

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

REGULAR MEETING
112 EAST STATE STREET
ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

APRIL 14, 2004

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

Dr. Gerald Caplan, Chairman
W. John Mitchell, Vice-Chairman
Dian Brownfield
John Deering
Dr. Lester Johnson
Eric Meyerhoff
John Neely
Swann Seiler
Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring

Members Absent:

Ned Gay (excused)

MPC Staff Present:

Beth Reiter, Preservation Officer
Lee Webb, Preservation Specialist
Wanda Dixon, Secretary

RE: Call to Order

Dr. Caplan called the April 14, 2004 meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review to order at 2:00 P.M.

RE: Sign Posting

No petitions were continued due to lack of sign posting.

RE: Consent Agenda

RE: Amended Petition of Dirk Hardison
HBR 03-3141-2
542/544 East Harris Street
Alterations to Crawl Space Material

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Continued Petition of Edwin Swift
HBR 04-3162-2
214 West Boundary Street
Principle Use Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison
Deborah Williams
HBR 04-3178-2
318 East Jones Street
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

HDBR Action: Ms. Seiler made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as submitted. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Regular Agenda

**RE: Amended Petition of Dawson &
Wissmach Architects, Bryan Harder, Agent
HBR 03-3013-2
9 West Gordon Street
Alteration to Carriage House**

Present for the petition was Bryan Harder, agent for the petitioner.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff Report.

The petitioner is requesting a reconsideration of a decision of the Review Board at the March 10, 2004 meeting, regarding infilling a garage door of the carriage house at 9 West Gordon. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for work completed.

FINDINGS

1. At the March meeting, the Review Board approved the use of brick to infill the left garage opening of the carriage house. The petitioner had proposed using stucco for infill.
2. The work had proceeded, with the infill of the garage door being stucco, as shown in the photographs submitted.
3. The base of the carriage house has received two coats of the three-coat-stucco system.
4. The center portion (between the garage doors) has been enlarged to receive the power meters and disconnects required.
5. The window size and lite configuration will be built as approved by the Review Board, and the stucco color will be as approved.
6. The petitioner provided additional photographs that the interior elevation of the carriage house, facing the courtyard, was stuccoed prior to the rehabilitation. It is Staff understanding it will be stuccoed as the rehabilitation continues.
7. The existing exposed brick on the upper level of the carriage house on the lane elevation will be maintained.

8. Despite the completed work contradicting what was approved by the Review Board, Staff feels the stucco infill is visually compatible and approvable after the fact. Staff would reiterate that the window size, lite configuration, and color be completed as previously approved.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommended approval.

Petitioner’s Comments:

Mr. Steve Day, Contractor, stated when the Review Board approved the stucco on the main house, they were under the impression that stucco was approved for the carriage house at the same time. He said two days before the decision was made by the Historic Review Board to do an infill of brick, the first two coats of stucco had been applied to the area shown on the drawing. He said it was not really after-the-fact because it actually happened before.

He further stated they were not able to use the existing electric meters and they had to have additional surface on which to put new electrical boxes. He said they were approximately 36” X 42”, not including the telephone boxes that would go underneath. He said stucco was already on the front of the doorway, on the area over the gate and across the top of the garage doors, and down the brick column. He asked that the Board approve the use of stucco with the appropriate color on the carriage house.

HDBR Action: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed

**RE: Amended Petition of Dirk Hardison, For
Richard Mopper
HBR 04-3150-2
612 Barnard Street
Fence**

Present for the petition was Dirk Hardison.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to construct additional fencing to the perimeter of 612 Barnard Street.

FINDINGS

1. On the front elevation, a proposed fence will be constructed of decorative metal, by Jereth Fences, in the Concord style, in black. The petitioner provided manufacturer information on the proposed fence.
2. The fence will be 4’ in height and will be installed immediately behind the existing granite curb along the Barnard Street sidewalk. However, the ordinance states: “Masonry copings shall be used with iron fencing.” Staff recommends that the new metal fencing be installed on top of the curb, rather than behind.

3. At the south end, the proposed fence will return east following the curb to the present location of the neighbor's chain-link gate.
4. The neighbor is planning on replacing the gate with a matching metal gate in the Concord style.
5. An existing masonry wall will be removed.
6. At the north end, the fence will return approximately 13'6" to attach to an existing masonry wall.
7. Along the south perimeter, a pre-manufactured wood plank privacy fence is proposed. A portion will be 6' from the eastern end of the metal fence along the property line to the rear wall of the neighboring house. A portion 8' tall will extend from this point to the post of the previously approved decorative wood fence along the rear property line.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommended approval with the condition that the fencing be installed on top of the curb.

Board's Comments:

Mr. Deering asked if it was iron or aluminum?

Mr. Hardison stated aluminum. He also stated originally that the owner asked that the fence be set behind the granite curbing because his attempts to find someone to install the fencing on top of the curbing resulted in everyone saying that the curbing was going to crack.

Ms. Brownfield asked if the fence could be cantilevered over the granite?

Mr. Hardison stated it was right next to the sidewalk. If it were supported on both sides, there could be a tripping situation on the sidewalk side.

HDBR Action: **Ms. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted, based on the physical conditions at the site. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Continued Petition of Laura Kessler
HBR 04-3164-2
400 Block – East State Street
New Construction – Part I Height/Mass**

Present for the petition was Mr. Lou Oliver, Architect and Mr. Gray Reese, Associate Architect.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting Height and Mass approval for a 4 story, 13-unit condominium fronting State Street, near Columbia Square.

FINDINGS

Standards Part I

1. **Setbacks:** No setback is required where the wall is not pierced by windows. The petitioner desires windows on the east elevation and on the west elevations. They are

planning to seek a variance from the building code to build to the 0-lot line by providing sprinkler devices at the openings as required by code. The front elevation (South) aligns with the adjacent building to the west. (Section 8-3030 (l) (3))

If the variance is granted the proposed project meets this standard. There are two garden walls, one on the east lot line and one on the west. The eastern wall on the Davenport House side is not historic, however the western wall may be.

2. Dwelling unit type: Apartment buildings as a dwelling type are rare in the Historic District and most date from the first quarter of the 20th century. They understood the 60 foot rhythm of the plan and were well detailed. (Manual for Development page 8)

Guide to Determining Dwelling type: Tithing Blocks: A variety of dwelling types may exist within any given Tithing Block in the historic District. As long as the rules for height, setback, lot coverage and street elevations are met, any of the historic dwelling types within the block may be used. (Manual for Development p. 9)

Dwellings in the Historic District, with the exception of detached houses on lots greater than 40 feet (generally lying south of Gaston Street) tend to be closely spaced. In order to maintain this spacing on which much of the character of the district rests, new or expanded dwelling structures should occupy the following minimum percentage of lot width along the front setback line as measured from side lot-line to side lot-line. Apartment buildings – 80% (Manual for Development pgs. 8-9).

The high stoop format is not generally found on apartment buildings in the Historic District. In the adjacent Tithing block there are four apartment houses on raised crawl spaces. The proposed project is raised on a 24" crawlspace (actually there are two levels of parking below). This is consistent with the apartment buildings in the adjacent Tithing Block.

Lot area coverage permitted in most sections of the Historic District is 75%. (Manual for Development p. 9)

The proposed lot coverage does not exceed 75%.

3. Street Elevation type: A proposed building on an East-West Connecting Street shall utilize an existing historic building street elevation type located within the existing block front or on an immediately adjacent Tithing or Trust Block. Section 3030 (l) (2) (a)

Three story high stoop townhouses are rarely found north of Oglethorpe with the exception of Anson Ward...

The apartment type is better suited for the use proposed for the building. It is visually compatible in this transition zone between Broughton Street and the residential streets to the South. There are also some larger residential conversions on Oglethorpe Avenue in this ward (Oglethorpe Row)

4. Entrances: A building on a Tithing Block shall locate its primary entrance to front the East-West Street. (Section 8-3030 (l) (4) (c))

The project complies with this standard.

5. Building Height: The site is located in a 4 story height zone. (Height Map)

The exterior expression of the height of the first story, or the second story in the case of a raised basement shall not be less than 11 feet. (Section 8-3030 (l) (1) (c) (b))

The exterior expression of the height of each story above the second shall not be less than 10 feet. (Section 8-3030 (l) (1) (c) (c))

The first floor is 12'-6" on a 2' "crawl space", the next stories are 11'-6" and the top story is 13'-6".

The proposed structure is 5' higher than the adjacent duplex to the west. It is 10' higher than the roof ridge of the Davenport House to the east and separated by 44' +/- and it is a few feet higher than the cornice of the Kehoe House (although the height of the Kehoe House is 15' +/- higher than the proposed structure overall. The height of the proposed development is visually compatible in this ward.

6. This project does not fall under Tall Building, Large Scale Development of Monumental Building standards

Visual Compatibility Factors

1. Height: **See above**
2. Proportion of structure's front façade: ***The proportion of height to width in the front façade appears to be consistent with other large structures in the vicinity. The height of the fourth story which is taller than the ground floor does vary from the typical proportion in Savannah. Consistently, the tallest floor is the ground floor in terms of a commercial structure and the parlor floor in terms of a raised stoop. This may warrant further reconsideration.***
3. Proportion of openings:
(Some of the window standards probably apply here they include the following)
All windows facing a street, exclusive of storefronts, basement and top story windows, shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3, provide however, nothing herein precludes an arched window being used (Section 8-3030 (l) (9) (f))

The petitioner needs to address this standard. Note that the ground floor openings open into garden rooms. Staff recommends that the petitioner readdress the openings on the East elevation to give them less visual "weight" than the front elevation. As presented the proportions are as massive as the front – these openings might be simplified.

The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically. (Section 8-3030 (l) (9) (e)): ***The proposed project complies with this standard.***

The distance between windows shall not be less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows. Paired or grouped windows are permitted, provided the individual sashes have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3. (Section 8-3030 (l) (9) (h))

There appears to be a larger percentage of glass on this structure than on comparable residential structures in the area giving it a more institutional feel. This might be studied particularly on the 4th story level and East elevation (as discussed above).

4. Rhythm of solids to voids in front façade: *For most detached structures in this ward the three bay rhythm is typical. (The Federal style Davenport House has a 5 bay rhythm, but it is located on a corner lot overlooking the square.) Occupying a lot and a half the proposed structure is divided into three three-bay sections.*

On the rear there is an elevator structure. It is not clear from the drawings what the visual appearance is at the elevator. It appears the elevator is blocking some windows. Please clarify.

5. Rhythm on street: *The proposed structure will occupy 100% of the lot frontage. This is consistent with other nearby apartment buildings, as well as with the double townhouse to the west. There is a 44' garden between the east wall and the Davenport House to the east.*
6. Rhythm of entrance and or porch projections (balconies): *Projecting balconies are found on the apartment buildings in the adjacent tithing block at a 4'-4" depth approximately (accessed by a French door) and 3' depth approximately (accessed by a vertically sliding window). The ordinance states that residential balconies shall not extend more than three feet in depth. The width of the sidewalk is not clear. The elevation states it is 6'-3" and the site plan shows 8'-10". Field measurements by staff average about 9'-6". The balconies at 4'-6" would require a variance from the Board of Appeals if the Board of Review finds this depth compatible.*
7. Roof Shape: *A flat roof with a parapet has been proposed. This is consistent with the structure immediately adjacent to the west and others in this ward. A roof with parapet is an appropriate roof form for an apartment type structure. It is not clear whether the HVAC units on the roof will be adequately screened by the parapet.*
8. Walls of Continuity: *The street wall is maintained by a 0 setback. The proposed structure does directly impact the adjacent garden walls on the east and west. That of the Davenport garden is not historic, however the west garden wall may be. It is not clear what impact the construction of this building on the 0 lot line will have on these walls. Will they need to be torn down for instance?*
9. Scale: *The apartment buildings in the adjacent block have similar proportions, but have more modest openings. These smaller scaled elements within the larger mass tend to help reduce the scale. The proposed development uses a central entrance apartment form and is designed in the Italianate style with large arched windows. This, together with the large casement-style windows on the first floor give an institutional feel to this residential building. This might be mitigated in the Part II design development phase by studying the effect of using smaller panes of glass in the casement windows. The ironwork grill design could also be critical in enhancing a neighborhood residential feel.*

Other:

1. ***Location of meters, utilities and trash cans. Where will these be located? Will there be a utility room for the breaker boxes etc.***
2. ***ADA requirements. Can a condominium building be built with rear elevator as the only ADA accessible point? The reason for this inquiry is that ramping the State Street sidewalk as was done at the Radisson would not be a visually acceptable solution***
3. ***Method for excavating site; placing the two underground levels and constructing building. There is great concern for the protection of the historic buildings on either side of this site. The Davenport House is individually listed on the National Register.***

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommended approval of height and mass with reconsideration of size and number of windows and size and number of panes in garden windows; discussion of all the questions raised in the staff report for the part II submittal.

Board's Comments:

Mr. Neely asked what the zoning was on the site and what uses would be allowed if they wanted to put in retail. He further asked if Staff happened to know the zoning.

Mr. Deering stated the property was zoned R-I-P-A.

Mrs. Reiter stated that this zone would allow a shop.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked were any additional plans submitted other than what was presented to the Board.

Mrs. Reiter stated that the Board had received a copy of the site plan and the elevations.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he was looking at the first sheet called the vicinity map. The second sheet was called the site plan. The vicinity map shows an indent on the lane side, which is the north side of the building with the elevator sitting outside of the building itself. The site plan, next page, shows a solid rectangular building, with no recess on the north side.

Mrs. Reiter stated that the model showed a third way, which was why she raised the question in the staff report.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked how do you know what is on the site plan.

Mr. Deering stated that the site plan itself shows the roof with the elevator tower projecting.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he understood, but without a floor plan or a series of floor plans they don't know whether there is an indent on the north side or not.

Mrs. Reiter stated that the model indicated that there was an indent, but it did not match the plans as submitted.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it made a big difference in reviewing the massing, whether the elevator was a freestanding element behind the building or it was a part of the rectangle. It was very difficult to ascertain that information without a floor plan or a series of floor plans.

Mr. Mitchell stated that his concern was with the windows at the top level. This was a drastic difference from what's in the area.

Ms. Brownfield stated that she knew that this was not the design phase, but it should be considered at this point. In her opinion, this design had nothing to do with the streetscape and was visually incompatible as far as she was concerned. The proposal seemed totally out of place and she too was concerned about going underground. She further stated that she knew that this was not within the Board's purview.

Mr. Lou Oliver, Architect, stated that he would like to start with clarification of some of the issues the Preservation Officer brought up. He stated regarding the garden walls on each side of the property, the intent of the applicant was to shore below those walls internal to the site so the walls do not have to be removed what so ever. The building would be built to those walls. He thought, technically one of the walls may be on the applicant's property. The intent was to build to that wall and not disturb it at all. One of the other issues concerned the balconies and if they were 4'-6" they would require a variance. The reason they made them 4'-6" was so they could be functional. They realized that the tradition in Savannah was typically more like three feet. They actually wanted chairs and tables out there to be used and there be enough room to walk around in and so that's the desire for the 4'-6" balconies.

He stated that the windows were drawn at three feet. They could definitely reduce them to 2'-8". The intention in doing three feet was to get as much view as possible in the condominiums. The view is definitely valuable on this site. The panes on the ground floor could definitely be reduced in scale. They could divide the larger pieces of glass into smaller mutin patterns.

They would not be doing any ramps on the outside of the building. They would be entering a door on the rear and ramping internally into the building. He further stated that they did not want to see ramps either. With regard to the issue of the rear elevator – the elevator is within the total rectangular foot print of the building. The area was actually roofed over and floored over on every level. The rear elevation was still under development and they may consider enclosing that as a total rectangular volume with arched fenestration, something that would leave a lot of light and air and incorporate the elevator tower as a part of the building envelope. He further stated as far as impact on the surrounding historic properties, the applicant obviously owns a major piece of property across the street, which is one of the closer buildings. There would be seismic monitors placed in adjacent buildings. The piles would be drilled and grouted versus pounded into the earth. He stated that they did not foresee any seismic activity whatsoever.

Mr. Oliver further stated that one of the major issues was just the general composition and the amount of glazing of the building. The applicant agreed to greatly reduce the fenestration towards the Davenport House. That building will be treated in a manner that is secondary to the Davenport House. He further stated that they felt that this was a very appropriate comment. Regarding the front on the structure, this was an issue that could go in either direction. There are two ideas in design and they can go in either direction, but they had one that they preferred.

The one idea was related to building typology – a building which is of its own time and expresses its current function. This is the philosophy that they have gone with and they are attempting to do very good design work within this. Style is obviously secondary to this philosophy and could be most any style. This is a condominium building and is a relatively modern typology and it doesn't fit into a row house, an apartment, or a commercial building. What he sees in Savannah are very definite building typologies. Buildings here are not faked. We don't have houses that look like churches, et cetera. They are trying to stay true to the typology of the condominiums. Condominiums are obviously designed to sell, to enhance the community, and to make a profit. They are trying to do as much glass as possible and trying to provide as much outdoor living space as possible and of course, the higher priced units are your top floor units, which command the best view, and in an ideal world have as much glass in them. They are working within that typology and working to produce something that is sensitive and good looking that they can sell. The other philosophy that they could have chosen was to do an historicist design. A lot of people confuse historicism with style. They are two different things. Style can be applied to Historicism or to a building typology. Historicism would mean that a condominium would pretend to be a single-family house or a mosque or something else, but it is cloaked in a false sense of history. He stated that this is not what they wanted to do.

Mr. Oliver stated, having said that, he was not sure that they had quite convinced the Board of what they wanted to do. They were asking the Board to just work with them so that they could do something that satisfied the Board and that they could sell.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked how many units would they have.

Mr. Oliver stated ten units.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated with ten units, they obviously have to provide ten parking spaces. He stated that he read in the staff report that they would go down two levels for parking.

Mr. Oliver stated, yes .

Mr. Meyerhoff asked why would you go down two levels when you have 6,000 square feet, that is 260 square feet per car. Why would you need to go down two levels.

Mr. Gray Reese, Associate Architect, stated that they had to provide parking for the inn that is grandfathered in on the site. He stated that they are actually providing 26 parking spaces.

Mr. Reese stated yes because they had to replace the parking that is currently there.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated when you go down two levels they would be going down 16 feet. They mentioned in the presentation that they were going to drill and grout the pilings. Mr. Meyerhoff stated a 16 foot hole, the width and length of the property would require sheet pilings.

Mr. Reese stated that they were also the architects for the hotel/mansion on Forsyth. He stated that they are employing the same conditions there and they are down 16 feet next to the site of the existing mansion. He stated that they just went through this. It would have some offset as it goes down. While the building is to the lot line, the actual lower level will pull back.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked approximately how much.

Mr. Reese stated three to four feet.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated from the east and west sides.

Mr. Reese stated yes to allow for the type of sheeting that Mr. Meyerhoff is talking about.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated asked if they would be using sheet piling in order to create the hole.

Mr. Reese stated that they will be using piling tiebacks. He further stated that he guessed sheet pilings were what Mr. Meyerhoff was talking about. They would be laid in, not drilled and tied back to the other people's property. It will be supported within the hole as they go down.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that they would have to drive the sheet piling and then drill and do the scalp work to hold the sheet pile in place.

Mr. Reese stated that they would not be doing anything from the other people's site. It would be done from inside the hole. They would be going down very slowly and taking a little dirt out and set a pile. Then they would set the sheeting and take a little more out and set it and ease it down. They would not be driving anything next to the building. They would have the same condition over on Forsyth Park where they are right next to a house.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that Forsyth Park was different. First it was a freestanding area and did not have a building immediately adjacent to it.

Mr. Reese stated that they were right next door to their existing building.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated other than their building. He further stated from his experience having put two buildings with garages on Bay Street – each time they started going down two levels they had to back off the second level because they hit the water table.

Mr. Reese stated that currently they were monitoring the situation and had two wells on the site. He stated that they know where the water is at this point. They are down 21 feet at the site and they had to do that to get plans for this. He further stated that they have a geotech person right now monitoring that issue.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he sees a major problem with going down 16 to 20 feet in order to create two levels of parking. He stated they would have to put in sheet pilings and he did not know how else they would get it in other than to drive it in. He stated that this is the only way to put sheet pilings in and then you have to break the sheet piling with the drill grout and that has to go to the outside and not from the inside.

Mr. Reese stated that what he was speaking to was really not sheet piling. They plan to drill the pile and fill it with concrete.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that is for the individual piles.

Mr. Reese stated that they would come behind that and lay it in. They excavate out and this slides like a slip pile. Slip sheeting is a better term for it. It slips in behind the pile. He further stated that the other alternative is that they would drill each pile and actually form a wall called fibercasting. This is where it is drilled side by side by side and that line of piles actually becomes the wall. He stated that this is the other option, but they have to look at all of that. Mr. Reese stated that they would obviously not start the project or do the project if they are not able to do this in one of the aforementioned manners. The contractor would be the same people

who are doing the hotel. They realize that they would not be able to drive and bang or do any of that on the site. He stated that they could provide back up information and actually provide the size information to the Board letting them know exactly what they are planning to do. They can certainly do that because they have a Geotech, structural engineers, and the contractor – again they could assure the Board that this was not an issue.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated whether they drive the sheet pile or have another method the sheet pile has to be anchored in order to keep it from collapsing inward in the hole. He stated that the way you do that is with the drilled grouting of the concrete.

Mr. Reese stated that if they do a series of piles that are like pencils lined up in a row. They will put every one of them in and they will be drilled and poured and they won't begin excavating until those are in place. Each one is drilled, and each one is filled, and then poured. You then have this sitting and then you begin to excavate in front of that and you haven't driven any sheet metal, any pile, anything. This is what holds the dirt back. He stated that they would be willing to provide any of that information.

Ms. Fortson-Waring stated that as interesting as all of that was, it doesn't come under the Board's purview and she doesn't think that the petitioner needs to supply that to the Board.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that it did come under the Board's purview from the standpoint that in his view, in his experience with this you have to go outside the property line to anchor.

Ms. Fortston-Waring stated that that did not come under the Board's purview either.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that it did, because then you are interfering with the walls that are adjacent.

Ms. Brownfield stated that she wanted to make sure that she understood. She further stated that the residential balconies should not extend more than three feet in depth. She stated that the petitioner said that they would be looking for a variance in order to make them wider so that people can sit outside.

Mr. Reese stated that they measured the adjacent balconies to the west and they actually measure 4'-4". He stated that they are really only two inches back and that is mentioned in the Staff Report. The report speaks of the existing balconies, with that said they could at least get a variance to go to what exists already near the site. He further stated that they would shave two inches off and they are willing to do that.

Dr. Caplan stated that the existing structures are grandfathered and the Board can't do anything about those structures. The current ordinance states that it should be three feet and they would need Board approval before they could get a variance. He stated that the petitioner should forget about the 4'-4", and he knows that it is hard to do. Dr. Caplan stated that the petitioner should realize that the Board's responsibility is to maintain the regulations, as they exist.

Mr. Reese stated that they would work with whatever the Board tells them to do on the site. If they have to meet the requirement they would just meet it. He stated, again, this was part of the second review of details and aesthetics.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked with regard to the two five-foot indents that are shown in the elevations, how deep will they go.

Mr. Reese stated that right now their plans read at least 18 inches. He stated that they would be willing to entertain any suggestion on this as well.

Mr. Mitchell stated that there was mention of seismic activity. He asked is it known how much the Davenport House could withstand.

Mr. Reese stated that if they don't know now, they will know. He stated that they have a good idea because they have the property on Forsyth, which is very delicate. They have their own mansion home there and they have done everything right up to it, dug underneath it and they have been monitoring this house with a Geotech agency. He stated that he doesn't feel that they could do much more to the site than they have done. He stated that they will not only monitor the Davenport House, but the owner's own property across the street – the Kehoe House that is actually closer to them than the Davenport House, not withstanding the wall.

Ms. Seiler stated that she had to echo her concerns for the jewel of the city, the Davenport House, and what the drilling could possibly do to that and the owner of the townhouses on that same street. They are going to have to deal with that kind of activity and construction because those houses are of tremendous historic importance. Also, on this street she worried about the residence there and that they have to deal with that. She asked why would the owner who has the inn across the street, from an architectural standpoint, not want to tie the work in. She stated that this was so out of character.

Mr. Reese asked whether it was an issue of style or fenestration or proportion.

Ms. Seiler stated that the issue was with the Kehoe House looking so entirely different. With the exception for the elevator shaft she did not see any similarity.

Mr. Oliver stated he thought that they had a bigger breadth of building and of course it is ten units instead of the original one unit. He further stated that he thought the Kehoe House and the Davenport House are seen as objects in space.

Ms. Seiler asked whether they would ever attempt (a similar design).

Mr. Oliver stated that he would not try to duplicate the Kehoe House in any fashion because he thought, number one, that they could never afford it. It would make the units cost ten million dollars a piece. He stated that he felt that it would take away from the house. They wanted to do something different and something that formed an urban wall versus a three dimensional object, which he felt was more appropriate to the multifamily typology. He further stated that there was a deliberate attempt not to have too many individual components take command of the façade, but, to make the façade uniform. Mr. Oliver stated that this was a deliberate design.

Ms. Brownfield stated that she wanted to remind the petitioners that they were in a major location and that this was a very serious and important project. She stated that they have done some very important things for the city and she was grateful for that. Ms. Brownfield stated that as an inn owner herself, she would ask that they consider the three-foot balcony as a very important part of keeping it a quieter neighborhood. She stated when you are an inn keeper and people are out on their balcony talking it does disturb the people who are in the Kehoe House. She stated that she said that from experience.

Mr. Oliver stated that he thought that they would be able to live with the three-foot balcony.

Mr. Deering stated that he had a problem with the proposed height and mass. He said that he applauded their typology and he thought the apartment building typology on the site was a good choice. He stated that he liked it looking like a condominium or apartment building. He further stated that he liked the three bay design, but he was not sure if he liked the center bay as wide as it is. He stated that this was his personal opinion. He agreed with Mrs. Reiter that the fourth floor should probably be reduced somewhat in height. It was a little bit too tall and it began to take on the commercial typology of Broughton Street. This looked like a Broughton Street building on the top. There were a lot of buildings on Broughton Street with arched windows at the top.

Mr. Deering further stated that he was concerned with the depth of the building from the street (to the) back. He thought that it was very deep and made the Davenport House look small and it made the four-story townhouses next door look small and it even made the Kehoe House look small in the model. He stated that this was surprising. When he first saw it in drawing form he thought it was about right. But, it did seem a bit large on this particular site and he thought that it should be reduced in depth and height by a few feet. The height could be reduced by just a few feet and be successful still. The depth of the project would take a considerable reduction to make it work. He stated that he agreed with Staff on the ground floor openings. If they were more residential in scale he felt that they would have a more successful project also.

Mr. Oliver stated that he respected Mr. Deering's advice and opinion. He stated that part of the reason they had to go up as tall as they did on the top floor was aesthetic. He thought they needed a crown to the building. The basic composition of it is classical. The second reason which may be more important was the fact that they needed a tall enough parapet to hide the mechanical units on the roof, that would not have existed 60, 70, or even 80 years ago.

Mr. Deering stated that he agreed with those points, but he still thought the center windows in the center bay were a little bit large for the rest of the neighborhood.

Mr. Oliver stated that they could definitely work with the Board on the next round.

Mr. Reese stated that he would like to address the Board's comment about the depth of the property. He stated that they had done a lot of studies. If you take the model and look at it at eye level, you would never see all of that at one time. You might see it from either end. Obviously looking at the model looking down it looks like a big block. The real elevation is one you are going to see from the rear, from the lane until that infills back there in the future. It is an empty lot right now. He thinks if they really sense the model from eye level where you would really be, it's not all there.

Mr. Deering stated when you're walking down Habersham Street you do perceive how big it will be and you do see how large it is when compared to some of the other structures.

Public's Comments:

Mr. Mark McDonald, Executive Director of the Historic Savannah Foundation. Mr. McDonald stated that the Historic Savannah Foundation is the owner of the Isaiah Davenport House so they have concerns about the project because of some of the things that have been mentioned. He stated that he would not go into those things, because they have been meeting with the Kessler Company and they appreciated their meetings. They have met on two occasions to talk

about those concerns and their concerns about the building. He stated that he wanted to state that the Historic Savannah Foundation is not opposed to construction on this site. There were buildings on the site in history. There were townhouses there in the 19th Century. As usual, they felt that vacant lots should be filled in with compatible architecture. He said that they supported the project and they supported the Kessler Company's efforts to build there.

He further stated that at the meetings that they have had with the Kessler Company they have raised some concerns. He would like to thank them for making some amendments already. He stated that he would like to turn the rest of his presentation over to Dirk Hardison, their design consultant, who would address issues of architectural compatibility and scale.

Mr. Dirk Hardison stated that the Architectural Review Committee was very concerned that the massing for the proposed building was not taken from the immediately adjacent properties. These properties being the Davenport House, and also the group of townhouses that sit to the other side, which have sort of gotten lost in some of these issues. If this petition were passed all of these buildings would be bested in height and especially now. If some of this could be helped, at least the height problem could be helped, this would be a huge step. If the upper floor were reduced, and the extreme mass of the building helped somewhat by bringing the building away from the zero lot line, utilizing the five foot side yard setback which is prescribed in this neighborhood. In this case having all of those windows right on the zero lot line is something they usually don't have to worry about because of fire codes not allowing running windows directly on the zero lot line. Technology supercedes this in this case and they have a situation that is not the Savannah building tradition. He stated that someone in their meeting stated it is like having your neighbor run right up to the wall and they're peering over it. The huge mass with all of these windows completely dominate the Davenport House garden. This is one of those cases where technicalities may be met, but this Board is composed of humans and not a checklist. This is because there are those times, and he believes this is one of them, when an ordinance is met, but it still results in a visually incompatible structure. He stated in any case, Part I, they do support Staff's recommendation that the size and number of windows should be reconsidered for the Part II proposal.

Mr. Tim Walmsley, an attorney representing the Moores who live in the townhouse next door. The townhouse is approximately five feet from the proposed construction. He stated, as with the Historic Savannah Foundation the Moores were not opposed to a building on this property. The Moores have had a couple of meetings and he has had one meeting with the Kesslers. They had a number of concerns about the building in its current form. He further stated realizing that this is a phase I review, that they would not get to some of the concerns that they had. There were a number of concerns that he felt did need to be addressed here. He stated that he would turn them over to Mrs. Moore. He further stated the main issue or one of the main issues is the zero lot line (windows on the zero lot line five feet away from his client's property). He stated another issue, which he understood that they did not need to get into today, was the two-story hole that was going to be dug five feet from his client's property. He turned it over to Mrs. Moore understanding that this was phase I, the zero lot line variance, and the certain sense of size of the building as compared to everything in the area.

Mrs. Marsha Moore stated that she is the homeowner with her husband of 308 East State Street. As Mr. Walmsley just said, her home's wall is five feet from the construction that's proposed and she is very concerned. She has lived on East State Street since 1992 and moved into her existing house in 1996. Every building on East State Street from East Broad Street to Abercorn Street is a primary residence, except the Davenport House. She stated that they certainly appreciated the consideration for the Davenport House and they looked forward to a

beautiful building on what has been a parking lot next to their property. When they moved into this property there were two magnificent huge ancient trees. They have pictures of the Red Tail Hawk and they had seen two Barn Owls land in those tree. The trees, of course, were diseased, but now they're sidewalks where those wonderful trees had been. The concerns that they have mainly were the zero clearance on the property line. She stated it would diminish their air and light. She stated that she knew that the petitioner wanted better views on their balconies for their residents, but they would benefit from a little more themselves. The three issues that they brought out in their meeting with Ms. Kessler, included the construction methods and the digging that may endanger their property. They are also concerned about the dirt and sand compacting that will be involved and the method that would be involved. She stated that they were concerned about the current water table. They are in drought conditions yet they see lots of water standing around the lane and on State Street. The proposed building usage, both in the front and back of this building, were of a great concern to them. She stated that she knew that intellectually and emotionally she has a lot of considerations when she considers the property that is being built here and she knew that she couldn't bring them up. Mrs. Moore stated that she has these considerations listed and she would very much appreciate if the Board would consider reading these before they make their final decision. (Mrs. Moore gave the Board a copy of her list of considerations).

Mr. Reese stated that he would like to take note of Mrs. Moore's comments. With regard to the height, they have since the first proposal reduced the size of the building some three to four feet. Also, there is some focus on the higher top floor. If they get the massing that they want approved today they are willing to work with the Board and the neighbors as far as how the elevations will actually read. There are a lot of things that they can do to make the top floor read differently, within the mass that they are asking to have. He stated that they could divide this into four equal floors if they had to, once they established the height. Mr. Reese stated that there was mention of the parapet and they do need some amount of screening because of the building type. Mr. Reese stated that they had flexibility on the fenestration of the exterior within the balance of the height. Regarding the windows on the Davenport House side (this is something they had spoken with Mark and Dirk and others) they are totally willing to work with (Historic Savannah) on that elevation. The zero lot line issue on the Moore side only has one window that is pulled back and meets code. They can certainly not have any windows there and still meet the zoning. You are allowed to have a zero lot line and not have windows. The Davenport side is an issue where they have talked about the variance because of the windows. They would have the option of taking the building to the zero lot line and put zero windows there, which they didn't feel was appropriate either because it almost turns a blind eye to the property. Again, that would be a part of the next proposal. He thinks that they have addressed the construction issue. They have done 15 projects like this, himself, Mr. Oliver, the contractors and the developers. They currently have a project underway in the city and they are very sensitive to what they are doing in the area. He further stated that their client would probably be one of the condominium owners themselves, maybe. It is not something that they will be developing and leaving. They will be here with the project and so there is sensitivity there. He stated that he believes that this addresses the concerns that were brought up with the Davenport House and the Moores.

Mr. Reese stated that he is not sure if the list was something they should address. He stated that it is certainly something that they would be willing to address it if it is not something that they haven't heard today.

Dr. Caplan asked if they were proposing to leave the height of the building the same and equalize the floor. He further asked were they proposing to lower the height of the floor.

Mr. Reese stated that they would like to be approved for the mass as submitted. He stated that they are tight on this building because of the structure required between the floor and also maintaining the piece of property that has the highest ceiling level that they could have for the condominiums. The ceiling height is historically valuable and they are interested in maintaining the height as it is. With the fenestration they could work within the envelope with windows, floor line, et cetera, to give an elevation that is appropriate.

Ms. Brownfield asked what would happen to the project if the mass were reduced.

Mr. Reese stated that at this point it would probably not be feasible because in order to make the numbers work with the parking they had to have for the inn, and the square footages for the condominium development. He stated that they had already reduced the height and the width from the back somewhat from where they started because they had to meet 75% coverage. He stated that they are actually back less than they were. It would be a different project and he doesn't think it would be as nice as what they are proposing for the site.

Ms. Brownfield asked would it be eight condominiums as opposed to ten.

Mr. Reese stated that he doesn't really know what it would be. It may not be condominiums at that point. He stated they would have to revisit it. Right now they have put forth what they think is the best type of development for the site. They like the idea of housing and in order for housing like this to work there is a break point. He further stated once you start dropping the number of units. He stated that they were up 13 units at one point, now down to ten and that this was as far as they could go. You have to have an elevator and stairs within the infrastructure.

Mr. Oliver stated speaking on behalf of Ms. Laura Kessler and Richard; he must say that they do an excellent job on anything that they do. One of the last projects he worked on with them was the Grand Bohemian in downtown Orlando. This project won Best of Brands for Westin worldwide, not just nationally. They do like to do really incredible interiors and he thinks that the scale of the project, to make it work with the level of finish they want to do, really does need to be what it is. He stated otherwise the quality level would have to drop somewhere because you can't just make it work any other way. Their goal is to do the finest condominiums in Savannah.

Mr. Reese asked if it would be beneficial to address the issues of Mrs. Moore at this point.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated no.

Mr. Reese stated that a lot of the issues were code issues and he feels that he has addressed most of them at today's meeting.

Dr. Caplan thanked Mrs. Moore for her letter. He stated that they were not issues that relate (to visual compatibility) but he realized that they were a concern to her and the Board was sympathetic.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated this was a very unique building. The east side of this building (which is the depth of the building) will always show because the Davenport garden will never disappear. Consequently, from Columbia Square you can see both the length and the width of this building. It is very unique when you can see 90 foot of length and 67 feet of depth all at one time. The massing is massive in comparison to the neighborhood. The attempt to make these into smaller architectural units worries him with an 18-inch depth to provide for indent is overcome by the

strong base element of the brick to the point that you lose the verticality that you are trying to create by showing three different elements (as Mr. Deering pointed out). Even though the center windows need to be a different width you lose all of that because of the strong dark element at the base. The length and width is accentuated rather than mitigated. Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he thought that this was something that architecturally could be done without decreasing the ten units. In addition, the windows on the top floor and the windows on the ground floor are such a size that it almost becomes commercial, as if they're show windows on the ground floor. None of the windows related to the typical windows of any of the buildings adjacent or in the neighborhood. The window massing is too large and the building massing is too large. He stated that he believes that it could be done architecturally with a material change and more accentuation of the vertical rather than the horizontal. The building could be brought into compatibility to the neighborhood. As it stands currently, it is an overpowering mass in the neighborhood. It is clearly visible in the model how overpowering this mass is and he stated that they must not forget that this mass in length and depth is always going to be visible from Columbia Square. This will be one of the few buildings that he knows of that you see both elements, unless it was a corner building. A lot can be done architecturally on the elevations to mitigate and overcome this massive presentation that they are seeing now.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated that she agreed with most of the comments that Mr. Deering made earlier. She stated that she did not have a problem with the height, but she did feel that the mass and the depth were not visually compatible with the neighborhood. She said she did have a concern, especially when she sees that it has the same mass as the SCAD Library in the middle of homes.

Dr. Caplan stated that there was a strong horizontal component to this project and it does make a difference in the appearance of the mass of this building because of this.

HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review deny the petition as submitted on the basis of Section 8-3030(K)5 that the mass is not visually compatible with the historic structure in this neighborhood. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Lou Thoman
HBR 04-3171-2
201 East Charlton Street
Roof Deck & Arbor**

Present for the petition was Lou Thoman.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for the construction of a roof structure between the Abercorn and Charlton Street properties, which includes railings and a pergola.

FINDINGS

1. The buildings located at 340 Abercorn Street and 201 East Charlton Street were rehabilitated as components of the Suites at Lafayette.
2. The flat roof section between the buildings has been used as a deck.
3. Following repairs of the roof, the applicant added new decking, a railing for safety purposes, and a pergola structure.

4. The new railing matches approved porch railings of the property.
5. No drawings were submitted by the petitioner of the constructed railing and pergola. According to the petitioner, the railing is 38" tall and the pergola is 8' tall.
6. The railings, decking and pergola were constructed of pressure treated wood.
7. The ordinance states "roof decks and pergolas shall only be visible from the rear elevation." The petitioner's pergola is clearly visible from Abercorn Street.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommended approval of the deck railing and denial of the rooftop pergola. The pergola structure should be removed within 30 days from the decision of the Review Board.

Mr. Thoman stated they were repairing the roof, which was leaking. Previously, he had had concerns about a railing because people had been getting up to that deck. He said he had family in town who were tradesman so they started and before he knew, there it was, a new deck and railing and pergola. He said he walked around the neighborhood to find other examples and found twenty-five other arbors.

Mr. Deering asked the petitioner if he would consider painting it?

Mr. Thoman stated yes.

HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion failed 2 – 6. Opposed to the motion were Ms. Brownfield, Mr. Deering, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Neely, Ms. Seiler, and Mrs. Fortson-Waring.

HDBR Action: **Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the railing and deny the pergola based on Section 8-3030(l)(10)(e) which states that roof decks and pergolas shall only be visible from the rear elevation. The pergola is to be removed within 30 days of this decision. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Petition of Lominack, Kolman
& Smith Architects
Ellen Harris
HBR 04-3173-2
546 – 548 East Charlton Street
Renovation**

Present for the petition was Ellen Harris.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff Report:

The petitioner is requesting approval of renovation as follows:

1. Replace non-historic windows with wood true divided light 2/2 windows similar to adjacent structures of the same era.
2. Remove concrete block porch rail and replace with wood.
3. Replace porch posts reproducing original capital detail - see photo
4. Replace porch roof with standing seam metal.

5. Restore cornice to match piece of original detail –see photo.
6. Install 8' board fence
7. Replace main roof with asphalt shingle roof
8. Paint doors gloss black; windows, window and door trim, cornice, eaves and dentils, porch columns and handrails bright white; wood siding – Pittsburgh Paints 433-6-“Barn Door.”

FINDINGS

The structure was built ca. 1906. The proposed renovation will return it to better reflect its original appearance.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommended approval.

Ms. Ellen Harris stated that they had applied for state and federal tax credits on this property, so it would be in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards for rehabilitation. She also added there was aluminum siding on the front façade, but it would be removed and replaced with wood siding to match existing.

HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Gregory Gill, AIA
HBR 04-3174-2
201 MLK, Jr. Boulevard
New Construction – Part I Height/Mass**

Present for the petition was Gregory Gill.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff Report:

The petitioner is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval of a five-story hotel at 201 M.L.K Jr. Blvd.

FINDINGS

1. The property is located at the intersection of Oglethorpe Avenue and MLK, Jr., Blvd., on the Southwest corner. The property is zoned B-C and is located within a five-story height zone in the Landmark District, with no building setbacks required.
2. The proposed new construction with a footprint of 19,610 square feet +/- falls under the Standards for Large Scale Construction. It is also defined under the Historic District Ordinance as a Tall building, which requires that the frontage be divided into architecturally distinct sections no more than 60 feet in width with each section taller than it is wide. In addition, buildings greater than four-stories in height shall use window groupings, columns, or pilasters to create bays not less than 15' nor more than 20' in width. Roofs shall be flat with parapets or be less than 4:12 with an overhang.
3. As proposed, the new construction will be oriented to have the primary facade facing MLK, Jr. Blvd, with the Oglethorpe Avenue façade having a storefront appearance, with

service and parking functions located behind and concealed by the building. The north elevation will face a pool area and parking lot. On the front façade, a two-story component of the building will be slightly recessed from the main façade, and will shield the pool and terrace area from the MLK, Jr. street view.

Part I Height and Mass: Visual Compatibility Standards:

1. Height: The proposed building is five-stories in height, which is allowed in this five-story zone of the Landmark District. The adjacent Kahn Building, facing M.L.K., Jr. Blvd, is four-stories in height. A component of the front façade is only two-stories in height. The exterior expression of floor heights meets the ordinance requirements. The proposed height is visually compatible and meets the Standards.
2. Street Elevation Type: This is a commercial structure and is divided into the base, middle, and top, though change of materials.
3. Proportion of Front Façade: The main section of the front façade is five-stories in height, with a two-story component adjacent and slightly recessed. The five-story section is 62'3" wide and 70' tall. The proportion of height to width in the front façade appears to be consistent with the adjacent Kahn Building on M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.
4. Window groupings: The window groupings appear to be within the 15-20' dictates in the ordinance concerning Tall Building Standards.
5. Division of Street Frontage: On the MLK façade, the building is divided into four segments, with the main, five-story section composed of three bays, divided by pilasters, and the two-story section comprised of three bays by vertical window alignment. Each section is less than 60' in width. On the Oglethorpe Avenue façade, the elevation is divided into nine sections, each less than 60' in width.
6. Rhythm of Solids to Voids in Front Facade: The petitioner's use of pilasters, horizontal banding, parapets, and windows on the MLK, Jr. Blvd front façade is visually compatible with the adjacent Kahn Building.
7. Roof Shape: The proposed roof for the hotel is flat with varying parapets, to provide varying heights and to relate to the adjacent building. The two-story component on the front façade has a hipped roof. The roof is visually compatible.
8. Rhythm of Entrances: The main entrance to the hotel is located on the MLK, Jr., Blvd façade, which is in keeping with the adjacent Kahn building, which also utilizes a main entrance off of MLK, Jr. Blvd. The main entrance will have a colonnaded portico feature with storefront glass and transoms. On the north elevation, facing the hotel pool and parking lot, other entrances will be incorporated. However, Staff is concerned that there are no significant entrances off of the Oglethorpe Avenue elevation. This elevation is 281'2" long. Staff would encourage the petitioner to consider adding some significant entrances on this façade, not to upstage the primary, celebrated entrance on MLK, Jr. Blvd, but to add provide other options to pedestrians on such a lengthy façade.
9. Rhythm of Structures of Streets: Buildings fronting MLK, Jr. Blvd are all built to the street, with space between the buildings. There is consistent open space between the buildings on the adjacent block heading south, with entrances into parking lots. The

proposed project will have 50' between the two-story component of the main façade and the adjacent Kahn Building. The area will include an entrance off MLK, Jr. into hotel parking lot and a brick and iron wall. This is visually compatible with the existing rhythm of the street.

10. Setbacks: The structure is built to the 0-lot line on the MLK, Jr. Blvd and Oglethorpe Avenue frontages, which is allowed in the BC- district.
11. Walls of Continuity: A brick and wrought iron wall is proposed for the MLK, Blvd, frontage, connecting to the Kahn Building, with an entrance into the side hotel parking lot.
12. Directional Expression of Front Elevation: The proposed building has a vertical directional expression, which is visually compatible with the adjacent Kahn Building, the closest historic building.
13. Scale of building: The building uses horizontal detailing, window alignment, and material variation along the MLK, Jr. Blvd, and Oglethorpe Avenue Street elevations to break up the massing and is visually compatible to the adjacent Historic Kahn Building. The lengthy elevation on Oglethorpe Avenue is compatible to the length of the Kahn Building and much less than the SCAD Upfreight Warehouse building on the adjacent block.

Other Issues:

1. The petitioner is proposing to use brick for the base of the building and hard coat stucco for the upper floors. The adjacent buildings are predominately brick or stone. This will be discussed under the Part II Review for materials and design details.
2. The petitioner is also proposing a large parking lot to the rear of the project, between Papy Street and the Thunderbird Motel. Parking lots are also proposed to the side of the hotel, adjacent to the Kahn Building, and lot to the Rear.
3. The drawings show the compressor units will be located on the rooftop. The petitioner needs to confirm that the parapets will shield the compressor units from view at the street level.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommended approval of Part 1 Height and Mass, with the reconsideration of additional entrances on the Oglethorpe Avenue façade, to be brought back in Part II review.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Gill stated they had two exits on Oglethorpe Avenue. However, he did not see a problem with providing some accented or defined entries. He said they probably could do that between column lines 2 and 4 on the plans and between columns 16 and 18.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated there was a traffic problem on this corner. He suggested that the drive entrance be emphasized.

Mr. Gill agreed that something there would help to alert the drivers that the entrance was there when they were a distance away from it.

Mr. Mitchell asked about the bus traffic coming into the hotel off of Oglethorpe Avenue or off of Papy Street. He said he felt that the driver would have a difficult time getting out onto M.L.K.

Dr. Johnson asked if the City did not approve the portion of street that he wants to claim, what effect would that have on their parking lot to the rear?

Mr. Gill stated the technical function of the hotel would not change. However, the reason they wanted to gain control over part of Papy Street was to provide security and safety for their guests.

Mr. Deering stated he agreed with the comments in the Staff report about the height/mass of the project. He said he felt the height was compatible. He also liked the way the mass was broken up on the building. However, he did have some suggestions that he may want to consider for Part II. He said he did not think the neoclassically inspired window hoods were very good or appropriate for that portion of the City. The pilasters on the Oglethorpe Avenue side did not seem to really support an entablature. The recreation of the sort of broken pediment that exists on the Kahn building and putting it on their building, he did not think was a good idea. He said they were too closely mimicking what was on the historic structure next door and he did not think it was appropriate for this building. The second floor windows on the Martin Luther King, Jr., Blvd. elevation he felt were too wide and arched too low and not compatible with the neighborhood.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated they offset the verticality by the strong base structure. He said if they could accentuate some of the vertical elements of the building it would visually decrease the length of the building.

Mr. Joe Sasseen (Citizen) stated he was disturbed that motels of three and five stories were all beginning to look alike. He said he felt it was incumbent upon the Board to make the architects be a little more original in their designs.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition for Part I – Height/mass as submitted. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Petition of Dawson Wissmach Architects
Neil Dawson
HBR 04-3176-2
15 Bull Street
Alterations**

Present for the petition Neil Dawson.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff Report.

The petitioner is requesting approval for a façade alteration. The existing openings and portions of the lower wall will be removed and replaced with new wood storefronts on the ground floor and Kolbe and Kolbe insulated wood, double-hung, true divided 2/2 windows on the second floor. The corner entry will be replaced with a 6' recessed entry on Bryan Street and a new entry to the lower floor on Bull Street. The existing entry to the second floor will remain on Bull Street. Shed style awnings will be placed in the entry bays; color: Sunbrella Mediterranean Blue. The windows, doors and base panels will be painted Benjamin Moore Forest Green. The

upper walls will be painted Benjamin Moore OC-8 Elephant Tusk. The base columns and frieze will be painted Benjamin Moore HC-29 Dunmore Cream and the cornice will be painted Benjamin Moore HC-24 Quincy Tan.

She stated that the owner would like to amend the petition and make the existing entrance at the lane a window. And to put a recessed entrance in the third bay. She said it would have a central entrance on Bull Street and a central entrance on Bryan Street. However, this would not change the look of the building.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommended approval as submitted.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Dawson stated there was one other minor modification. He said they would like to further amend it to go to a two bay structure under the Bull Street windows because they felt it looked better.

Mr. Deering asked if there was any way to change the proportions of the windows on the second floor?

Mr. Dawson stated there was an existing header and footer there and the only way they could do it would be to drop the sill lower. He said it gave it more of a 3:5 proportion, which looked right but it dropped the sill to about 20 inches above the floor. He said when they did it, it did not look right because it decreased the amount of sill from the cornice line up. However, they could consider it, but what they have now was existing window openings. He said if he could talk the owner into doing that and if it looked right, they would like to but he could not raise the header.

*Mr. Mitchell acted as Chair because Dr. Caplan stepped away.

*Dr. Caplan returned.

HDBR Action: Ms. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as amended. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Lee Meyer, AIA, for
Michael Portman
HBR 04-3177-2
402 West Broughton Street
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Lee Meyer.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff Report:

The petitioner is requesting approval to rehabilitate the exterior of 402 West Broughton Street, including opening windows on the second floor, constructing a new storefront, and restuccoing the exterior.

FINDINGS

1. Staff conducted a site visit to the property and met with the petitioner.
2. The petitioner provided a photograph showing the Broughton Street elevation prior to its current configuration. The storefront/Broughton Street facade has been greatly altered, including panels covering the second floor windows and details.
3. Currently, the second floor windows on the Broughton and Montgomery Street facades, are bricked-in and covered with stucco. The sills of the windows and doors are still visible through the stucco on the Montgomery Street façade. The windows on the rear façade are currently six-over-six, non-historic windows and will be replaced.
4. The petitioner is proposing opening all the windows, and replacing missing windows.
5. The new windows will be one-over-one, double hung, aluminum clad windows manufactured by Marvin, in white. The proposed windows match the lite configuration in the submitted photograph showing the building prior to the exterior alteration.
6. The exterior will receive a new stucco coating and will be scored. The photograph shows the building had been previously scored. Cornice detailing will be replicated to match the photograph and existing detailing on the Montgomery Street façade. The stucco will be the color “buff.” Staff would recommend that the petitioner provide a sample or color chip of the proposed stucco color.
7. A new storefront is proposed. According to the ordinance, “storefronts shall be constructed of wood, cast iron, Carrera glass, aluminum, steel, or copper as part of a glazed storefront system.” The proposed storefront would consist of fixed glass panes in wood frames and raised or beveled wood panels at the base. The parapet will have a stucco cap. Staff would recommend that the wood panels on the storefront be simplified.
8. As proposed, the new storefront would have two entrances flush with the new exterior. The ordinance states regarding commercial design standards:” Entrances shall be recessed and centered within the storefront.” Staff would recommend that the petitioner revise the proposed storefront and incorporate recessed entrances as required by the ordinance. Staff would recommend that the petitioner provide more information on the proposed front doors, including material.
9. On the Montgomery Street elevation, current bricked-in door openings will be reopened as windows, with wood panels below the windows. As proposed, the wood panels will match the storefront wood panel. Staff would recommend simplifying the panels.
10. It appears from the submitted drawings, canopies are proposed for the storefront and 1/1 door on the Montgomery Street elevation. Petitioner needs to provide information on the proposed canopies/awnings.
11. Metal doors on the rear elevation will remain and be painted gray.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommended approval of the opening of bricked-in windows and doors, approval of the window replacement, and approval of the proposed storefront, with the conditions that the storefront entrances be recessed, the wood panels simplified, door information provided, with revised drawings and stucco color coming back to Staff. Staff also recommended that the proposed canopies/awnings come back for Staff approval.

Mr. Webb further stated that after the Review Board packages went out, Mr. Meyer responded to Staff’s concerns and provided revised elevations showing recessed entrances on Broughton Street. Mr. Meyer also provided information on the front doors, which would be wood with metal door details and glass. He said that Mr. Meyer had eliminated the wood panels underneath the

windows on the Montgomery Street side. He stated that the canopies could come back for Staff approval.

HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended. The canopies and color were continued for staff review. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of City of Savannah
Thomas Perdue
HBR 04-3179-2
Corner Drayton Street & Street
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Thomas Perdue, City of Savannah Architect.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff Report:

The petitioner is requesting approval of alterations to the dummy fort structure in Forsyth Park as follows:

1. Repair or reconstruct to match existing structure where required. The demolition will occur where the glass is going on the first floor north elevation. Remove existing paint, patch the existing skim coat and refinish with a white elastomeric coating.
2. Add a new main entrance portico on the north side. The new stucco cornice will be an extension of the existing cornice line. Remove walls between the pilasters and replace with a butt glazing system. Portico to be supported by round precast columns to match existing pilasters. Existing pilasters to remain elsewhere. Refer concrete paver design and color to staff.
3. Add a new band shell pergola on the south elevation. Round precast columns to match profile of existing pilasters.
4. The tent is portable and will only be up for performances.
5. Extend second story space with foldable wall system that can be opened up in good weather to the outdoor seating on the roof. Two four-part sections, one on the north and one on the east elevation will fold.
6. Add parapet to existing roof to hide mechanical equipment on West side of roof and south side of roof.
7. Replace existing deteriorated and non code compliant 26" +/- inch concrete railing with new 42" synthetic concrete railing cast from molds made from original railing, except that the decorative infill between posts will be increased in vertical proportion to meet code.

FINDINGS

1. Additional sections will be provided for the file of the new columns.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommended approval as submitted. Ms. Reiter further stated that the petitioner has a presentation to make.

Petitioner's Comments

Mr. Perdue stated that the proposed building was in horrible disrepair. They x-rayed the structure and there had been massive deterioration, but the building itself was safe. To use it for any structure without major repair was not feasible. They had the engineers look at the building and they came back about a year ago and their recommendation was to encase the exterior columns with steel. He stated that this was unacceptable. They went to the State Historic Preservation office in Atlanta and talked to them about the structure. They thought a better approach would be to take the interior and gut it to the exterior walls trying to save mainly the south elevations with the butresses and a lot of the east and west elevations. He stated they would take down the north elevation and add a portico. The City planned to install a mini visitor's center. There would be someone on the site during all hours of operation. The City had leased the facility to a manager who would manage the facility for the City. They would provide security, keep the bathrooms clean and manage the two restaurants. There would be a small restaurant on the ground floor and a restaurant on the second floor with outside seating.

Mr. Perdue further stated that they started this project about a year and a half ago, trying to find a use for the facility. He stated you could build a monument, but it would just sit there. Mr. Perdue stated that they had to find a use for the building which it had not had since the militia left.

Mr. Neely asked about parking.

Mr. Perdue stated that the existing parking lot would remain on Drayton Street. He stated that most of the people would be the joggers in the park and the tourists who would be walking through. He stated that they don't see this as a destination point. It's not like the main visitor's center.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked what was purpose of the tent structure in front of it? Did it have an acoustical function?

Mr. Perdue stated yes. Also, the consultant was designing an acoustical panel that would be temporary that would go between the columns and the pergola, so that the sound is pushed forward.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if it was roofed?

Mr. Perdue stated yes, and the tent had some supports that went out into here and splayed out to the front where it would push the sound out.

Mr. Deering asked what was the material of the window wall? He also asked if they functioned or if they were fixed?

Mr. Perdue stated from a maintenance standpoint they picked aluminum and they were hurricane proof. He said sections could be opened.

Mr. Deering stated he had some concerns with the design of the portico on the front and the pergola on the back. He said he felt they too closely mimicked the historic architecture. He said he liked the canopy and the modern design of that was good. But the portico and pergola designs were poor. He said if you were going to use a classical inspired design then make it classical and make the column spacing correct, the entablature correct, and all those sorts of things. At present what was shown in the renderings was not. He said he felt the building would be better served with just a simple modern canopy as an entrance and then maybe a

modern structure in back to tie into the canopy. He said he felt it would help the historic structure stand out more than seeing these sort of replicated details.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he concurred with Mr. Deering. He commented that the petitioner should change the beam and column structure, so that it stands alone instead of trying to extend the fort. The fort structure should stay as it is and the two extensions on the north and south sides read as being different.

Mr. Perdue stated personally he felt it was a very modern building. He said they also talked to the State about the columns. The question came up about not using the same columns that were presently there, which they had seriously considered doing. He said they were not sure what had been added to the building. To the best of their knowledge the pilasters were original. He said they had no problems using a different order.

Mr. Deering stated that he and Mr. Meyerhoff were not talking about another classical order, but going to something like you would see in Washington, Boston, or Chicago where you have more modern sculptural elements in front of these historic buildings. Especially when you tie the canvas to it with the projecting arms it could be really interesting.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he felt there was nothing wrong with the banister. But when you come out with a semicircular entrance, he felt it should be detached. He said it should not look like an extension of what was on the fort. He said it should stand alone.

Discussion:

Mr. Deering stated he felt it needed more study. He said not to hurt anybody's feelings, but the portico on the north side looked like the port cochiere of a West Hollywood funeral home. He said it was not well thought out.

Mr. Joe Shearouse (City of Savannah) stated he appreciated the comments. However, he thought the Board needed to know that for the last two years they had been working on this project. He said they worked close with the Staff, had three community meetings, and met with Historic Savannah. He said they went step by step and it was a little disturbing to come before the Board and hear that it needed more design. He said they had never heard these comments before.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated Mr. Perdue said that he had considered changing the colonnades of the band shell.

Mr. Shearouse stated the band shell was temporary and should not have been presented.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated if Mr. Perdue has considered changing the colonnade for the band shell, would they continue to consider it and come back or was this the final solution as presented? He said what the Board was saying if they were considering changing the colonnade on the band shell side then consider doing that also in the front.

Mr. Deering stated he loved the idea of the whole concept. He loved the glass curtain wall between the columns, and there were a lot of things that was great about the project. However, the two elements mentioned needed further study.

Mr. Shearouse stated they would make the adjustments.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the exception of the front and rear porticos which are to be redesigned and brought back to the Board. Mr. Neely seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Request for Extensions

1. Petition of Paul Hansen, For
Independent Presbyterian Church
HBR 02-2793-2
210 – 214 Whitaker Street
Request for Extension
Approved 03-12-2002
Extended 03-12-2003

HDBR Action: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the request for an extension. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Staff Reviews

1. Petition of Dawson Wissmach Architects
Andrew Lynch
HBR 03-3082-2
220 West Broughton Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
2. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Jim Morehouse
HBR 04-3169(S)-2
208 East Broughton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
3. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Jim Morehouse
HBR 04-3170(S)-2
409 East York Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
4. Petition of Dirk Hardison
HBR 04-3172(S)-2
526 Price Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

5. Petition of Peter Nelsen
HBR 04-3180(S)-2
616 Barnard Street
Color/Shutters

STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

**RE: Work Performed Without Certificate
Of Appropriateness**

1. 301 East Charlton Street
 Roof Deck
2. 615 Tattnall Street

Mr. Deering asked if Staff approved the Sakura sign on Broughton Street?

Mrs. Reiter stated no, and she will check into it.

RE: Report on Items Deferred to Staff

Mrs. Reiter stated there were no items to report.

RE: Notices, Proclamations & Acknowledgements

Dr. Caplan stated the Georgia Trust Historic Preservation meeting was going to be this weekend in Savannah. He said a number of Board members were signed up for the Saturday session.

RE: Approval of Minutes

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – March 10, 2004

HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the minutes of March 10, 2004 as submitted. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Other Business

- I. Unfinished Business
- II. Application Revisions

- II. New Business
 1. Update on Central of GA Freight Warehouse
 2. Update on 125 – 127 West Congress Street
 3. G8 Plans

Dr. Caplan stated Mr. Jay Turner had resigned from the Board.

Dr. Caplan stated if there were any suggestions for his replacement please submit them to Beth Reiter. He said if you could not get a CV on the suggested individuals, please give some sort of narrative, so they could give it to the Mayor's office.

Dr. Caplan stated the new application forms for Certificate of Appropriateness had been distributed to the Board at the last meeting. He said they would like to discuss approval at this meeting. He asked Beth if there were additional changes?

Mrs. Reiter stated on the first page a check box had been added to indicate initial application, amended application, or after-the-fact application. There were also some typos that were corrected. Also, they added in utility boxes, trashcans, and air conditioning.

Mr. Deering stated they may also want to add that they do not have to Xerox 12 copies of the application to give to the Board.

Mrs. Reiter stated some applicants do and some do not.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked on the application under Height/mass approval if it said floor plans had to be submitted, in addition to the elevations?

Mrs. Reiter stated it was stated in the second submittal, but not the first.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he felt it needed to be stated in the first submittal.

Dr. Caplan commended Beth and Lee for redoing the application. He said he felt it would prevent a lot of misinterpretations and problems that were encountered in the past, as long as the people who get it and fill it out look at it and understand what they were doing.

Dr. Caplan asked Staff if they heard from Chris Morrill on the meeting with the Mayor that the Board requested?

Mrs. Reiter stated no.

Dr. Caplan stated they obviously were very busy with other things such as the G-8. He said the Board would have to be patient. But they were in contact with them and he was sure they would be happy to meet with the Board as soon as they could.

Dr. Caplan stated they have also been unable to schedule a meeting about the utility placement. It was interesting that when they asked people in Charleston what they did about their utility problem...

Mrs. Reiter stated their meters were off the main façade and they painted them to match the building.

Mrs. Reiter also stated under new business she would like for the Board to be aware that the Review Board meeting would fall in the middle of the days the meetings were scheduled for G 8. She said she felt the June meeting needed to be moved to June 16, which would be the next Wednesday. She added that there was no idea how smooth things were going to be during this time.

She further stated in reference to the Central of GA Freight Warehouse, that it did collapse in the middle around St. Patrick's day, so part of it was taken down. But they were now working on it and she had pictures.

She also stated in reference to 125 – 127 West Congress Street that Charlie Angell had removed some of the metal work on the front of the building. She said they were replicating the metal and putting it back. However, she would remind them again about removing things without first coming to the Board. But it was considered in-kind repairs.

Dr. Caplan stated that Mr. Gay asked for an excused absence and it was granted to him.

Dr. Caplan thanked Beth and Lee for the manner in which they were preparing their summaries explaining exactly what sections of the Ordinance were covered.

RE: Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR:wdd