorporated elsewhere on the property.**

The carriage house is proposed to be 23'-5 ½" in height. Staff has determined that the proposed height is compatible with the height of the adjacent, contributing carriage houses to which the New Construction will be visually related. The standard is met. The North-facing façade will be visible from East Charlton Lane. Three windows are proposed to be installed on the second floor of the carriage house. An (approximately) 8-foot-wide opening will be located on the first floor to allow for the installation of a vehicular, garage door opening. The existing, arched courtyard gate will be incorporated into the new carriage house design. Staff determined that the height of the proposed windows are incompatible with the neighboring carriage houses; however, Staff has determined that the taller windows help to differentiate the New Construction carriage house from the contributing resources to which it is visually related.

The openings along the South elevation will not be visible; however, a similar garage door is proposed on the first floor with an adjacent pair of arched, double doors. The second floor will have a pair of French doors located above the garage door, and an accompanying pair of twin casement windows will be located above the first floor entrance. A full-width balcony is proposed, and will have a black aluminum railing. The height of the railing was not provided to Staff.

The following materials are proposed:

Exterior Walls – Brick veneer of *Carolina Brick Company*, Savannah Grey bricks with *Argos* mortar in the color "Ivory Buff"

Entrances – Wood gate, painted "Tri-corn Black" by Sherwin Williams (North Elevation)

T&G, double doors painted "Tri-corn Black" by Sherwin Williams (South Elevation)

Rustics, 'French Quarter' French doors (South Elevation)

Windows – *Pella*, 'Architect Series,' traditional wood, double-hung windows in the color matte black (North Elevation)

Pella, 'Architect Series,' twin casement window in the color matte black (South Elevation)

Garage Doors – *Architectural Doors*, tongue-and-groove, composite wood, overhead garage door painted "Tri-corn black" by Sherwin Williams (North Elevation)

Architectural Doors, tongue-and-groove, composite wood, overhead garage door with lites painted "Tri-corn black" by Sherwin Williams (South Elevation)

Staff determined that the proposed materials are compatible with the contributing resources to which the New Construction will be visually related.

The roof is proposed to have a 5:12 pitch and a 3'-6" high parapet. Staff determined that this roof shape is compatible with contributing resources in the area.

Per the petitioner, the carriage house is proposed to be "...sited against existing masonry wall at north property line." Therefore, the existing walls of continuity will not be disrupted by the proposed New Construction. Additionally, Staff determined that the two-story carriage house will help to form a (further) wall of enclosure with the adjacent, contributing, two-story carriage houses.

Staff determined that the scale of the proposed carriage house and the directional expression of the front elevation are compatible with the adjacent, contributing resources. The New Construction, carriage house will be differentiated from those on the lane which are historic.

Carriage houses are character defining features of lanes in the *Savannah Downtown Historic District*; therefore, the proposed New Construction will preserve the historic ward pattern of the streets and lanes within the Oglethorpe Plan Area. The standard is met.

The New Construction, carriage house is proposed to have two-stories. The first floor is proposed to have an exterior expression of approximately 8'-6". A 1'-2" brick beltcourse is proposed to be located directly between the first and second floors. The second floor will have an exterior expression of approximately 9-feet. Staff has determined that the exterior expressions are visually compatible with the adjacent, contributing carriage houses. The intent of the standard is met.

The New Construction, carriage house is proposed to follow a building form that is compatible with the contributing, carriage houses located on East Charlton Lane. The standard is met. Side and rear yard setbacks are not required in the *Savannah Downtown Historic District*. It is proposed to be slab-on-grade. Staff determined that this foundation is appropriate for a New Construction, carriage house located on East Charlton Lane. The lot is approximately 24-feet-wide. It is proposed to form a continuous plane parallel to the street. The exterior walls are proposed to brick veneer of *Carolina Brick Company*, Savannah Grey bricks with *Argos* mortar in the color "Ivory Buff". The standard is met.

The carriage house's North elevation is proposed to utilize the existing wood gate, painted "Tri-corn Black" by Sherwin Williams. On the South elevation, *T&G*, double doors painted "Tri-corn Black" by Sherwin Williams and *Rustics*, 'French Quarter' French doors are proposed; however, the South façade will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

The garage doors are proposed to be *Architectural Doors*, tongue-and-groove, composite wood, overhead garage doors painted "Tri-corn black" by Sherwin Williams. **Door frames shall be inset no less than (3) inches from the exterior surface of the façade of the building.**

All carriage house windows are proposed to be from the *Pella*, 'Architect Series,' traditional wood, double-hung, SDL windows with 5/8" putty-glaze profile mullions. The (3) windows on the North elevation will have a 6-over-6 lite pattern and will be in the color matte black. The windows on the South elevation will be *Pella*, 'Architect Series,' twin casement windows. The paint color has not yet been determined; however, the South elevation is not visible from the public right-of-way. All window glazing will be Low-E glass, and all windows will be inset a minimum of 3-inches from the exterior surface of the façade of the building. In the drawings provided to Staff, all framing members appear to be covered with appropriate trim. The standard is met.

The carriage house's South elevation will not be visible from the public right-of-way; however, a full-width balcony is proposed, and will have a black aluminum railing. The height / specifications of the railing and materiality of the porch / brackets were not provided to Staff for review.

The roof is proposed to be flat with a 5:12 pitch and a 3'-6" parapet. The roof material will be rolled roofing on sloped sheathing. The parapet is proposed to have a stringcourse; however, coping was not noted in the drawings. **Parapets shall have coping.** The mass model, provided to Staff, confirms that the New Construction, carriage house's height and mass will not exceed the principal building. The New Construction, carriage house will be two (2) stories tall.

The New Construction, carriage house will be aligned with the existing, contributing accessory dwellings on the lane. The New Construction, carriage house will have a roof with a 5:12 pitch, that will be hidden by a parapet. The standard is met.

A small, accessory structure, located in the north-west corner of the property, does appear on the 1916 Sanborn Map, and remains in the approximate location on the 1954, and 1973, Sanborn Maps. However, Staff determined that the masonry wall adjacent to the existing shed's North-facing façade, appears to have been previously altered. Additionally, Staff does not believe that the existing, brick shed is a character defining feature of the overall property or has historic integrity worth preserving.

Any bricks removed (from the demolition of the brick shed) shall be salvaged and stored on-site, to be incorporated elsewhere on the property.

The proposed garage opening will be 8'-6" wide, while the garage door (itself) will be 8-feet wide. Staff has determined that the proposed garage door design is appropriate for a New Construction carriage house.

The existing electrical meter is not proposed to change. The new mechanical equipment is proposed to be mounted on the carriage house's roof, and will be screened by the parapet wall. The refuse storage area is proposed to be located inside the first floor of the carriage house, adjacent to the parking spot. The standard is met.

Contemporary gas lanterns are proposed on either side of the garage door. The lanterns will be attached using steel brackets. The standard is met. The carriage house is proposed to have structured parking within the first floor. The vehicular access for this single family, residential dwelling will be accessible from the lane. The New Construction, carriage house is proposed to be accessory and clearly incidental and subordinate to the permitted principal use. The site already has an established, permitted principal use. The New Construction, carriage house will be located on the same property as the principal dwelling. The New Construction, carriage house is in keeping with the character of the principal dwelling. New Construction, carriage houses are permitted in the district. The accessory dwelling unit will be detached from the principal dwelling. The detached accessory dwelling unit is proposed to be separated from the principal dwelling by 20'-9"; 24'-9" (when not including the proposed balcony on the South elevation).

The footprint of the proposed accessory dwelling unit is 504-square-feet. 40% of the principal dwelling's footprint (1,261-square-feet) is 504.4-square-feet. The accessory dwelling unit will contain 600-square-feet of heated area. The accessory dwelling unit is proposed to contain only one (1) bedroom. Staff determined that the proposed accessory dwelling unit is designed in an architectural style that is similar and compatible with the

principal dwelling and the contributing resources to which the New Construction will be visually related. The intent of the standard is met.

The carriage house is proposed to have structured parking within the first floor. The vehicular access for this single family residential dwelling will be accessible from the lane. The standard is met.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Joel Snayd, representing the petitioner and owner, reiterated the structure is not visible except the metal roof. He was not certain of the walls seen in the pictures/drawings.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Ryan Arvay, Historic Savannah Foundation, stated they support Staff recommendation. However, they would like to see more research on the small lane structure regarding the date and materiality before demolition.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

The Board members had many concerns regarding the age and the remaining historic integrity of the brick shed. Since the shed will (ultimately) be demolished, due to the proposed New Construction, the Board wanted to ensure that extensive research was completed to document the structure’s history appropriately and accurately, so that the Board can make the most comprehensive decision. Preservation of the bricks as a condition lend to the structure being historic.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approve a New Construction, Accessory Building (Small Parts I and II) in the rear of the property located at 18 East Jones Street with the following conditions to be submitted to Staff, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1. Any bricks removed (from the demolition of the brick shed) shall be salvaged and stored appropriately on-site, to be incorporated elsewhere on the property.**
- 2. Door frames shall be inset no less than (3) inches from the exterior surface of the façade of the building.**
- 3. Parapets shall have coping.**

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to CONTINUE to the February 9, 2022 HDBR meeting the petition for a New Construction, Accessory Building (Small Parts I and II) in the rear of the property located at 18 East Jones Street to the February 9th HDBR Meeting, in order for the petitioner to ensure the accuracy of the existing conditions, in regard to the historic shed, and provide additional photographs / research relating to the construction and age. Ensure that a demolition COA is applied for, if applicable.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Melissa Memory

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Becky Lynch	- Not Present
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye

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

[14. Petition of Pantheon ADC | 21-006817-COA | Lot 6, Tything Lot – The Digby | Amendment to Previous COA with Special Exception Request](#)

- 🔗 [Staff Recommendation 21-006817-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Revised Narrative.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Revisions and Materials.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Revised Drawings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal - Revised Model.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previous Board Decision 21-002857-COA \(Part I\).pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previous Submittal Packet - Drawings \(Part I\).pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previous Board Decision 21-002857-COA \(Part II\).pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Previous Submittal Packet - Drawings \(Part II\).pdf](#)

Ms. Olivia Arfuso presented the petitioner's request of approval for an amendment to a previously approved New Construction (Part I) and New Construction (Part II) [File No. 21-002857-COA] to allow for an increase in building height from five (5) floors to six (6) floors.

The petitioner is also requesting a Special Exception from the following standard:

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

“...To allow for a curtain wall to be treated as a wall, rather than a window or punched opening.”

Per the submittal packet, “The proposed design intent, aesthetic, and details remain unaltered although the proportions have changed due to an increase of +(1) story, resulting in an increase in height...” The height of the previously approved building is proposed to increase by 6’-8”.

The proposed New Construction will be located in Decker Ward. Decker Ward is located in the D-CBD Zoning District and has a 6-story height maximum, as defined by the Height Map. *Hotel Indigo* is situated to the North of Lot 6, while the *Andaz Hotel* is located to the immediate East. The proposed New Construction will be directly visually related to these hotels.

The petition was originally docketed for June 9th, 2021; however, the petitioner requested to be “Continued” to the July 14, 2021, HDBR Regular Meeting.

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.

On **September 9, 2021**, the project was heard again by the Board. The petitioner was requesting approval of *Part II: Design Details* and revisions to the previously approved for New Construction, Part I: Height and Mass. The Savannah Downtown Historic District Board of Review approved the petition for the revisions to New Construction, Part I: Height and Mass as requested, because the work was visually compatible and met the standards. Additionally, the Board approved New Construction, Part II: Design Details with the following conditions:

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. The corner, curtain wall should be made operable or a Special Exception shall be applied for from the related standard.

On **December 16th, 2021**, Staff received an application for an amendment to the previously approved design, as well as a Special Exception request. *Per the revised submittal packet*, the revisions are as follows:

1. Updated to a six-story building height, and change in floor-to-floor heights
2. Skylights removed
3. Stairs added along the West Bryan Street entrance, Barnard Street entrance, and Northeast entrance on Barnard Street. An ADA ramp, also, added to the Barnard Street entrance
4. Storefront glazing along the West Bay Lane elevation infilled, and louvers proposed in old transom location
5. Canopies added over storefront windows on the South-facing façade
6. Slight alteration in window sizes
7. Spandrel material updated to insulated metal panels

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION:

The petitioner is requesting a Special Exception from the Design Standard as follows:

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

"...To allow for a curtain wall to be treated as a wall, rather than a window or punched opening."

The Special Exception request is to a Design Standard within the *Savannah Downtown Historic Overlay District*.

Per the petitioner, "...it is our opinion that curtain walls are more similar to walls, structurally,

than windows, as they constitute the entire wall assembly; unlike windows, which are glazed openings within a solid wall. Our interpretation of the ordinance is that a curtain wall should be treated as wall rather than window, thus allowing them to remain inoperable. Our proposed design is in keeping with the design intent of the ordinance, and we would like to maintain our concept treating our corner curtain walls as walls, rather than windows.”

Staff determined that the curtain walls are being utilized as a design element to create visual interest and to distinguish the corner bays from the rest of the building. Although glazing is incorporated, the feature (more appropriately) functions as a wall, not as a window. Staff determined that the special exception would be located, operated, and maintained in a manner in conformance with the goals, policies, and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and the provisions of the Ordinance. Additionally, the special exception would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, welfare, function, and appearance of the adjacent uses or general vicinity. It is Staff’s opinion that not granting the special exception, and insisting that the curtain walls be operable, could actually impact the overall health, safety, and welfare of the building’s inhabitants. Staff does not recommend any additional conditions, restrictions, or safeguards for the special exception.

The New Construction is now proposed to have an exterior expression of six-stories; 79’-8” 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 still be compatible with the hotels to which it will be (directly) related.

The New Construction is proposed to front a West Bryan Street and Barnard Street and will now be six-stories in height. The first floor will have an exterior expression of 16-feet, and floors 2-5 will have an expression of 12-feet. The top floor will have an exterior expression of 14-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 still greater than that of any story above, and that the top story is distinctive from the stories below. The top expression is now approximately 14-feet in height and the middle expression has increased to 48-feet. Staff has determined that the revised still comply with the minimum percentages of surface area; the standard is met.

On the North elevation the previously approved first floor, storefront windows are now proposed to be infilled. The infilled openings will have new louvers where the previous transoms were proposed. This revision is due to the fact that the North elevation’s first floor runs parallel to the lane. Staff has determined that this revision is appropriate and common in the Savannah Downtown Historic District on lane elevations.

“...To allow for a curtain wall to be treated as a wall, rather than a window or punched

opening.”

Per the petitioner, “The above section does not explicitly prevent the use of curtainwall, nor does it require it to be operable. Furthermore, it is our opinion that curtain walls are more similar to walls, structurally, than windows, as they constitute the entire wall assembly; unlike windows, which are glazed openings within a solid wall. Our interpretation of the ordinance is that a curtain wall should be treated as wall rather than window, thus allowing them to remain inoperable. Our proposed design is in keeping with the design intent of the ordinance, and we would like to maintain our concept treating our corner curtain walls as walls, rather than windows.”

On the North elevation the previously approved first floor, storefront windows are now proposed to be infilled. The infilled openings will have new louvers where the previous transoms were proposed. This revision is due to the fact that the North elevation’s first floor runs parallel to the lane. Staff has determined that this revision is appropriate and common in the Savannah Downtown Historic District on lane elevations.

Brick stairs have been added along the West Bryan Street entrance, Barnard Street entrance, and Northeast entrance on Barnard Street. An ADA ramp has, also, been added to the Barnard Street entrance. **A minimum of (6) feet of unobstructed sidewalk shall be maintained.** Canopies have been added over the storefront windows on the South-facing façade, to match those on the East-facing façade. The canopies are proposed to be metal and will be located 13-feet above the sidewalk.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. James Gallucci, petitioner, stated that they support Staff recommendation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Ryan Arvay, of the Historic Savannah Foundation, stated their support of this project was based on the original conscientious decision to build at five floors rather than six. HSF is disappointed in this change request for that additional floor. They are aware the the Ordinance permits 5 stories, however, the Digby will be the tallest. The surrounding historic structures are two- and three-stories. HSF opposes based on visual incompatibility.

Mr. Gallucci stated he and his client believe they are contextually compliant with the Ordinance.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

The Board expressed disappointment in additional new construction the downtown historic district. The heights continue to tower and overpower the historic structures. Hopes future developers are more forthcoming initially rather than requesting amendment. Would like to lower the height expression of the structure so it does not appear to loom over the other structures. The Board concurred that the additional floor accentuated the visual height of the sixth (top) floor, in comparison to the rest of the building and the surrounding structures.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approve an amendment to a previously approved New Construction (Part I) and New Construction (Part II) [File No. 21-002857-COA] to allow for the building to go from five (5) floors to six (6) floors (including some minor additional revisions) with the following condition, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. **A minimum of (6) feet of unobstructed sidewalk shall be maintained.**

AND

Approve the request for a Special Exception from the following standard:

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

“...To allow for a curtain wall to be treated as a wall, rather than a window or punched opening,” because the Special Exception criteria are met.

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to APPROVE an amendment to a previously approved New Construction (Part I) and New Construction (Part II) [File No. 21-002857-COA] to allow for the building to go from five (5) floors to six (6) floors (including some minor additional revisions) with the following condition, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. A minimum of (6) feet of unobstructed sidewalk shall be maintained.

AND

Approve the request for a Special Exception from the following standard:

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

"To allow for a curtain wall to be treated as a wall, rather than a window or punched opening,"; because the Special Exception criteria are met.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Becky Lynch	- Not Present
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Nay
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[15. Petition of Hallett & Co. | 21-006814-COA | 701 Whitaker Street | Alterations](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation 21-006814-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)

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

📎 [Submittal Packet - Material Specifications.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Research.pdf](#)

📎 [Additional Information Regarding Rear Openings \(Email\).pdf](#)

Ms. Olivia Arfuso presented the applicant's request of approval for alterations to the building located at **701 Whitaker Street**. The historic building was constructed in **1897** and

is a contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District. The building is first visible on the 1898 Sanborn Map. The dwelling is depicted as a two-story, frame building with a one-story section visible in the rear. The Queen-Anne style porches, curved towers, and various bays are all noted. Interestingly, the small, two-story, side addition (currently the laundry room and upper bathroom) is not depicted. Staff determined that this feature was not shown on *any* of the Sanborn Maps.

The only visible alteration to the principal building is the re-design of the South-façade on the 1916 Sanborn Map; specifically, the bay. Instead of having five walls, the bay is reduced to three-sections. Staff does not feel that this minute modification is indicating anything more than a mere oversight on the 1898 Sanborn Map. Staff believes that a sleeping porch (currently, the laundry room) was likely constructed prior to the upper addition, that presently houses a bathroom. The sleeping porch is nestled behind the curved, open-air front porch, obscuring it from the front facade. Therefore, the feature would have been relatively hidden without a second story. The trim of the second story's roof also appears newer and incompatible with the thick trim found elsewhere on the principal building. To conclude, it is likely that the upper bathroom was added atop an original sleeping porch, when the building was modernized at a later date.

Sleeping porches are character defining features of Victorian Era architecture as a whole; however, they are particularly prevalent in the Queen-Anne style. This specific example appears to have been added shortly after the construction of the principal building. Slender, Doric columns (similar to those visible on the North-façade's first floor porch) are incorporated into the design. Its location would provide privacy, while allowing adequate airflow from three sides. Since the rear of the building houses a one-story extension that functioned as a service area (originally), the side elevation was the only appropriate location for such a feature. An enclosed porch, located on the first floor, snuggled in between the shade of two dwellings would have provided a cool, secluded room to escape the oppressive heat of Savannah.

Located along the South-facing elevation, visible from the south-east corner of the property, is the existing laundry room. The room located above the laundry room, currently functions as a bathroom. Although, the uses of the laundry room and bathroom will not change, the exterior aesthetics of the laundry room are proposed to be altered. *Per the petitioner,*

We propose to replicate the existing wood transom to use over a new custom oak, five paneled door. The new door will be made to match the existing door facing Hall Street, which matches all the interior doors as well. The window to the left of the door as well as the lower range of windows that face the blank wall of the adjoining property will have the sashes removed (the original sashes that face the neighbors house will be stored) and the openings filled with fixed wood shutters. The window in the bath above will be similarly filled- sashes stored, the trim to remain in place with the existing wood shutters used to 'blind' the opening. This whole area is recessed 12' behind the face of the building and is further obscured by the decorative porches that extend almost thirty feet out from where the changes are being made. The changes were designed to blend in with the existing structure, be reversible, and not create a false sense of history (HALLETT & Co. 1).

The openings on the West-facing façade are, also, proposed to be altered. *Per the petitioner,*

Currently there are two windows that face the neighbors blank brick wall to the south; they will be eliminated by being blinded by shutters while retaining the exterior trim. The south wall has two modern 15 light French doors with transoms above; these were originally double hung sash windows which the previous owner altered in 1970

to provide access from the rear of the house to the yard. On the west wall we will be adding four double hung windows that will match the existing windows in height and width but will be constructed from aluminum clad wood, the southernmost window will be in exactly the location that was once a window. We will then be adding a 6' French door unit with a transom above that will align with the adjacent windows also constructed of aluminum clad wood. All casing, siding, and wainscot details will be retained or replicated as needed (HALLETT & Co. 1).

The East-facing façade of the existing laundry room is proposed to have a custom oak door installed, as well as a new transom that will match an adjacent transom. All window sashes along the South-facing façade will be removed. The sashes are proposed to be stored and the existing openings will have custom shutters installed, to be fixed in place. The transoms will all be retained. Staff believes that the laundry room was originally constructed circa 1900s, as a sleeping porch. The feature/space characterizes this historic property and shall not be altered. The extensive windows and large transoms are indicative of sleeping porches, to allow for adequate air flow. These elements shall be retained and preserved.

While Staff is not convinced that the door and accompanying transom are original, Staff has determined that the proposed oak door is not appropriate. The installation of a secondary entrance, that clearly reads as a door, will create a false sense of historical development. Historically, this contributing building only had one entrance on the front façade. Since the original configuration, and design, of the sleeping porch's East-facing façade is unknown, the current configuration and openings shall be retained and preserved. Although the installation of shutters on the South-facing windows (to remain in the fixed position) is appropriate, the alteration of this character defining feature, or the removal of any historic materials (including the existing window sashes) cannot be supported by Staff.

An existing bathroom, located above the laundry room, is proposed to have a window altered. The South-facing window is proposed to have the window sashes removed and stored. The exterior window trim is proposed to remain; however, shutters will be installed and fixed shut. Staff believes that the upper bathroom was added atop the original sleeping porch at a later date, when the building was modernized / renovated. Additionally, Staff has determined that the window is minimally visible from the public right-of-way. **Although, Staff does not have any reservations regarding the installation of shutters to remain in the fixed position, the window sashes must remain intact.**

The West-facing façade is proposed to have first floor openings altered. The two, existing rear doors are proposed to be removed and the openings are proposed to be altered. Four new (grouped) windows are proposed to be installed, as well as an adjacent pair of French doors with transoms. The existing deck will, also, be reduced in size. Staff determined that the first floor of the West-façade is minimally visible due to an existing garden wall that is approximately 7'-6" in height.

The one-story, rear extension originally functioned as a service area and its footprint has remained relatively unchanged since the 1898 Sanborn Map. Staff could not locate any images of the West-facing façade; therefore, the configuration, location, and dimensions of any original first floor openings could not be determined. The 1973 Sanborn Map does indicate that the one-story extension served a 'Commercial' purpose for a period of time. Taking this into consideration, as well as information provided by the petitioner, Staff believes that the West-facing, first floor doors have likely been altered. That being said, the trim on the left appears significantly older than the trim on the right. **All existing opening widths, heights, and trim details shall be retained and incorporated into the proposed design to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.**

Staff could not locate any images of the West-facing façade; therefore, the configuration, location, and dimensions of any original first floor openings could not be determined. The 1973 Sanborn Map does indicate that the one-story extension served a 'Commercial' purpose for a period of time. Taking this into consideration, as well as information provided by the petitioner, Staff believes that the West-facing, first floor doors have likely been altered. That being said, the trim on the left appears significantly older than the trim on the right. **All existing opening widths, heights, and trim details shall be retained and incorporated into the proposed design.**

Staff determined that all doors and windows are proposed to be clad wood. Since the alterations are proposed to occur to the principal building, Staff has determined that the *Sierra Pacific*, Monument, Double-Hung windows, and Clad Flexible Access Inswing Doors, are not appropriate or visually compatible.

Additionally, no information was provided to Staff regarding shutters or any proposed paint colors. **An appropriate wood window and wood door type must be provided to Staff for review, as well as shutter specifications and all proposed paint colors.**

During the review process, Staff noticed various color swatches on the rear, exterior wall. **Any proposed exterior color changes must be applied for and reviewed by Staff.**

Staff determined that the doors (proposed to be installed on the rear of the building) are to be clad wood. Since the alterations are proposed to occur to the principal, contributing building, Staff has determined that the *Sierra Pacific*, Clad Flexible Access Inswing Doors are not appropriate or visually compatible. **An appropriate wood door with glass lites must be submitted to Staff for review.**

An existing bathroom, located above the laundry room, is proposed to have a window altered. The South-facing window is proposed to have the window sashes removed and stored. The exterior window trim is proposed to remain; however, shutters will be installed and fixed shut. Staff believes that the upper bathroom was added atop the original sleeping porch at a later date, when the building was modernized. Additionally, Staff has determined that the window is minimally visible from the public right-of-way. **Although, Staff does not have any reservations regarding the installation of shutters to remain in the fixed position, the window sashes and trim must remain intact.**

Staff determined that all windows (proposed to be installed on the rear of the building) are to be clad wood. Since the alterations are proposed to occur to the principal building, Staff has determined that the *Sierra Pacific*, Monument, Double-Hung windows are not appropriate or visually compatible. Additionally, no information was provided to Staff regarding shutters. **An appropriate wood window must be provided to Staff for review, as well as shutter specifications.**

The existing rear deck is proposed to be removed, and a new deck is proposed to be constructed. The new deck will not be visible from the public right-of-way due to an existing garden wall.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Matthew Hallett, petitioner, highlighted that one of the windows is not original; it was salvaged and infilled with excess wood as it is too narrow. Will leave and cover with shutters. The door also is not original, will replace with one fitting the historic opening. Paint colors will be submitted; will be same as current color scheme. Will obtain custom wood doors and windows - questioned if allowed to add additional windows and doors or remain

within confines of what currently exists.

Ms. Arfuso stated the current height, width, and trim should be incorporated into the new fenestration.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Ryan Arvay, of Historic Savannah Foundation, stated they support Staff recommendations regarding materials and openings.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

The Board supported Staff recommendations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the installation of fixed shutters along the South-facing facade, and the alteration of the first floor openings along the West-facing façade, of 701 Whitaker Street with the following conditions to be submitted to Staff, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. All existing opening widths, heights, and trim details shall be retained and incorporated into the proposed design.
2. The window sashes and trim must remain intact where fixed shutters are proposed.
3. An appropriate wood window and wood door specification must be provided, as well as shutter specifications and all proposed paint colors.
4. Any proposed exterior color changes must be submitted.

AND

Deny the alteration of the East-facing façade of the existing laundry room, because the preservation standards are not met.

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to APPROVE the installation of fixed shutters along the South-facing facade, and the alteration of the first floor openings along the West-facing facade, of 701 Whitaker Street with the following conditions to be submitted to Staff, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. All existing opening widths, heights, and trim details shall be retained and incorporated into the proposed design.
2. The window sashes and trim must remain intact where fixed shutters are proposed.
3. An appropriate wood window and wood door specification must be provided, as well as shutter specifications and all proposed paint colors.
4. Any proposed exterior color changes must be submitted.

AND

Deny the alteration of the East-facing facade of the existing laundry room, because the preservation standards are not met.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: Steven Bodek

Becky Lynch	- Not Present
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

[16. Petition of Basin Company LLC | 21-006788-COA | 315 West Wayne Street | After-the-Fact Fence](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation - 21-006788-COA 315 West Wayne Street.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet- site plan.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet-photos-.pdf](#)

Ms. Monica Gann presented the applicant's request of an approval for an after-the-fact fence at property 315 West Wayne Street. On December 15, 2021, it was reported a fence was being installed without a COA. The property owner and contractor were contacted by Code Compliance. The fence was erected and stands at 6 feet high, made of KDAT SYP. The fence is not proposed to be painted.

The building was constructed in 1985 and is a non-contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District.

The fence that has been already erected on site is made of wood, KDAT which is visually compatible with contributing buildings to which it is visually related. The fence is proposed not to be painted nor stained which is **not** visually compatible. Provide staff with paint or stain sample. The after-the-fact fence is six (6) feet tall and on West Wayne Street; the fence is approximately one foot off the property line and in line with the adjacent building to the north. Additionally, the fence fronting the street has a twelve (12) foot wide gate with double doors. There is only 4 feet between the fence and the neighboring building to the south, not meeting the standard. Relocate the fence to provide a minimum of 5 feet clear.

Ms. Ardis Wood, citizen, requested landscaping conditions be applied since it was constructed without approval.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Seth Speir, petitioner, stated he and his client supports Staff recommendation. He stated the client and a staff member erected fence with his knowledge. He apologized for lack of adherence to the process.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There was no public comment.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

The Board supported Staff recommendation. The Board wanted to be sure the petitioner understands the importance of gaining approval before doing work.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the after-the-fact fence at property 315 West Wayne Street, with the following conditions, to be submitted to staff for final review otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1. The fence must be painted or stained. Provide staff with color selection.**
- 2. The southern fence section must be relocated to provide a minimum of 5 feet of clearance between the fence and the neighboring building to the south.**

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to APPROVE the after-the-fact fence at property 315 West Wayne Street, with the following conditions, to be submitted to staff for final review otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1) The fence must be painted or stained. Provide staff with color selection.
- 2) The southern fence section must be relocated to provide a minimum of 5 feet of clearance between the fence and the neighboring building to the south.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Steven Bodek

Becky Lynch	- Not Present
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

[17. Acknowledge and approve of Staff-approved decisions as presented.](#)

[18. Petition of CHATHAM DEVELOPERS, Patrick Johnston | 21-006811-COA | 23 WEST BROUGHTON STREET | Window/Roof Replacement & Exterior Wall Repair](#)

[📎 SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-006811-COA - 23 W Broughton St.pdf](#)

[19. Petition of DANIELLE JARVIS | 21-006860-COA | 507 EAST McDONOUGH STREET | Repaint exterior wood siding](#)

[📎 SIGNED Staff Dec - 21-006860-COA 507 E McDonough.pdf](#)

[20. Petition of KELLY KESSINGER | 21-006858-COA | 13 EAST YORK STREET | Repaint rear exterior doors](#)

[📎 SIGNED Staff Dec - 21-006858-COA 13 E York St.pdf](#)

[21. Petition of ROBERT PERKINS | 21-006782-COA | 601 WHITAKER STREET | Exterior paint change](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 21-006782-COA.pdf](#)

[22. Petition of FLOURISH COLLABORATIVE, Erica Kelly | 21-006873-COA | 502 EAST BROUGHTON STREET | Window sign, under-awning hanging sign, and color change](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-006873-COA - 502 E Broughton St.pdf](#)

[23. Petition of GALLERY 209, Shirley Daniell | 21-006438-COA | 209 EAST RIVER STREET | Awning replacement \(3\) with existing colors and configurations; added graphic for middle awning](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-006438-COA - 209 E River St.pdf](#)

[24. Petition of WHITLOW CONSTRUCTION, Jeff Whitlow | 21-006602-COA | 429, 431, & 433 MONTGOMERY STREET | Replace 72 wood windows](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 21-006602-COA 429, 431, 433 Montgomery St.pdf](#)

[25. Petition of PATRICK PHELPS | 21-006455-COA | 208 WEST HALL STREET | Clean and seal exterior masonry](#)

[☞ SIGNED Decision Packet 21-006455-COA 208 West Hall Street.pdf](#)

[26. Petition of SCAD, Helen Morgan | 21-006604-COA | 622 DRAYTON ST | Temporary glass and frame installation \(to clean existing stained glass off-site\)](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 21-006604-COA 622 Drayton Street.pdf](#)

[27. Petition of MARRTA MIZGALA | 21-006614-COA | 14 NORTH ABERCORN STREET | Installation and screening of porch piping; paint & stain railing and deck](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-006614-COA - 14 N Abercorn St.pdf](#)

[28. Petition of METALCRAFTS, Katie Lee | 21-006578-COA | 20 EAST GORDON STREET | Roof repair](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec - 21-006578-COA 20 E Gordon Stt.pdf](#)

[29. Petition of YOUR EXTERIOR PROS | 21-006496-COA | 537 - 539 EAST HALL STREET | Roof replacement](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Dec 21-006496-COA 537 & 539 E Hall St.pdf](#)

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

[30. Report on Work Inconsistent With Issued COA for the January 12, 2022, HDBR Meeting](#)

[☞ Work Inconsistent with Issued COA_January Report.pdf](#)

[31. Report on Work That Exceeds Scope of Issued COA for the January 12, 2022, HDBR Meeting](#)

[☞ Work That Exceeds Scope of Issued COA_January Report.pdf](#)

[32. Report on Work Performed Without a COA for the January 12, 2022 HDBR Meeting](#)

[☞ Work Performed Without a COA_January Report.pdf](#)

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

[33. Stamped Drawings - January Report](#)

[☞ January 2022 REPORT.pdf](#)

[34. Items Deferred to Staff - January Report](#)

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

[35. COA Inspections - January Report](#)

[January 2022 - REPORT.pdf](#)

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

[36. Nominating Committee Announce Nominations for Chair and Vice-Chair - Board to Vote](#)

Ms. Memory presented the Nominating Committee's nominations:

Chair: Ellie Isaacs

Vice Chair: Steven Bodek

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to APPROVE the Nominating Committee's recommendations for Chair and Vice Chair.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: David Altschiller

- Becky Lynch - Not Present
- Dwayne Stephens - Abstain
- Melissa Memory - Aye
- David Altschiller - Aye
- Nan Taylor - Aye
- Kevin Dodge - Aye
- Stan Houle - Aye
- Ellie Isaacs - Aye
- Steven Bodek - Aye

[37. Chair](#)

Ellie Isaacs

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to ACCEPT nomination of Ellie Isaacs as Chairperson.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: David Altschiller

- Becky Lynch - Not Present
- Dwayne Stephens - Abstain
- Melissa Memory - Aye
- David Altschiller - Aye

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

38. Vice Chair

Steven Bodek

Motion

The Historic District Board of Review motioned to ACCEPT nomination of Steven Bodek as Vice-Chairperson.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: David Altschiller

Becky Lynch	- Not Present
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Aye

39. Presentation of 2022 MPC Calendar

📎 [Final Calendar - 12.14.2021.pdf](#)

Ms. Leah Michalak presented the 2022 MPC Calendar.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

40. TENTATIVE: Next HDBR Pre-Meeting - Wednesday, February 9, 2022 at 1pm

41. Next HDBR Regular Meeting - Wednesday, February 9, 2022 at 2pm

42. Adjourn

There being no further business to present before Board, the January 12, 2022 Historic District Board of Review adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Leah G. 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.