

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

APRIL 13, 2005

2:00 P.M.

**MINUTES**

**Members Present:**

Swann Seiler, Vice Chairman  
Dian Brownfield  
Dr. Gerald Caplan  
John Deering  
Ned Gay  
Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring  
Eric Meyerhoff  
John Neely  
Joseph Steffen

**Members Absent:**

Dr. Lester Johnson, Jr. (Excused)  
W. John Mitchell (Excused)

**MPC Staff Present:**

Beth Reiter, Preservation Officer  
Lee Webb, Preservation Specialist  
Christy Adams, Secretary

**RE: Call to Order**

Ms. Seiler called the April 13, 2005 meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review to order at 2:00 p.m.

**RE: Welcome**

Ms. Seiler welcomed the Preservation Law class of Dr. Bob Allan.

**RE: Sign Posting**

All signs were properly posted.

**RE: Consent Agenda**

**RE: Amended Petition of The Spriggs Group, P.C.  
Kenneth Spriggs  
HBR 04-3262-2  
146 Whitaker Street, 148 Whitaker Street  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Continued Petition of Dirk Hardison  
HBR 05-3330-2  
500 Block of East Charlton Street  
Alteration - Garage**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Doug Bean Signs  
Donna Swanson  
HBR 05-3358-2  
15 East Broughton Street  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Paula Danyluk  
HBR 05-3362-2  
36 West Broughton Street  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Coastal Heritage Society  
Scott Smith  
HBR 05-3365-2  
601 West Harris Street  
Alteration**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the Consent Agenda as amended. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Regular Agenda**

**RE: Petition of West Broad Development, Co.  
Walter Evans  
HBR 05-3359-2  
502 – 508 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.; 419 West Gaston  
Street  
New Construction – Part I Height/Mass**

Present for the petition Horoun Hodayun and Dr. Evans.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass Approval for a mixed use project (retail, residential).

**FINDINGS**

The following Standards Apply:

Height Map: The portion of the lot between MLK, Jr. Blvd. and the lane is zoned for five stories. The eastern half of the lot east of the lane is in a four story zone. The MLK construction is proposed at five stories and the eastern lot is proposed for three stories, therefore, this standard has been met.

In a commercial building the exterior expression of the height of the ground floor shall not be less than 14'-6". At 16' this has been met. The exterior expression of the second story shall not be less than 12'. At 14' this has been met. (Note that the cumulative total of the first two floors on the three story building is 27'). The exterior expression of the height of each story above the second shall not be less than 10'. At 11', 15' and 14'-6" this has been met.

The western portion of the construction is located in a BC zone and the eastern portion is in an R-BC-1 zone. No setbacks are required.

The Western building falls into the "Large Scale Development" standards as well as the "Tall Building" standards.

- a. The frontage of tall buildings shall be divided into architecturally distinct sections no more than 60 feet in width and each section taller than it is wide. This standard has been met.
- b. Buildings greater than four stories in height shall use window groupings, columns or pilasters to create bays not less than 15 feet nor more than 20 feet in width. This standard has not been met on the MLK, Jr. Blvd. side. In addition, there is a disconnect between the rhythm established at the ground level from the second floor and the floors above. The Seabrook building next to the proposed structure gives an excellent reference for the various kinds of rhythms established by commercial buildings on MLK.

The design of the second floor (MLK elevation) is problematic because by altering the rhythm of the openings between the ground floor commercial and the upper floor residential units, it does not relate to either. See also the Commercial development guidelines in the *Manual for Development in the Savannah Historic District*.

- c. Roofs shall be flat with parapets or be less than 4:12 with an overhang. If pitched, the roofs shall be bracketed, corbelled, or have an entablature. This standard is met except for some delineation of the parapet.

Large Scale Development Standards;

- a. Large scale development shall be designed in varying heights and widths such that no wall plane exceeds 60 feet in width. This standard has been met.
- b. Primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street. This standard has been met. In addition, regarding the corner tower entrance piece, this needs greater emphasis perhaps through the use of a contemporary interpretation of a cupola.

The following Visual compatibility Factors shall apply:

Height: The heights of both buildings meet the standards of the height zone.

Proportion of structure's front façade: See comments above re MLK building

Proportion of openings: Most of the principal windows are rectangular.

Rhythm of solids to voids in front façade: See comments above

Rhythm of structures on streets: See comments above

Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projections including balconies:

Roof shapes: See roof comments above

Wall of continuity: The street wall is maintained and the corner accentuated.

Scale: Elements within the façade help establish a scale. Within the various facades some of the elements seem somewhat random. It might help to give these elements a more regular order. Again the Seabrook Building is a good example for the ordering of sub-elements within a façade.

Directional expression: The ground floor and second story have a horizontal expression and the stories above have a vertical expression on MLK. See discussion re disconnect above.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval of height and mass with the condition that staff comments will be addressed in the Part II Design phase.

### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they were looking at a five story building with the same material going up? He asked if there was any division either vertically or horizontally that would reduce the scale?

**Mr. Homayun** stated the architect he looked up to was William Gibbons Preston. He said he felt Preston had a technique where he used the same material but changed the weaving of the brick and created around the windows. He created details, instead of changing the materials. He said his intention was there would be texture within the red brick. The weaving could be a little different and there would be more detailing underneath the storefront windows and up to the second floor. He said in regard to comments raised by staff. That this was a five story multi-use building and he felt the natural grouping of the mass would be horizontal, because of the changing uses for each floor. He said each use required a different kind of fenestration. Philosophically, he was in favor of a very honest expression in a building. In an honest expression, this building was really not the same as The Seabrook Building. He said this was y three different types of uses stacked on top of each other. He said what he has done through creation of the bays and proportions of the windows was subliminally created these vertical relationships without relying on cosmetic 4 or 5 inches of the planes. He said in answer to the question, yes, there would be a lot more elaboration on the brick work, some texture, some shading or some kind of weaving pattern that would create a line of demarcation between the first and above the second floors.

He further stated between the balconies were a strong expression and they did not come all the way down to the street. He said the use of balconies was a response to the western exposure. The western exposure on M.L.K. was critical because there were no buildings across the street and no vegetation. He said he and his client decided that balconies would be a great use to block out some of the western exposure. He said in twisting it a little bit northerly, it broke up the influx of the sun hitting the western windows, so it was an environmental response. He said for that reason when they went around to the north elevation they took the balconies out. side. He said an office situation did not need balconies. Instead they used deep shading devices to protect from the western sun.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he understood that there would be different patterns, but they were going brick from sidewalk to parapet. He said there was no definition of base, shaft, or capital.

**Mr. Hodayun** stated it would all be through projection.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that in his opinion the only problem with the petitioners concept was that the petitioner was dealing with functionality and the Board was dealing with cosmetics. He said the petitioner needed to understand that the comments made by Staff were very important, because the building it has to be cosmetically compatible with the rest of the district and buildings. He said they may not be accepted because the Board was interested in how it looked rather than what it was going to be.

**Mr. Hodayun** stated he was going to respond to Staff's comments. He was not saying that staff's comments were going to be ignored, but he was trying to give the Board a little explanation.

**Mr. Deering** asked if he could respond to the comment by Staff with regard to the tower at the corner of M.L.K. and the lane?

**Mr. Hodayun** stated a five story building overpowered everything else around it. He said he was really sensitive to the height of the building and did not want to make any additional expressions of the roof. He said it would become more overpowering. He said he was trying to contain the cylinder as a strong kind of expression, but he did not want to bring it out so much higher that it would become pretentious.

**Mr. Deering** stated that element helped round the corner nicely and was very well executed. Personally, he did not think that it needed a cap.

#### **Public Comments:**

**Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF endorsed the height, width, and depth of the building. However, HSF had some questions about what appeared to be two bay windows glassed in on the north side when the ordinance states that bay windows were not permitted on buildings over three stories in height. He said HSF was also concerned about possible excessive screening of the balconies which tended to make them a part of the mass and not just something that would fit into Part II design concerns. He said they also wanted to know what happens on the roof gardens. He said HSF appreciated the idea of a roof garden, but they noticed there were no shading devices. He said other roof gardens built without shading devices tended to look like a garden of out-houses sitting on top the buildings. He said HSF hoped that this could be screened by maybe some sort of roof pergola or something that would make the shading devices that were sure to go up on the roofs not visible or at least somewhat screened from public right-of-way.

\*Mrs. Fortson-Waring arrived approximately 2:25 p.m.

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

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
HBR 05-3360-2  
223 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.  
Alterations**

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself from the petition.

Present for the petition was Patrick Shay.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to make alterations to 223 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd, including adding signage and painting.

**FINDINGS**

1. 223 M.L.K, Jr. Blvd, is not a rated building in the Historic District.
2. On the south elevation, a new aluminum storefront will replace the previously removed storefront to match the existing storefront on the MLK, Jr., Blvd, façade.
3. A new metal canopy, with metal bracket supports, will be installed over an existing door on the south elevation. The canopy will project 6' and will have an 8' clearance.
4. The building will be painted Benjamin Moore "Snow White", with the eaves to be painted Benjamin Moore "Ruby Red". Color samples were provided.
5. Existing gutters will be repaired and repainted.
5. A new sign will be installed in the MLK, Jr. Blvd façade. The sign will be channel letters backlit with fiber optic cable, with the text to read "image is everything." The sign will be 19' long and 1'2" in height, with the logo being 2'6" long and 2' 10" tall.
6. The submitted information also shows banners which are prohibited in the Historic District Sign Ordinance, unless approved by the Zoning Administrator.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of alterations and denial of banner.

**Petitioner's Comments:**

**Mr. Shay** stated they agreed with the Staff report.

**HDBR Action:** Dr. Caplan made a motion that the the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition for alterations and wall sign. The banner sign is denied. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Trever Wells  
HBR 05-3361-2  
116 East Taylor Street  
New Construction – Part I & II**

Present for the petition was Trever Wells and Roy Sims.

The petitioner is requesting approval of Part I: Height and Mass and Part II: Materials and Design Details for the new construction of a single-family residence on a vacant lot at 116 East Taylor Street.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Part I: Height and Mass**

The following Visual Compatibility Factors and Design Standards from Section 8-3030 apply to new residential construction for Part 1: Height and Mass:

1. **Height:** The lot is located in a four-story height zone. As proposed, the main house will be three stories and the carriage house will be two stories in height. A two story component will attach the main house to the carriage house but will not be visible from the public right-of-way. The main house will be 41' 10 ½" in height and the carriage house will be 21' tall. In respect to exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights, the main house will have an 11' first floor, and 10' second and third floors. The proposed height and exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights appears to be visually compatible to the adjacent structures.
2. **Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:** The front façade will have a width of 34.03'. With the vertical alignment of the front façade's voids, the front façade will have a vertical directional expression, compatible to the adjacent structures.
3. **Proportion of Openings Within the Facility:** The window openings on the first floor of the front façade will be 3'4" wide and 8'9" tall. The window openings on the second and third floors will be 3'4" wide and 6'3" tall. The proposed height and width of windows in the structure appears to be visually compatible with the adjacent structures.
4. **Rhythm of Solids to Voids in Front Facades/Directional Expression of Front Façade:** The front façade of the house will have a three-bay rhythm, with the windows and front door aligned vertically. The relationship of the solids to voids gives the front façade a vertical directional appearance. The immediate adjacent historic structures are three-story attached row houses, with three bay rhythms. The proposed new construction is visually compatible in respect to the rhythm of solids to voids on the front façade and the vertical directional expression of the front façade.
5. **Rhythm of Structures on the Street:** The proposed structure will be attached to the row of townhouses to the west of the vacant lot and will be separated from the structure to the east by 3'. Along East Taylor Street, project will have a zero.
6. **Rhythm of Entrance and Street elevation Type:** The three-story house will have a main entrance at street-level, with five steps off of East Taylor Street, over a crawlspace. The adjacent row of townhouses has street level entrances, while other adjacent structures have high stoops. This meets the requirements of the ordinance which states;" A proposed building on an East-West through Street shall utilize a historic building street elevation type fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward."
7. **Roof Shapes:** The main house and carriage house will have flat roofs with parapets which is characteristic of the adjacent structures and is visually compatible.

8. **Setbacks:** The house and carriage house will have a zero line setback on East Taylor Street and East Berrien Lane. There will be a 3' setback on the east property line.
9. **Walls of Continuity:** The house and carriage house will maintain a wall of continuity on the East Taylor Street.

## Part II: Design Details and Materials

The following Visual Compatibility Factors and Standards apply for Part II: Design Details:

### Section 8-3030 (k) Development Standards

- (6) Visual Compatibility Factors:
  - (g) Relationship of materials, texture, and color.
1. Section 8-3030 (l) Design Standards
  - (8) Exterior walls: Exterior walls shall comply with the following:
    - c. Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.
  - (9) Windows
    - a. Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian.
    - c. Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction, provided however that the windows meet the following standards: the muntins shall be no wider than 7/8", the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding.
    - d. "snap-in" or between the glass muntins shall not be used.
    - e. The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically.
    - f. 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, provided however, nothing precludes an arched window being used.
    - g. Window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building.
    - h. The distance between windows shall be not 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.
    - k. In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.
  - (10) Roofs: Roofs shall comply with the following:
    - c. Parapets shall have a string course of not less than six inches in depth and extending at least four inches from the face of the building, running the full width of the building between one and one- and half feet from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum of two-inch overhang.
  - (11) Balconies, stairs, stoops, porticos, and side porches.
    - c. Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street.
    - d. Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone or slate; provided, however, the historic review board may approve other

materials upon a showing by the developer that the product is visually compatible with historic building materials and has performed satisfactorily in the local climate.

(14) Lanes and Carriage House.

- c. New carriage houses may provide up to four-foot setback to allow a turning radius into the garage on a narrow lane.
- d. Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.
- e. Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapets.

## **DISCUSSION**

1. **Exterior Materials:** The exterior walls will be finished in reclaimed Savannah brick. The petitioner submitted samples of the brick and the mortar. Sills and lintels will be precast limestone. On the east elevation, separated from the adjacent property by 3', corbelled brick will be located along the parapet. The petitioner has proposed a cast stone lintel over the windows and front door on the front façade. Staff is concerned that the lintel and door surround design are too elaborate for this context and recommends simplifying. The petitioner has submitted an alternate lintel design which is more simplistic yet appears to have the same dimensions as the initial design.
2. **Foundation:** The foundation will be precast limestone. Treated wood, louvered crawlspace vents will be visible on the front façade. The petitioner provided a detail of the foundation design and louvered vents, with dimensions.
3. **Windows:** All windows visible from the public right-of-way will be double-hung, single-glazed, true-divided lite wood windows. The pattern will be a six-over-nine at the first floor and six-over-six on the second and third floors. The windows will be custom made in a mill shop to match the windows found on adjacent historic houses. All windows meet the vertical to horizontal ratio of 5:3. All window sashes will be inset a minimum of 3" from the façade of the masonry. All shutters will be operable, louvered wood shutters. Within the courtyard, (not visible from the public right-of-way), a two story bay window, with a copper roof, and rows of windows on the two-story connector, will be located.
4. **Doors:** The front door will be a four panel wood door, with a fan light above, surrounded by precast stone and a lintel. Also, it appears that columns will be placed on either side of the door. The petitioner needs to provide more information on the front door design. Staff is concerned that the stone door surround is too elaborate in this context and would recommend simplifying as suggested for the window lintels. Precast steps will lead to the front door.
5. **Roof:** The roof of the main house and carriage house is flat with a cast stone parapet. At the cornice, cast stone accents will be placed beneath the cast stone cornice. Cast iron vents will be located below the cornice. A cornice detail was provided. Corbelled brick will be used on the east elevation at the roofline.
6. **Colors:** All wood trim will be "Courthouse White" by Martin Senour Williamsburg Collection. A paint color chip was provided by the petitioner.
7. **Carriage House:** The brick carriage house will have two, 12' wide doors. The doors appear to be traditional carriage house doors with arched tops. Staff would request the petitioner provide manufacturer information on the garage doors.

8. **Other:** All downspouts will be copper.
9. **Electric Meters/Trash receptacles/HVAC Equipment:** The electric meters will be located on the exterior east wall of the carriage house and the trash receptacle will be located in the garage. HVAC equipment will be located on the rooftops of the carriage house and the two-story connector, as shown on the submitted floor plans.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval of Part I: Height and Mass and Part II: Materials and Design Details with the conditions that the lintel and front door designs be simplified and that the garage door manufacturer is provided.

### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the elevation as shown with the horizontal floor lines indicates that the transom goes into the floor line of the second floor.

**Mr. Sims** stated that was not a transom. He said it was a cast stone panel.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated there was a 3 foot easement on the east side. He asked if there was any thought of screening that from the sidewalk?

**Mr. Sims** stated it will have iron gates. He said on the rear off the lane was where the meters would be.

**Mr. Deering** asked if they thought about simplifying the cast stone door surround ?

**Mr. Wells** stated yes.

**Mr. Deering** stated their original lintel design and the door surround were more like high style federal houses that you would find in Georgetown, or Baltimore.. He said he felt it would be helpful if they were simplified.

### **Public Comments:**

**Mr. Joe Sasseen** stated he felt it was refreshing that somebody has taken the time to get rid of the plain lintels.

**Ms. Catherine Oslen** stated she was the owner to the west of the property. She said she disagreed in regard to the lintels. She said she would like to see them smaller, so it would be more in keeping with the rest of the block. She also stated that the house was planned to be built against the wall of her house. She said they have a prescriptive easement as to many items on that wall. She said there is a problem with certain items including elevator bolts that have been there for at least 50 years. She said they needed consideration as accessing that if ever necessary, etc.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated easements were not within the purview of the Board. She said they were legal documents and if there is any discussion or controversy as to an easement then the proper forum would be in a court.

**Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated while HSF finds the scale and proportion of the structure to be acceptable they agreed with Staff that the details needed to be simplified to be visually compatible with the neighboring houses. He said HSF felt the keystone should be eliminated from the lintel. He said they felt the lintel should be simple. He said HSF also felt the entrance door needed to be simplified. HSF would also like to see clarification of the cornice detail. He said HSF felt ¼ inch line drawing should be provided to Staff to review to see if it was proper.

**HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design with the condition that the petitioner submit revised details to staff for the lintels, door surround and parapet. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Petition of Dawson + Wissmach Architects  
HBR 05-3364-2  
Neil Dawson  
100 Block West Bay & Bryan Streets  
New Construction – Part I**

Present for the petition was Neil Dawson.

Mr. Neely recused himself from the petition.

The petitioner is requesting approval of the following:

- 1) Demolition of two non-rated buildings, 113-115 West Bay Street and 117-119 West Bay Street
- 2) Additional penthouse stories to be added to two rated buildings, 105-109 West Bay Street and 121-123 West Bay Street
- 3) Part I: Height and Mass approval for the new construction of buildings replacing 113-119 West Bay Street and on the West Bryan Street block bounded by Whitaker Street, Barnard Street and Bay Lane.

This proposal is the redevelopment of the former Savannah News Press Site facing West Bay Street and the adjacent parking lots on West Bryan Street.

## **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Demolition:**

The following language from Section 8-3030 applies to requests for demolition

- (2) *Demolition of historic structures.*

Demolition of historic structures is deemed detrimental to the public interest.

- a. All requests for demolition of any building within the historic district shall come before the board of review.
- b. Buildings less than fifty years old may be considered for listing on the historic building map if they are found to have achieved exceptional importance.

**Buildings D and E facing West Bay Street:**

1. **The Petitioner is requesting approval to demolish two buildings facing West Bay Street, indicated as D and E on the site plan, in order to create a covered courtyard space and a new building during the redevelopment of the News Press site.**
2. **Buildings D and E are not rated structures on the Historic District Building map. According to the Petitioner's submittal the date of construction for Building D is unclear. Based on analysis of cadastral surveys and property records, Building E was constructed in 1958 and replaced a brick and wood structure with a non-combustible concrete and metal system. (Sanborn Map)The two buildings are similar in exterior design and detailing. The interior structural systems of Building D were altered in 1958 when Building E was constructed. Neither building has infill floors now.**
3. **Staff recommends that the request for demolition of Buildings D and E be approved as they are unrated structures and do not appear to have achieved exceptional architectural importance.**

**Additional Stories to Rated Building:**

The following Standards from Section 8-3030 apply to new additions:

- (k) *Development standards.*
- (1) *Preservation of historic structures within the historic district.* An historic structure and any outbuildings, or any appurtenance related thereto visible from a public street or lane, including but not limited to walls, fences, light fixtures, steps, paving, sidewalks, and signs, shall only be moved, reconstructed, altered, or maintained in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior architectural features of the historic structure or appurtenance thereto. For the purposes of this section, exterior architectural features shall include but not be limited to the architectural style, scale, general design, and general arrangement of the exterior of the structure, including the kind and texture of the building material, the type and style of all roofs, windows, doors and signs. In considering proposals for the exterior alterations of historic structures in the historic district and in applying the development standards, the documented original design of the structure may be considered.
- (6) *Visual compatibility factors.* New construction and existing buildings and structures and appurtenances thereof in the historic district which are moved, reconstructed, materially altered, repaired or changed in color shall be visually compatible with structures, squares and places to which they are visually related. The following factors shall be considered in determining the visual compatibility of such a building, structure or appurtenance provided they comply with the specific design standards as set forth in this subsection. These factors shall not be the basis for appeal of an adverse decision. Greater weight shall be given to adjacent historic structures.
- (12) *Additions:* Additions shall comply with the following:

- d. Additions shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features of the building, including, but not limited to, rooflines, cornices, eaves, brackets. Additions shall be designed to be reversible with the least amount of damage to the historic building.
- e. Additions, including multiple additions to structures, shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.
- f. Designs for additions may be either contemporary or reference design motifs of the historic building. However, the addition shall be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible as set forth in the visual compatibility factors.

**1) The Petitioner is proposing add penthouses and rooftop terraces to Buildings C and F.**

**2) The project location is in a 6<sup>th</sup> story maximum height zone.**

**3) Buildings C (currently 4 stories) and F (currently 3 stories) are rated buildings on the Historic District Building Map.**

**4) The Petitioner provided proposed site sections that indicate that the new penthouse additions are recessed from the edge of the buildings' roofs and will only minimally be visible from a reasonable distance on a public-right-of-way (West Bay Street and Barnard Street).**

**5) One site plan indicates an addition as a 7<sup>th</sup> story, however, this is incorrect in that the addition is a roof top deck and will not be covered by roofing, and does not qualify as a story.**

**6) Due to the recessed locations of the additions they will be minimally visible from a public right-of-way. Staff recommends approval of the penthouse additions and terraces for Building C and F.**

#### **New Construction: Part I Height and Mass**

The following Standards from Section 8-3030 apply:

- (6) *Visual compatibility factors.* New construction and existing buildings and structures and appurtenances thereof in the historic district which are moved, reconstructed, materially altered, repaired or changed in color shall be visually compatible with structures, squares and places to which they are visually related. The following factors shall be considered in determining the visual compatibility of such a building, structure or appurtenance provided they comply with the specific design standards as set forth in this subsection. These factors shall not be the basis for appeal of an adverse decision. Greater weight shall be given to adjacent historic structures.
  - a. *Height.* New construction or additions to existing structures shall be within the height limits as shown on the historic district height map.

**The project is located in a 6 story height area.**

**The proposed courtyard area will appear to be three stories due to a screen wall.**

**The adjacent new building on West Bay Street will be six stories.**

**The new hotel building and office building located on West Bryan Street will be six stories each.**

**The height requirements are met. The minimum floor-to-floor heights have also been met.**

- b. *Proportion of structure's front facade.* The relationship of the width of a structure to the height of its front facade shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which it is visually related.

**Courtyard: width of 54'.**

**New Building on West Bay Street: width 67'.**

**Hotel Building on West Bryan Street: 238' 3".**

**Office Building on West Bryan Street: 65' 8".**

The historically established widths of the buildings along this block of West Bay is 60' except for the main News Press building which appears to be 50'. The courtyard width at 54' and the new West Bay Street building at 67' are close to the established rhythm of the Oglethorpe Plan, but it would be preferable if these widths could be adjusted to come closer to the 60' module. (Reference *The Primacy of the 60 foot Lot* in Manual for Development in the Savannah Historic District.)

Historically, along Bryan Street the 60' lot widths were broken down into 30' subdivisions for various storefronts. The length of the proposed hotel has been broken down into bays that vary from 31' to 40'. The office building is proposed for 65' 8". As on Bay, these widths should be studied to be brought as close as possible to the traditional divisions of the 60' width.

- c. *Proportion of openings.* The relationship of the width of the windows to height of windows within a structure shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.

Concerning the courtyard screen wall and the hotel building, the overall shape of the voids appears to create large horizontal expanses. In addition, the entry tower on West Bay Street appears to be large sheets of glass. The petitioner has indicated that these areas will have infill in the design phase. Historically, windows in Savannah tend to be more vertical than horizontal. In the design phase, attention needs to be given to the way in which these expanses are divided in order to achieve these groupings of vertical elements. With the exception of the entry tower, Building E and the office building appear to achieve a more compatible division of the void space.

- d. *Rhythm of solids to voids in front facades.* The relationship of solids to voids in the facades visible from the public right-of-way of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.
- e. *Rhythm of structures on streets.* The relationship of a structure to the open space between it and adjacent structures shall be visually compatible with the open spaces between contributing structures to which it is visually related.

**It is suggested that the strong cornice line at the second floor between the hotel and the office building be eliminated from the office building so that these read as separate structures.**

- f. *Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection.* The relationship of entrances, porch projections, and walkways to structures shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which they are visually related.
- h. *Roof shapes.* The roof shape of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which it is visually related.

**The predominant historic roof shape of the commercial buildings in this area is flat with a parapet or cornice. With the exception of one mansard roof (which was not a predominant roof form in Savannah) these cornices projected. The recess of the top floor of the hotel seems weak and might be revisited in the design phase.**

- i. *Walls of continuity.* Appurtenances of a structure such as walls, wrought iron, fences shall form consistent walls of enclosure along a street.

**The proposed buildings form consistent walls of enclosure along the street. Further thought might be given to the screen wall at the courtyard in order to reduce the scale of the openings. The petitioner has indicated that the inspiration for this space is a metal truss arcade form. This idea should be developed in the design phase.**

- j. *Scale of a building.* The mass of a structure and size of windows, door openings, porches column spacing, stairs, balconies and additions shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.

**The final treatment of the infill in the voids will be critical in creating the fine scale that is typical of buildings in Savannah's Historic District.**

- k. *Directional expression of front elevation.* A structure shall be visually compatible with the structures to which it is visually related in its directional character, whether this be vertical character, horizontal character, or non-directional character.

**Most of the historic buildings on these blocks are either vertical or non-directional. The West Bryan Street hotel bays need further study.**

- l) *Design standards.* The above visual compatibility factors are further expressed in the following implementing design standards:

2. Commercial buildings:

- (a) The exterior expression of the height of the ground floor shall not be less than 14'-6".
- (b) The exterior expression of the height of the second story shall be not less than 12 feet.
- (c) The exterior expression of the height of each story above the second shall be not less than 10 feet.

**This standard has been met.**

- (5) *Commercial design standards.* Commercial buildings shall comply with the following:

- a. The first story of a retail building shall be designed as a storefront.
- b. The first story shall be separated from the upper stories by an architectural feature such as a string course (i.e., a projecting horizontal band). Such architectural feature may be placed at the top of the second story when the first and second stories have the visual appearance of a separate exterior expression.
- c. The height of the first story shall be not less than the exterior visual expression of the height of any single story above the first story.
- d. The exterior visual expression of the top story of buildings over three stories shall be distinctive from the stories below the top story.
- e. Retail storefront area glazing shall be not less than 55 percent. Such glazing shall be transparent; provided, however, black glass may be used in the sign area above the storefront window transoms. Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18--24-inch base of contrasting material, to the lintel.
- f. Storefront glazing in subdivided sashes shall be inset a minimum of four inches from the face of the building; provided, however, that continuously glazed storefronts may be flush with the face of the building.
- g. Entrances shall be recessed and centered within the storefront.

**In the design phase this standard needs to be studied further for the retail spaces. As shown the entrances are not centered or recessed.**

6) *Tall building standards.* Tall buildings shall comply with the following:

- a. The frontage of tall buildings shall be divided into architecturally distinct sections no more than 60 feet in width with each section taller than it is wide. **(See previous comments about the West Bryan Street bays and second floor band.)**
- b. Buildings greater than four stories in height shall use window groupings, columns or pilasters to create bays not less than 15 feet nor more than 20 feet in width. **This needs to be addressed in the Part II submittal with dimensions.**
- c. Roofs shall be flat with parapets or be less than 4:12 with an overhang. If pitched the roofs shall be bracketed, corbelled, or have an entablature. **(See previous comments on roofs)**
- d. Buildings less than 60 feet wide located on a corner tithing lot abutting a north-south connecting street shall locate primary entrances on both the east-west and north-south streets unless a corner entrance is utilized. Buildings greater than 60 feet in width shall have an entrance located on the east-west street regardless of the location of any other entrances. **This standard has been met.**

(7) *Large scale development.* Large scale development shall comply with the following:

- a. Large scale development shall be designed in varying heights and widths such that no wall plane exceeds 60 feet in width.

**Courtyard:** The courtyard is designed with three bays with the following widths: 16'6", 21', and 16'6". As stated elsewhere the design of this front needs further consideration.

**New building on West Bay Street:** This building is proposed to have a two bay rhythm, with an entry tower. The two bays will be 25' each, and the tower 15', with a 2' connector to the two primary bays.

**Hotel on West Bryan Street:** The hotel facing West Bryan Street will have a seven bay rhythm, including a corner entry tower, of the following widths: 22'6", 39'9", 34', 31', 32'10", 37'4", 40'10". See previous comments on adjusting these widths.

**Office Building on West Bryan Street:** The office building at the corner of West Bryan Street and Whitaker will have three bays of various widths: 20'6", 12', 33'3".

The intent of this Standard has been met but see previous comments on the rhythm of the 60' lot. The bays should reflect the division of the 60' lot more closely.

- b. Primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street. **This standard has been met.**

**No setbacks are required in a BC-1 zone.**

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval of Part I: Height and Mass with the condition that staff concerns be addressed in the Part II: Materials and Design Details phase.

### **Petitioner's Comments:**

**Mr. Dawson** stated they have really looked at this in detail and have met with Staff and felt the comments were appropriate. He said in terms of the hotel proportions there needed to be some standardization of the bays. He said what they did as a team was visit 7 or 8 different cities in the South and looked at what new good architecture looked like. He said he felt although the buildings were modern they picked up some of the detailing, spacing, rhythm of solids and voids. He said he felt the articulation of corners and bays seemed appropriate for a new building in a Historic District. The materials speak of the historic quality in terms of cast stone, architectural-pre-cast brick, decorative metal work in areas where it was appropriate. He said they also saw some interesting roof shapes and forms that seemed to not upset the balance of architecture in the historic districts. He said they did not want to take a standard rectangle and punch 3 X 5 openings in it. He said they really wanted to study it and take more of a comprehensive effort to break it down into more finite pieces.

He further stated that in terms of context it was important for them to study the surrounding area. He said it was striking, the richness and diversity of buildings that we used to have, that were now gone. He said he felt the historic canopies were a great inspiration for a form that had a contemporary look. (Showed photographs). He said they looked at the surrounding context, particularly Bay Street. He said he felt Staff's comments about the rhythm were appropriate, particularly the tower element on the Bay Street side of the new building. He said they wanted to make sure they were treating this side correctly. As they looked at Bay Street they found that there was a diverse range in terms of building sizes. He said Staff was correct in that the 30 – 60 foot increments were traditional, but they found many that were 25, 35, 75 or different combinations. He said what they did not want to do was just take a block and say they were going to put a big building here. He said they felt there was a certain rhythm to it. He said there were many cases that break the rules, but they wanted to break the rules in a way that was constrained. He also stated with regard to the court yard that they felt it was what they needed to do the most study on. He said they felt it was important to retain the urban wall. He said what they wanted to do with the edge was make it a place that was more transparent where people could walk through.. He said in Part II there will be further refinement of the window elements.

He stated in regard to the comments on the St. Julian Street side they agreed that the cornice line needed to be broken so that the office building read as a distinctive mass separate from the hotel. He said he felt part of the confusion was that it was all rendered in white and there was not any kind of distinction in massing, color, and materials which he felt would help to distinguish the two. On the Whitaker Street side, the first bay was access for the underground parking (1100 spaces below grade), which would be a heavily trafficked area. He said they wanted to work that into a regular façade, so that it did not look like a parking garage. He said they considered taking this bay around to the next one and making it a standard 60 foot. But they felt like this vertical piece should be articulated in a slightly different way so they broke it down into two asymmetrical widths.

He stated in regard to Staff's comments on the hotel, there was a lot of precedent for tower corner elements that were special and that addressed squares. He said they looked at several examples, historically where the squares were addressed by unique entry feature on the corner. He said they felt that was what they wanted to emulate with the hotel. He said they have gone to great lengths to work with the hotel developer to not have doors that were locked. He said they have worked with the developer to have the main valet entrance on the Barnard Street side and corner entrances that would go into the lobby. He said these bays were dining areas, which could be problematic because they would probably be locked at times. He said the other bays would go into retail space. He said in regard to the width of the masses they were symmetrical, but irregular. He said it would be refined as they continued with the project.

#### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked how many hotel rooms were between each colonnade?

**Mr. Dawson** stated two rooms between each bay.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if it was central air or through-wall units?

**Mr. Dawson** stated it would not be through-wall units.

**Mr. Deering** stated he was concerned about the Bryan Street façade. He said they showed the new Days Inn building, which he felt did not need to happen again. If they did something to project where you entered the parking garage that would help. He said he liked the idea of a tower on the corner. However, this project had three perceived towers which he felt may be too much. He said the one on the Bay Street side was a little much. He said he felt the roof form was odd, but modern interpretation of a tower roof. However, he felt it may call too much attention to itself. He said he also hoped that they would break down this particular façade a little better and address Staff's concerns with the hole on Bay Street.

**Mr. Dawson** stated in terms of the roof form on Bay Street that was kind of their first attempt at it. He said he felt the butterfly type form was not offensive or historical. He said their intent was to try to pick up that kind of leaning up canopy that was on the news press building. He said perhaps if it was butterflyed in the other direction that would be more of a reference to Bay Street and may be better.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he wanted to complement the petitioner on what he has accomplished so far. He said he was not offended by the entry element on Bay Street. He said he felt it was creative and not distracting. He said it may need a little work here and there, but he liked it. He said he also felt the same for the tower element on what would eventually be on the restored Ellis Square.

#### **Public Comments:**

**Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF was also enthusiastic about this project. He said HSF was concerned about the emptiness regarding the courtyard façade facing Bay Street. Also HSF was concerned with the stair tower on Bay Street disrupting the rhythm of Bay Street. However, HSF felt that it could be mitigated in the design phase by tying the stair tower a little closer to the new building. He said HSF had great faith at this point with this coming so far so fast that these problems will take care of themselves in the near future.

#### **Discussion:**

**Dr. Caplan** stated he felt they were dealing with a very good project that can be made a very wonderful project. He said he agreed with Mr. Steffen in that he was not too concerned about Bay Street. He said he felt there was real concern about the Bryan Street façade without any break up, but felt the petitioner would address that.

**HDBR Action:** Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the demolition of 113-115 and 117-119 West Bay Street and also approves Part I Height and Mass with consideration given to staff findings in the Part II design submission. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed. Mr. Neely recused himself.

**RE: Petition of Bloomquist Construction  
David Bloomquist  
HBR 05-3366-2  
405 East Gaston Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was David Bloomquist.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

Changes apply to 405 East Gaston only. The applicant is requesting approval to install a new wood, true divided light, 2/2 triple window on the rear first floor centered on the center upper window and to install a new 2/2 window in the existing door opening. On the second floor to install a new door and transom in the center window opening. Also to construct a new wood rear porch with second floor deck, 6 x 6 columns, 4 x 4 posts and 2 x 2 balusters. Paint to match existing trim.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval.

**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: Staff Reviews**

1. Petition of Paul Robinson  
HBR 05-3354(S)-2  
127 Abercorn Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
2. Petition of Lominack, Kolman, Smith Architects  
Ellen Harris  
HBR 05-3355(S)-2  
225 West President Street  
Color/Stucco  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
3. Petition of Emily Brzozowski  
HBR 05-3356(S)-2  
507 East Perry Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
4. Petition of Half – Moon Outfitters  
HBR 05-3357(S)-2  
15 East Broughton Street  
Color/Lamps  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

**RE: Other Business**

1. Petition of Dawson & Wissmach Architects  
Neil Dawson  
HBR 03-3082-2  
220 West Broughton Street  
Request for 1 Year Extension

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the request for a one-year extension. Mr. Steffen seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated there will be a preservation conference in Tifton, GA and they were usually held in the Spring and Fall of every year. In the Spring the conference is in the southern part of Georgia and in the Fall it was in the northern part of Georgia. She said she would like to encourage Board members to go. In addition, she has talked to the City Manager and he has approved for Beth and herself to come together with a budget for Review Board members to attend preservation conferences. She said they meet all over the State and they were wonderful conferences on how to be a board member, how to chair a meeting, etc. She said Board members can see her about either Fall or Spring and she can try to work up a budget with Mrs. Reiter.

**Dr. Caplan** asked what were the dates for the upcoming conference?

**Mr. Webb** stated May 20 & 21, 2005.

**Ms. Seiler** asked Mr. Webb to email the Board with the dates and times for the conference.

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

**Mrs. Reiter** stated it was reported that there were banner signs on River Street. She said it she reported it to the Inspections Department and the banners were being taken down. She said it was reported today that there was a huge banner on the old wash world building at Liberty and Jefferson Streets.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if there was anything else pending?

**Mrs. Reiter** stated the wall on President Street will be brought before the Board in the next month or so.

**RE: Minutes**

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – February 9, 2005
2. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – March 9, 2005

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the minutes of February 9, 2005 and March 9, 2005 as submitted. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**Ms. Seiler** asked Mrs. Reiter what was the status of the parking tags?

**Mrs. Reiter** distributed the tags to the Board members.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if there was any information on the Board Retreat?

**Ms. Seiler** stated the Retreat will be held at Savannah Electric, but Board members will have to park on their own. She said she was working with Mr. Webb on final dates for the Retreat.

**Mr. Webb** stated they have talked to the Mayor's office to get some dates. He said they were looking at doing it in June. He also stated that Mrs. Reiter was going to Indonesia to represent the City at the end of June, so he was trying to also coordinate dates with Beth.

**Mr. Steffen** stated it needed to be noted on the minutes for March 9, 2005 that he attended the meeting.

**RE: Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

BR:ca