

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

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

FEBRUARY 9, 2005

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

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

MPC Staff Present:

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

RE: Call to Order

Mr. Mitchell called the February 9, 2005 meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review to order at 2:00 P.M.

RE: Sign Posting

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated she did not see a sign posted for 309 West Bay Street.

**Ms. Seiler** stated it was there. She asked if there was a sign posted for the Day Break?

**Mr. Shay** stated yes.

RE: Consent Agenda

RE: Amended Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff. & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
HBR 03-3125-2  
309 West Bay Street  
Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Anne Smith  
HBR 05-3322-2  
304 East Bryan Street  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Ruslin, Inc.  
Lynwood Willis  
HBR 05-3323-2  
530 – 532 East Broughton Street  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Ted Carellas, III  
HBR 05-3324-2  
111 East Broad Street  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of William Rhangos  
HBR 05-3326-2  
513 West Jones Street  
Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison  
HBR 05-3329-2  
3 East Gordon Street  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Peter Nelsen & Tomi Nelsen  
HBR 05-3331-2  
616 Barnard Street  
Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Ciphers Design  
Gary Sanders  
HBR 05-3332-2  
230 Habersham Street  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**Dr. Caplan** requested that the Amended Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, & Shay, HBR 03-3125-2 be moved from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda because there was a condition in Staff's recommendation.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** requested that the Petition of Ruslin, Inc., Lynwood Willis, HBR 05-3323-2 be moved from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda.

**Mr. Deering** requested that the Petition of Anne Smith, HBR 05-3322-2 be moved from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda.

**Mrs. Brownfield** requested that the Petition of Ciphers Design, Gary Sanders, HBR 05-3332-2 be moved from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda.

**HDBR Action:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the Consent Agenda as amended. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Regular Agenda**

**RE: Amended Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
HBR 03-3125-2  
309 West Bay Street  
Alterations**

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself from the petition.

Present for the petition was Patrick Shay.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of two double-faced projecting principal use signs. The first is to be located on the Bay Street elevation two bays east of the entrance canopy projecting from the second story level. The projection is 10 feet. The bracket is black metal per drawing. The sign size is 3' x 10' or 30 square feet. The material is sandblasted urethane with green and blue letters on a white background. It is to be externally illuminated by incandescent down lights.

The second sign will be located at the rear of the hotel on the Montgomery Street elevation. The details are the same as above.

### **FINDINGS**

The Historic District Sign ordinance applies.

The zoning for this lot is BC-1. This permits a 30 square foot projecting sign, however the maximum projection can only be 6 feet and no portion of the sign can be erected within 2' of a curb line.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval of the design of the sign, with the condition that the sign be brought into conformance with the sign ordinance or the petitioner submit a written approval from the Zoning Administrator regarding the projecting and distance from the curb.

**Petitioner's Comments:**

**Mr. Shay** stated he followed up with Tom Todaro, City Inspections Department, because other signs he has done for hotels on Bay Street have been 10 feet. He asked if the standard in BC-1 zone was that no project were more than 6 feet?

**Mrs. Reiter** stated it has always been 6 feet.

**Mr. Shay** stated he was before the Board several months ago for the Radisson and those signs are 10 feet. He said it is the first time that he has heard this. He said he was not disagreeing with the staff report, but if the Board could give a conditional approval and let him straighten out the matter with the Zoning Administrator.

**Mr. Neely** stated he felt the Board could allow Staff approval.

**HDBR Action:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the amended petition with the understanding that the sign will be approved by Staff and Zoning Administrator. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was passed. Abstaining to the motion was Ms. Waring.

**RE: Amended Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
HBR 04-3249-2  
222 West River Street  
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 amend the previously approved application by installing six custom designed light fixtures on the River Street elevation of 222 West River Street.

**FINDINGS**

The following Standards and Guidelines are applicable:

Section 8-3030(k) Development Standards:

- (1) Preservation of historic structures within the Historic District: An historic structure and any outbuildings, or any appurtenances 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 features of the historic structure or appurtenance thereto. For the purposes of this section, exterior architectural features shall include, but not 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.

- (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 Manual also states:

“Savannah’s architecture is rich in carefully crafted details. Contemporary artistic craftsmanship can enrich the visual texture of the city. Incorporation of the following kinds of details is encouraged:” Cast iron decorative railings, downspouts such as dolphin downspouts, etched and stained glass, moulded terracotta, lamp brackets, decorative vent covers, decorative tiles.”

### **DISCUSSION**

1. The proposed light fixtures will be custom made by locale artisans and will resemble pineapples.
2. The fixtures will be powder coated in an antique black finish and will emit light speckles from the scales of the pineapple as well as against the stucco of the building.
3. It appears from the submitted elevation, a total of six fixtures will be installed on the elevation.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval in concept for the installation of the light fixtures, with clarification from the petitioner of the following:

- 1) Dimensions of the fixture.
- 2) How fixture will be attached to the façade.
- 3) Exact location on the façade where fixtures will be attached, including clearance from the sidewalk, and projection from the façade.

### **Petitioner’s Comments:**

**Mr. Shay** stated there will be six light fixtures on the façade. The height below the bottom of the fixture would be a minimum of 8 feet.

**Mr. Deering** asked if the light would only come through the scales?

**Mr. Shay** stated no, it would also come through a little from the bottom.

### **Public Comments:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF did not have any objection to the fixtures. However they noticed from the photographs that there was conduit on the façade of the building. He asked if the light fixtures were going to be wired with surface mounted aluminum conduit?

**Mr. Shay** stated yes. He said he did not think it was an ideal situation, but there was no other feasible way to do it. He also stated they were going to paint the façade and paint out the conduit as they went along. He said with regard to the sign, the wood border will be stained to match the wood that was on the doorway. He said the windows that were in the arched openings that faced River Street would be a gold colored metal and a crème color with a black background that would be similar to the black that they see on the pine apples. He said the dimensions would be amended to 3'-6" feet instead of 4 feet and 4 feet instead of 5 feet.

**Mr. Deering** stated the petition says the fixture will be black. He asked if the light fixtures would be the brown color that was shown today?

**Mr. Shay** stated yes.

**HDBR Action:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the amended petition with the understanding that the sign will be submitted to Staff for approval based on the new dimensions. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Continued Petition of Richard Guerard  
HBR 04-3302-2  
412 East McDonough Street & Price Street  
New Construction**

Present for the petition was Richard Guerard.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting Part I: Height and Mass and Part II: Materials and Design Details approval to construct sixteen, single-family row houses on the block bounded by East McDonough, Price, Habersham, and East Hull Streets.

### **FINDINGS**

Three structures are located on the block at present, including the ruins of a metal and brick shed and a two-story structure with a stucco front and red brick sides. These buildings appear to retain no historic integrity. A third building is a one-story warehouse built ca.1950. None of these buildings are rated structures or listed on the Historic District Building map. These structures will be demolished as a component of the project.

The context of the block includes a prevalence of vacant and asphalt-covered parking lots. The block is bounded by a large, vacant lot to the north; a large, asphalt parking lot between the three-story brick police headquarters and the stucco façade of the old jail on the west; a three-story brick duplex facing Habersham with an asphalt parking lot behind and a one-story brick and concrete building facing Price Street to the south; and a vacant lot and a one-story concrete block building to the east. Some historic residential two-and three-story duplexes are located across Price Street facing East Hull Street.

East Hull and East McDonough Streets function as secondary streets within the Oglethorpe Plan. These streets are similar to Howard, Tattnall, and Jefferson Streets. The block is an anomaly within the Historic District. It is not a true block as defined in Section 8-3030: "A block is a rectangular space bounded on three sides by a street and on the fourth by a lane and

occupied by or intended for buildings.” Nor is it a Trust Block as defined in Section 8-3030:”A unit of Oglethorpe’s Plan for Savannah. Trust blocks are located on the east and west sides of a square. There are four Trust Blocks in each ward.” This block does not serve as a Trust Lot to the nearest square which is Crawford Square.

The block is located in an R-I-P-A zoning district which allows for 75% building lot coverage, which as proposed the project meets.

As proposed the project would provide one off street parking space per unit, in a front entrance garage, off both East Hull and East McDonough Streets.

Revisions to the project since the December Review Board meeting include the relocation of two of the row houses to the Habersham and Price Streets ends of the block and moving their courtyards to the interior of the block, and changing the exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights to comply with the ordinance.

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 block is located in a four-story height zone. As proposed, the row houses would be three stories, with a total height of 34’. In respect to exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights, the first floor will be 11’ in height, the second floor 10’6” in height, and the third floor 10’ in height. According to the Ordinance: “The exterior expression of the height of the first story...shall be not less than 11 feet. The exterior expression of the height of each story above the second shall be not less than 10 feet.” The proposed height of three stories is visually compatible and the exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights meets the requirements of the ordinance.
2. **Proportion of Structure’s Front Façade:** Eight units will face East Hull and eight units will face East McDonough Streets. The front façade of each row house will have a width of 19’4”, with a 10’8” garden wall between paired row houses. With the vertical alignment of the front façade’s voids, the front façade will have a vertical directional expression, which is visually compatible.
3. **Proportion of Openings Within the Facility:** The openings on the second and third floors appear taller than wide. A courtyard space is located between paired groups of row houses, with a garden gate. The Habersham and Price Street elevations have the side walls of the detached townhouses, and groupings of windows, with the center windows aligned vertically. The proposed height and width of windows in the structure appears to be visually compatible.
4. **Rhythm of Solids to Voids in Front Facades/Directional Expression of Front Façade:** The front elevation of each row house will have a three bay rhythm on the second and third floors. The first floor has the main door and an 8’ garage door opening. As drawn on the elevations and rendering, the garage opening has a flat header. Staff would suggest that a curved arch header over the garage opening would enhance the design of the project. The second and third floors have single windows that are aligned vertically. As re-designed, two row houses have been located to the Habersham and Price Street ends of the block and the courtyard space relocated to the interior of the block. Within the block, the row houses are paired, with a courtyard space between each pair of row houses. Behind each courtyard space, a recessed component of a row house

is located. Within this space, French style doors open into the courtyard. The relationship of the solids to voids gives the front façade a vertical directional appearance.

5. **Rhythm of Structures on the Street:** Attached and semi-detached row houses are characteristic of the Historic District. Attached duplexes are located across Price Street facing East Hull Street. The attached row houses will face East Hull and East McDonough Streets. As proposed, the project has the appearance of mews houses.
6. **Rhythm of Entrance and/or Porch Projects/Street elevation Type:** The street elevation type of the proposed project is a three-story structure with a street level entrance. The entrance will have a bracketed hood. The historic residential duplexes across Price Street have raised and high stoop entrances. The adjacent historic building facing Habersham Street has a high stoop entrance. Historic buildings facing Liberty Street within Crawford Ward have street level entrances.
7. **Roof Shapes:** The row houses will have flat roofs with parapets which is characteristic of the adjacent structures and is visually compatible.
8. **Setbacks:** The row houses and garden walls will have a zero line setback on all elevations.
9. **Walls of Continuity:** The row houses and garden walls will maintain a wall of continuity around the entire block.

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 muntin 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.
  - l. Shutter shall be hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening. The placement of the horizontal rail shall correspond to the location of the meeting rail of the window.
  - m. Shutters shall be constructed of durable wood, 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.
- (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.

## **DISCUSSION**

The petitioner provided a list of materials and manufacturer information with the submitted application.

1. **Exterior Materials:** The exterior will be brick, selected to match that found in the Historic District in respect to size, texture, and color. The brick is from Cherokee Brick and Tile Company. The queen size brick will be used in the walls, with dimensions of 3 1/2" x 2 3/4" x 7 5/8". The brick pattern will be running bond and joints will not exceed 3/8" in width. The petitioner provided a sample of the brick and the mortar. 1" brick soldier courses will be located above the first floor and above the third floor. Brick will also be used for the window sills and lintels. The elevations and rendering show a grill within the parapet. However, no information was provided. Staff request information on the grill within the parapet.
2. **Windows and Doors:** The windows and French doors are manufactured by Anderson (Narroline Model for the windows). The windows are wood clad, six-over-six, double hung, double glazed with simulated divided lights. The petitioner is reminded that the muntins should be 7/8" wide with a profile that simulates traditional putty glazing and the lower sash should be wider than the meeting and top rails. The centerline of windows and French doors are aligned vertically; all windows and doors are recessed a minimum of 3" from the façade of the building; all windows and doors facing a street are rectangular and have a vertical to horizontal ratio not less than 5:3 The distance between the windows or doors is not more than two times the width of the window or door. The French-style doors, opening onto the courtyard, appear to be wood-true divided light; the petitioner needs to clarify this. The petitioner provided some window information but Staff request that the Petitioner provide information on the muntin and profile. The proposed window has been approved for new construction in the Historic District. The front doors will be mahogany raised four panel door by Simpson.

3. **Roof:** The proposed townhouses will have a flat roof, concealed by a parapet. HVAC equipment will be located on the roof and screened by the parapet. The parapet will have brick coping, with a 1” overhang.
4. **Front Entrance:** Each front door will have a bracketed hood, with a metal shed roof. Staff requests the petitioner provide more information on this feature, including a section or profile.
5. **Garage doors:** The overhead, garage doors will be manufactured by Wayne Dalton, using the Charleston Model, which is wood with 8 glass windows at the top. The elevations provided by the Petitioner do not show the proposed garage door accurately. Staff has suggested changing the header over the garage door opening from a flat arch to a curved arched opening to enhance the design of the project.
6. **Shutters:** Shutters will be manufactured by Atlantic, using the Manchester model, which is an operable, louvered shutter. This make and model have been approved previously for new construction.
7. **Garden Walls and Gates:** The garden walls will be constructed of the same brick as the main townhouses. Wrought iron gates will be custom made by Black Creek Iron Works and the design was provided by the petitioner. The courtyard walls will be 8’ tall.
8. **Colors:** The petitioner has provided a list of proposed colors for the trim, front door, and garage doors, all by Sherwin Williams. The windows and all wood trim will be white. The wrought iron work will be black. Staff requests that actual colors samples be provided by the petitioner for review and Staff level approval.
9. **Other: Exterior Lights:** The petitioner has provided information on several exterior lights. Staff requests petitioner to clarify which lights will be used in which locations.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of Part I: Height and Mass and Parts II: Materials and Design Details, with the following conditions and considerations:

- 1) Clarification of French doors and muntin profile on proposed windows.
- 2) Consideration of changing design of header over garage door opening from a flat to a curved arch.
- 3) Submittal of front entrance bracketed hood profile, with description of materials for Staff level review and approval.
- 4) Submittal of samples of paint colors for Staff level review and approval.
- 5) Clarification of parapet grills.
- 6) Clarification of exterior lights.

### **Petitioner’s Comments:**

**Mr. Guerard** stated they tried to make some changes in response to the last meeting. He said after several other meetings with different groups they came to the conclusion that nobody liked their garage doors. He said he had a revised drawing that showed elimination of the garage doors and brought two windows down to where the garage doors were. He said they would like to get approval with the conditions that they delete the garage doors and bring the windows

down. He said the windows would be the same size as the other windows. He said they would also have the wrought iron gate, which would satisfy their off-street parking space and also meet their open space requirement.

**Mr. Deering** asked regarding the end elevations that face Price and Habersham Streets if the small windows in the bathrooms could be made into regular size windows? He also said false window openings might give some verticality to the end elevation.

**Mr. Guerard** stated they could do that.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the plans were a tremendous improvement making this a courtyard that would house the car. He said not only did it take away the garage doors, but one of his big objections was the eight drives that were there could now be reduced to four drives. He said he felt it made the entire streetscape in front of the building much better.

**Mr. Neely** asked where would the utility boxes be located?

**Mr. Guerard** stated inside the gate.

#### **Public Comments:**

**Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF felt this was a better solution. However, HSF would like to suggest that there were a variety of headers over the windows. He said they would like to suggest that all the headers be the same across the project so it looked like one long row and not individual houses. He said also if possible on the Habersham and Price Streets façade if the window could be elongated so it was equal in length to the other windows rather than being square.

#### **Additional Comments:**

**Dr. Caplan** asked if the petitioner clarified the other issues raised by Staff?

**Mr. Guerard** stated the grill at the top was wrought iron which was made by Black Creek. He said it was basically rectangular with a center metal piece with bars coming off of it and he told Staff that he would get them a copy of it. In regard to the muntin, Guerry Lumber (Steve Jake) said that they would fax over a spec sheet. He said they did not have a problem that it not exceed 7/8". In regard to the hood bracket profile, they printed out a photo and it would be a heavy wood bracket with a metal top. He said in regard to the exterior lights he submitted three different lights, so that each home purchaser could individually select which one out of the three lights they would like to be on their unit. He said there would not be a mixture of lights on any unit.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked in regard to the courtyard, if he had two gates was one or two walls going back.

**Mr. Guerard** stated one wall.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he would recommend that he study the pilaster that separated the two gates to see if that could be a little smaller?

**Mr. Guerard** agreed. Also, in regard to the headers he felt the rectangular ones should match the ones up top. He said there were only two headers which alternated with every other unit. He said he felt the alternation of the headers gave each unit more individuality.

**Mr. Deering** stated he agreed and disagreed with his comment. In certain cities there was a propensity to do this sort of thing, but in Savannah most of the long brick rows had the same header down the whole length of the building. He said you get your individuality from shutter color, front door color, lighting fixture and those sorts of things.

**Mr. Guerard** asked if it would be simpler to put the soldier course on all of them.

**Mr. Deering** stated that was what he would suggest.

**HDBR Action:** Mrs. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended with the following conditions: (1) the gate will be resubmitted to Staff, (2) the headers be changed to brick jack arches, (3) pilasters between the gate be 12 inches, (4) the bracket will be a heavy wood bracket, (5) the end walls of the row that faces Habersham and Price Streets have a window per unit on the ground floor added and some false windows that look like they were bricked-in opening, and (6) colors to be submitted to Staff for approval. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Amended Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
HBR 04-3317-2  
11 – 21 West York Street  
Alterations**

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

Present for the petition was Patrick Shay.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to make exterior alterations to 11-21 West York Street, which includes the Lindsay and Morgan Building, including replacement of windows and the addition of windows, doors, and balconies. This petition was continued from the January meeting.

### **FINDINGS**

The current petition reflects changes requested by Staff and other changes made by the petitioner in response to comments from the Review Board and the public. The revisions are:

1. The proposed wood entrance door on York Street has been eliminated and the current aluminum storefront door will be maintained.
2. The proposed projecting balconies on the east elevation have been reduced from a 4' projection to a 3' projection.

3. The proposed windows on the north and south elevations on the modern annex have been changed from a residential appearance to an industrial appearance. The windows on the second and third floors of the south elevation will be 6' wide and 9'3" tall.
4. The proposed two-over-two windows on the rear (south) elevation of the Lindsay and Morgan building have been revised to be one-over-one. The size of the openings remains as proposed in January.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval with the petitioner providing window manufacturer information to Staff once selected.

**Petitioner's Comments:**

**Mr. Shay** stated in regard to the windows, they were going to read as industrial sash windows. He said they would let the Board know the manufacturer.

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated at the last meeting they discussed the balconies that were on the south side of the building that were over and adjacent building and he said that he would have to get permission from the owner to do that.

**Mr. Shay** stated that negotiation was still on-going. He said it is a condominium association and they have been approached. He said they also met with Kathy Ledvina who will be doing the tax credit certifications on this project. He said he presented all this to her and she felt comfortable with the balconies and windows on that side.

**Public Comments:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF felt this was a group of important buildings with a lot of complicated issues relating to the industrial character of the additions and architectural styles. He said HSF would like to commend the Board for its sensitivity as well as the petitioner.

**HDBR Action:** **Mr. Deering** made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the window specifications be brought to staff for approval. **Mrs. Brownfield** seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Anne Smith  
HBR 05-3322-2  
304 East Bryan Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Anne Smith.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of alterations as follows:

1. South Façade (Bryan Street): Replace center door with smooth finish wood door in existing opening with glass lite. Paint flat black. Awning to be brought back to staff for

- review. Repair existing windows and paint wood black. Repoint brick where needed. Remove loose paint. (all sides)
2. West Façade (Lincoln Street): Remove south garage door and replace with standard matte anodized aluminum storefront. Repair existing window and paint wood flat black. Repair other garage door and paint black. Add a galvanized aluminum vent stack at rear roof.
  3. North (lane) Façade: Install new wood windows in existing opening. Paint black.
  4. East Façade: (will be exposed when existing adjacent front and rear concrete block walls are removed – Staff approval December 2004). Repair existing wood windows and paint wood black. Install new matte anodized aluminum storefront and door in former window. Extend opening to the ground.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval.

### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Deering** asked why did they decide to remove one of the garage doors and put in the storefront? He said he really felt the garage doors were character-defining architectural elements of the building. He said he felt they needed to try everything they could do to keep both of them there or replace one with the big glass overhead garage door, so that it still appeared as a garage door.

**Ms. Smith** stated what they found was between the two doors there was enough original material to put one in operation because the other one was too far gone as far as the hardware and so forth. She said the prospective tenant hoped to have the one garage door open in good weather so tourists could wander in/out, but in inclement weather they would need a pedestrian door there. She said they thought since only one of them could be restored back to its original state that they did not want to fabricate another one to go in the other opening. She said they thought it was cleaner to do a simple infill that was clearly not of the same time.

**Mr. Deering** asked if they could do it black like the rest of things that she said would be painted black or make it at least blend if its modern?

**Ms. Smith** stated it will be recessed back into the opening and it would be anodized aluminum. She said it was clearly the new and old there.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the two openings were there, but perhaps if they pushed the new door and glazing back to the rear of the wall as the garage door then the two openings would be more predominant.

**Ms. Smith** stated there was no problem with moving it further back into the opening. She said if the Board would prefer they could do black there, but they would prefer to keep it with the clear anodized aluminum.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the southern door be recessed in the opening. M. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: **Petition of Ruslin, Inc.  
Lynwood Willis  
HBR 05-3323-2  
530 – 532 East Broughton Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Dirk Hardison.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting part I and Part II approval for a one story garage behind 532 East Broughton Street.

### **FINDINGS**

The garage measures 21' x 25' by 9'-4" high. The roof slopes to 8'-8" on the courtyard side. Two garage openings 8' wide will be on the lane side with smooth finish wood overhead doors. The garage will be stuccoed and the color will match the house at 530 East Broughton Street.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval.

### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the project as shown on the drawings was out of character. He said the suggestion to put a parapet on it to increase the height would do very little to change the character. He suggested that the petitioner restudy it in the form of a hip or gable roof to relate to the other three structures. He said he felt it is a very visible building because of the open courtyard.

**Mr. Deering** stated as far as context there was a row of small masonry gable roofed houses further down the lane, which may be some beginning point for design. He said he felt it appeared like a little bunker. He said if it were going to be a modern structure it would be okay, but there was nothing that indicated that it was thought out or designed.

**Mr. Neely** asked if they considered a more traditional carriage house type design that was two story?

**Mr. Hardison** asked how important was it that the design be two story because he felt the petitioner would come back with one story?

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated it needed height and one way to get it was with a hipped or gabled roof.

### **Public Comments:**

**Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF felt the project should be denied because it did not meet the ordinance

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review deny the petition based on visual incompatibility. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
HBR 05-3327-2  
N.W. Corner of Barnard & Bryan Streets  
New Construction**

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval for a six story hotel. Also to demolish the non-historic structure currently on the lot.

### **FINDINGS**

The following standards apply:

Section 8-3030(k) Development Standards (5). The construction of a new structure...in the Historic District visible from a public street or lane shall be generally of such form, proportion, mass, configuration, material, texture color and location on a lot as will be compatible with other...nearby structures designated as historic...

General comments: In light of the proposed project to eliminate the above ground garage on Ellis Square and the proposed redevelopment of the News Press lot, the corner of Bryan and Barnard is going to be a very prominent site. Many of the recently approved hotels have a similar look. There is an opportunity here to break out of the mold and coordinate with the News Press developers, or at least use materials similar to those found in the historic part of that complex such as the grey granite.

Section 8-3030 Tall Building Standards.

- 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. *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' in width. *This standard has been met.*
- 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. *The proposed roof has a solid and open parapet and intersecting gable roofs that are associated with the pediments over the two entrances. The majority of the commercial structures in this ward have "flat" roofs with parapets. However, at six stories the gable probably won't be noticed. The applicant should look at "beefing up" the entablature and using a solid cornice rather than the iron or wood one proposed.*
- 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. However, the main Barnard Street entry is dwarfed by the flanking stucco or cast stone “Pilasters”. The applicant should look at removing these altogether and reducing the width of the pediment. The entry door could be emphasized more, reducing the sidelights and perhaps introducing large scaled light sconces in the entry alcove. See also comments on openings and canopy below.*

- e. Height: The lot is located in a six story zone. Commercial exterior expression of height is ground floor not less than 14'-6", second story 12' and floors above 10'. *The proposed construction meets the standard*

Setbacks: *No setbacks required.*

Entrances: *See above*

The following Visual Compatibility Factors shall be considered

**Proportion of front façade**: *See comments on solids and voids.*

**Proportion of openings**: *The rectangular windows align vertically.*

**Rhythm of solids to voids**: *The Barnard Street elevation is visually dominated by the central stucco (?)pilasters. This center section around the recessed balconies appears visually too wide. This is accentuated by the projecting center part at the sixth floor level. The center feature on the other five floors is actually flat. Eliminating this center stucco feature and overhang and introducing a different narrow window feature on either side of the recessed balcony might lighten the ponderous visual effect of this center portion and relate it better to the side (square) elevation.*

**Rhythm of structures on the street**: *The proposed construction does address both street frontages with both entry and storefront windows.*

**Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection (includes balconies)**: *The proposed design utilizes both projecting and recessed balconies. The space over the front door cannot be used as a balcony because the entrance canopy fills the space. The applicant should consider redesigning the canopy in order to free this space so that it can be accessed.*

**Roof shapes**: *See above regarding reducing size of pediment and creating a consistent more monumental parapet.*

**Walls of continuity**: *The building is built to the 0 lot line which is typical in this ward.*

**Scale and Directional expression**: *The scale of the building can be affected by the number and variety of details within the composition. Some of these details include the secondary columns on the recessed porches, the window lintels and sills (there are three styles of lintels shown) two types of pilasters (stucco? And brick that change materials three times in each vertical bay. The Barnard Street elevation lintels at the second floor do not correspond to the Bryan Street elevation. Staff recommends that the applicant use the Bryan Street elevation as the prototype for window lintels and placement, thereby eliminating the lintels with the keystone and look at inserting the smaller columns on all the recessed balconies. The change of materials on the thinner pilasters should be eliminated in favor of all brick, thereby helping to assert the verticality.*

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Approve the demolition of the non-historic Day Break restaurant building and continue for height and mass revisions.

## **Petitioner’s Comments:**

Mr. Shay stated the building that was going to be located there would add a total of 30 rooms to the inventory of about 200 that were already included in these two buildings. The

loading/unloading for the proposed hotel will be right here, but they would also have access to the parking garage. The parcel that was immediately to the east was proposed to become a six story building.

He further stated in regard to the comment to beef up the entablature, he agreed and would look at how to do that. He said Staff's comments that it could be made somewhat narrower and the gable and entablature made more prominent was something that they agreed with. In regard to materiality, they have not settled on what materials they wanted to present. The building they wanted this to relate to architecturally was the old Gukenheimer building, which is owned by the same hotel owner. He said when they get down to the details of the pediments they understood the Board did not want to have three different kinds, so they will study that more.

### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Deering** stated he agreed the corner should be a six story corner. He said there were buildings that were only this big that were six stories like at Whitaker and Bay Streets. He said if it did not have the news press building stuck up against it, it would be a very tall interesting building. He said he also agreed with Staff. He said as far as the mass, the Bryan Street elevation looked like a quaint Savannah small building that suited the City. And when you look at it with the elevation that faced Barnard Street, he felt it missed it and he agreed with Staff's comments. He said he felt that he could take the central section and move it over to Barnard Street and make the rest of Barnard Street just a bunch of punched openings he would have it and it would be a charming little building.

**Mr. Shay** stated they have used both projecting and interior recessed balconies and felt it was appropriate thing for them to look at doing here.

### **Public Comments:**

**Ms. Cynthia Hunter** stated she was concerned about the height of the building. She said if you looked to the south of Ellis Square and the historic buildings they were three to four stories high. She said this was the first new project being proposed for this site. She said she felt that this would set a stage for what happens on Ellis Square as well as the other parcels. She said she felt that six stories plus the roof was too high in considering the historic context south of Ellis Square and those buildings adjacent to it. She said she felt a four story building would be much more in character with the area.

**Mr. Joe Sasseen** stated he disagreed with the previous speaker because he felt you always have to think in terms of return on investment. He said you have to expect the hotels or businesses to be able to get a return on their investment because of the kind of money they are putting up front. He said he felt you also have to think of inflation and where the return comes from when you have to raise employment, insurance and so forth. He said he felt you always have to consider the business man in conformity with good planning, but also give them a chance to make a return on their investment. He also stated he felt the petitioner did a good job with the plans today.

**Mr. Deering** asked the Board how they felt about the projecting element under the pediment on the Barnard Street side?

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated it did not bother her.

**HDBR Action:** Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition Part I – Height/mass. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Mark Wilkes & Carl Knudsen  
HBR 05-3328-2  
307 West Hall Street  
New Construction – Part I & II**

Present for the petition was Mark Wilkes and Carl Knudsen.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioners are requesting Part I Height and Mass approval and Part II Design approval to erect two attached townhouses and two attached two-story carriage houses on a vacant lot at 307-309 West Hall Street.

**FINDINGS**

The following standards apply:

Height:

The lot is located in a three story height zone. The exterior expression of height of the first story shall not be less than 11 feet and 10 feet for each story above. This standard has been met. The heights are 12 and 10 feet.

Dwelling unit type: Semi attached town houses are found in the same block across the street.

Semi-attached dwellings should occupy a minimum of 80% of the lot width along the front setback line. This standard has been met.

Street Elevation Type:

A proposed building on an east-west through street shall utilize a historic building elevation type fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward. This standard has been met. The raised crawl space type is found on the adjacent historic structures.

Setbacks:

There shall be no front yard setbacks except on tithing lots where there is a historic setback along a particular block front.

There is an established historic setback along this street. The proposed townhouses match the setback of the adjacent historic houses.

Doors and Windows:

A building on a tithing lot shall locate its primary entrance on the east-west street. This standard has been met. The front door is a solid wood four raised panel door with transom by Baird

Brothers. The back and upstairs doors are solid wood 15 light doors with transom by Baird Brothers.

- Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian.
- Double glazed windows are permitted on new construction provided that the windows have muntins no wider than 7/8"; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash rail shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding.
- The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically.
- The proportions shall not be less than 5:3 and shall be rectangular.
- The distance between windows shall not be less than for adjacent historic buildings.
- In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.

The proposed window is a Monarch brand, wood double hung window. The window is 2/2 SDL with a spacer bar.

#### Roofs:

Gable roof pitches shall be between 4:12 and 8:12. The proposed roof is a double gable with a 8:12 pitch. This standard has been met.

#### Porches:

- Wood portico posts shall have cap and base molding.
- Balusters shall be placed between the upper and lower rails.

The proposed porch is a two story recessed porch with 6" x 6" wood posts and wood pickets and rail. The porch meets the standards.

#### Fences

- Fences shall not extend beyond the façade of the front elevation.

A six foot high 1"x6" board fence is proposed between the main house and carriage house along the side lot lines. This standard has been met.

#### Carriage Houses

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

The windows are the same brand as those in the main house. The garage openings are nine feet wide. The garage doors are flat panel smooth steel doors. The roof is a side gable.

The following Visual Compatibility factors apply:

1. Height: See above

2. Proportion of structures front façade: The relationship of the width to the height of these units is similar to the adjacent and across the street historic structures.
3. Proportion of openings: The windows are rectangular and align vertically.
4. Rhythm of solids to voids on front façade. A three side bay window is used on the front of each unit similar to that on the adjacent historic structures.
5. Rhythm of structures on the street: The setbacks are typical of the historic structures in this block.
6. Rhythm of porch projection: There are recessed porches on nearby historic structures.
7. Materials and color: Wood frame siding is typical of this neighborhood. The colors are: Siding: Sherwin Williams 6394 “Sequin” (gold); trim, posts, pickets, soffit, fascia and garage doors Sherwin Williams 6378 “Crisp Linen” and window sashes, railing and brackets Sherwin Williams 6214 “Underseas”.
8. Roof shape: See above.
9. Walls of Continuity: The proposed construction defines the streetscape in a manner similar to adjacent historic structures.
10. Scale: The scale of details is similar to adjacent historic structures.
11. Directional Expression: The verticality is similar to adjacent historic structures.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design Details for both the townhouses and the carriage houses.

### **Board Comments:**

**Dr. Caplan** stated on Page 26 of the Guidelines it says – “the following guidelines should also be considered in designing new carriage houses. Applied trim sectionalized overhead wood door should be used to simulate the first garage door ...” He said the petitioners were within their rights to request a plain simple door painted as mentioned in the guidelines. He asked the petitioners if they had any thought about making their garage doors a little more interesting.

**Mr. Knudsen** stated yes, but because they were on the lane it did not seem that important.

**Mr. Wilkes** stated also within the context of the rest of the carriage house structure they would be opened to something that made sense, but nothing other than a solid door came to mind.

**Mr. Deering** stated there were no other carriage houses on the lane.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition Part I and Part II - New Construction. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE:     Petition of Dirk Hardison  
          HBR 05-3330-2  
          500 Block of East Charlton Street  
          New Construction – Part I**

Present for the petition was Dirk Hardison.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting Part I: Height and Mass approval for the new construction of a three unit row house and a six-car one-story garage on a vacant lot between East Charlton Street and Macon Lane.

### **FINDINGS**

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 project is located in the Beach Institute Neighborhood within a 2½ story height zone. The proposed three unit row house is two stories tall and measures 23' to the eave. In respect to exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights, the first floor will be 10' in height and the second floor 9' in height. According to the Ordinance: "... where floor-to-floor heights can be shown to be historically predominantly lower, such as in the Beach Institute neighborhood," lower exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights may be used than what is usually required by the ordinance. The proposed six-car garage is one-story. The proposed heights are visually compatible.
2. **Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:** The proportion of the three unit row house's front façade is greater in width than height, giving a horizontal rather than a vertical appearance. This is consistent with the adjacent historic structures.
3. **Proportion of Openings Within the Facility:** The proposed height and width of windows in the structure appears to be visually compatible to the adjacent historic properties. The windows and doors are aligned vertically. The garage door openings are approximately 9' wide.
4. **Rhythm of Solids to Voids in Front Facades/Directional Expression of Front Façade:** The three unit row house has a three-bay rhythm, within each unit, with the windows aligned vertically on the front elevation. A three-bay rhythm is visually compatible. However, the hipped roof gives the project a horizontal directional expression.
5. **Rhythm of Structures on the Street:** Attached row houses are characteristic of the Historic District and the Beach Institute Neighborhood.
6. **Street elevation Type:** The Beach Institute neighborhood is characterized by buildings with raised piers or curtain walls at the ground level, and low stoops. The proposed row houses will have raised brick foundations and low covered stoops. This meets the recommendation of the design manual and is visually compatible.
7. **Rhythm of Entrance and/or Porch Project:** Each unit will have a raised covered stoop main entrance, which is characteristic of the neighborhood. However, the end (southeastern) corner unit's stoop is reversed from the other stoops.
8. **Roof Shape:** The roof is hipped. While hipped roofs are found in the Beach Institute Neighborhood of the Historic District, the pitch is usually lower. Staff would encourage petitioner to reconsider the pitch of the hipped roof.
9. **Setbacks:** As proposed, the new three unit row house will have a 0 lot line setback, which is prevalent in the adjacent area. The proposed setback is visually compatible.

10. **Lot coverage:** The lot coverage as proposed is 74.6%.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval with consideration of lowering roof pitch.

**Board Comments:**

**Dr. Caplan** asked Staff how much would they lower it?

**Mr. Webb** stated he had talked to the petitioner about lowering it to at least 3:12.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated when you come from Price Street everything up to the point of the western elevation of that house were little row houses. He said then all of a sudden you get to the end and there is a explosion, which may be the pitch on the roof that makes it look larger.

**Mr. Webb** stated that across the street there were some two story side gable houses that were more vertical in appearance than what was being proposed.

**Mr. Dirk Hardison** stated they had no problem with lowering the roof. He said with regard to the height pattern on the block, in the middle there were one story cottages on both sides of the street, and at the ends there were larger houses. Previous Sanborn maps showed four units two stories high on this lot facing East Broad Street. He said that orientation would cause parking difficulties so they faced the side street.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they would consider moving the end unit entrance to the East Broad Street side?

**Mr. Hardison** stated they could consider it.

**Mr. Deering** stated that was his suggestion also. In addition, for more vertical proportion, they could make the windows on their first story taller.

**Public Comments:**

**Mr. Joe Sasseen** stated on Taylor Row there were a total of 18 identical garage doors. He said he understood they had to have garages, but he would like to suggest that the garages be different colors or doors.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board District of Review approve the petition Part I – Height/mass with the roof pitch at 3:12 and also that the Part II – Design address the concerns raised. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion.

**Discussion:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he has always felt that height and mass includes solids and voids. He said he felt the solids and voids would change by moving the entrance. He said he felt the Board could not approve height and mass. He said he felt a continuance was in order. He said he felt the Board would be approving something they had not seen.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated she felt the Board was approving what was submitted, other than the roof.

**Mr. Deering** stated the roof slope as the Board discussed changing it, but the rest of the (height and mass) was not being changed.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he still felt that solids and voids were a part of height and mass.

**Dr. Johnson** stated if the Board did not entertain that now when the petitioner comes back with design the Board may feel that they do not want the entrance on the East Broad Street side and that would be a month wasted.

**Dr. Caplan** stated he felt there has to be an understanding that this would be addressed at the next meeting and that it was not approved. And that the Board would like to have more input about the possibility of changing the entrance. He said he felt sometimes the Board gets confused over what is height/mass and design.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Mitchell called the vote. The motion was 6 – 2. Opposed to the motion were Dr. Caplan and Mr. Meyerhoff.

**Dr. Caplan** stated he did not know if what was said was incorporated in the motion.

**Mr. Mitchell** restated the motion. The motion is for approval with the understanding that the roof pitch be lowered to 3:12.

**Mr. Neely** stated that he also said in the motion that the petitioner had to take in to account the comments that were made.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated he did not specify that he had to.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the Board was not saying that the revisions should be approved by the Preservation Officer.

**Mr. Deering** stated the petitioner has to come back with Part II – Design.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if she was saying that she did not want a reconsideration of the instances or anything else the way the motion is read?

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated the motion as she understood it was that the only thing that had to be changed was the roof pitch to 3:12 and the petitioner should take into consideration what was said, but he did not have to make further changes.

**Mr. Neely** stated he made the motion and his assumption was they could address the question of the entrance coming off of the side.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated he did not specify that needed to be moved.

**Mr. Neely** stated that was part of his saying take in to account the comments that were made today and let the petitioner redesign the project. He said he felt the solids and voids issue was minor that it could be incorporated in the Part II – Design.



**HDBR Action:** Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion for reconsideration. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion for reconsideration was unanimously passed.

**HDBR Action:** Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition Part I – Height/mass with the roof pitch at 3:12. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was passed 7 - 1. Opposed to the motion was Mr. Meyerhoff.

**RE: Petition of Ciphers Design  
Gary Sanders  
HBR 05-3332-2  
230 Habersham Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Gary Sanders.

The petitioner is requesting approval to make alterations including changing doors to windows, windows to doors, and replacing rear fire stairs with circular stairs.

### **FINDINGS**

The following Standards and Guidelines are applicable:

Section 8-3030(k) Development Standards:

- (2) Preservation of historic structures within the Historic District: An historic structure and any outbuildings, or any appurtenances 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 features of the historic structure or appurtenance thereto. For the purposes of this section, exterior architectural features shall include, but not 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.
  
- (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.

### **DISCUSSION**

1. On the front elevation, facing Habersham Street, the petitioner proposes to change the doors under the stoops into windows, and relocating one door under the central canopy, next to an existing door. The new windows will be nine-over-nine windows moved from the rear elevation.
2. A brick wall encloses a courtyard area on the rear elevation, obscuring the ground level from view from a public right-of-way.
3. On the rear elevation, the existing stairs will be removed and replaced with new metal spiral stairs. While not visible to the public, on the ground level, doors underneath the porches will be changed to glass block and bricks. New doors will be located in the center of the ground level, replacing windows. These windows will be used on the front elevation.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval.

**Board Comments:**

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated in the interest of time she was the one who asked that this item be moved to the Regular Agenda and she needed clarification. She said on page A3.0 of this plan one door said new door and the door next to it did not indicate a new door. Yet, the door that was currently there did not match the door that was on the plan. She asked if they were going to leave the door that was there now. Or did they plan to change it to another door?

**Mr. Sanders** stated it was a drafting error, but their intention was to match the door. He said they will change it to a six panel door.

**Dr. Caplan** asked Mr. Meyerhoff if this was a circular stairway that might be approved by the City or not?

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated spiral staircases were not approved as a fire exit. He said the plans showed a spiral staircase, over which the Board did not have jurisdiction, but the petitioner would not be able to get a building permit if this was a fire stair.

**Public Comments:**

**Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated with regard to the comment on the circular stair, the plans showed a separate apartment on the top floor. The second means of egress was the circular stair.

**Mr. Sanders** stated that the main egress to the apartment (third story) was on the second floor. He said the spiral stairs were not serving multiple units on each floor. He said it was a convenience stair and not a required egress.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** suggested that if the petitioner did not get a building permit because of the stairs that he revise the plans and bring them back to Staff for approval.

**HDBR Action: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that both first floor doors on the front elevation will have six raised panel doors and that if the petitioner does not receive permission from the City to use a circular stair he will bring an alternative back to staff for approval. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Petition of Poticny, Deering, Felder  
John Deering  
HBR 05-3333-2  
Corner of Tattnall Street & West Gaston Street  
New Construction**

Mr. Deering recused himself.

Present for the petition was Pete Callejas.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval for a single family house.

### **FINDINGS**

The following Standards apply:

1. Section 8-3030 (k) Development Standards (5) nonrated structures: The construction of a new structure...in the historic district visible from a public street or lane shall be generally of such form, proportion, mass, configuration, material texture, color and location on a lot as will be compatible with other structures in the historic district, particularly nearby structures designated as historic...
2. Setbacks: There shall be no front yard setback except on tithing lots where there is a historic setback along a particular block front. *All the historic properties in this vicinity appear to have 0 lot line setbacks. A 3'-11" setback is proposed. Please clarify whether this is due to a sight-line clearance requirement at the corner?*
3. Dwelling unit type: *There are detached single family houses adjacent to and across the street from the proposed site. The proposed dwelling appears to be within the 75% building coverage requirement.*
4. Street Elevation type: *The proposed type is a three and one half story high stoop detached townhouse. Three story high stoop attached townhouses are found on Barnard Street one block away. The house next door to the proposed site is a detached three story high stoop house. However, the predominant types are one and two story houses in the immediate vicinity of the proposed site. Given the flooding problems in this area, a high stoop is a practical solution. However, the proposed street elevation type is inconsistent with the historic context in terms of number of stories and overall height.*
5. Entrances: *One of the previous structures on this site fronted Tattnall. The proposed entrance is consistent with this.*
6. Height: *The proposed lot is in a three story height zone. The proposed construction is a 3½ story house. This standard has not been met. Floor-to-floor height. The exterior expression of raised basements shall be not less than 6'-6" and not higher than 9'-6". The second story shall not be less than 11 feet. The height of each story above shall not be less than 10 feet. The proposed stoop is 11 feet above grade. This standard has not been met.*
7. Visual Compatibility Factors

Proportion of structures front façade: *The overall height and mass appears too large for the context. The height of the first floor is visually incompatible in this neighborhood.*

Proportion of openings: *The proportion of the openings at 3:5 is consistent with historic window sizes in the area. The oriel window next to the recessed porch on Gaston Street is visually incongruous in this area and may not meet the standard which states that bay windows are not permitted on structures over three stories in height.*

Rhythm of Solids to Voids: *There is a three bay rhythm on the front (Tattnall Street) façade and the windows have a 3:5 proportion and are aligned vertically. This meets the standards. However the side elevation (Gaston Street) is visually incongruous. There are two garage openings on Jefferson Street (a street to which many recent garages have been oriented), however there is a third garage door on the Gaston elevation. Gaston Street serves as an E-W through street and most buildings have their main entrance on Gaston. The large void of the third garage opening and the general imbalance of the recessed porch, projecting oriel and spacing of the windows is visually inconsistent here. The Gaston Street elevation is, in this case, as important visually as the front.*

Rhythm of structure on the street. *There were two smaller dwellings previously on this lot. The proposed structure is oriented in the same direction as one of the former residences. This corner lot certainly can support a somewhat prominent structure, but the proposed structure is too large in scale for the site.*

Porch projections: *There is a high stoop, side porch and rear recessed porch. These have been discussed in other sections.*

Roof Shapes: *The proposed roof is an intersecting gable with dormers. There are gable roofs in the vicinity, however this one due to the size of the house is very dominant visually.*

Walls of continuity: *The streetscape is defined by the facades of the proposed structure and garden wall.*

Scale: *The scale of the proposed structure both in height and mass is larger than the existing neighboring historic properties. The mass and scale as proposed would be in scale on the east end of Gaston Street, but appears massive in this context.*

Directional Expression: *The height and verticality is visually inconsistent with the historic structures in this immediate neighborhood.*

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Reconsider design to bring in conformance with the Historic District ordinance in terms of number of stories, height, garage openings, mass and scale, and bay window.

## **Petitioner's Comments:**

**Mr. Pete Callejas** stated they have a set of revised drawings. He said they could eliminate the window and put in some sort of vent if that was going to make it a three story as opposed to 3½ stories. The originally proposed structure was at this height and they made some revisions in the floor-to-floor heights on all three floors, which brought the building height down approximately 5'-4" from the original proposed height. On this elevation the only real change was the height, and the stoop was now in conformance with the ordinance. On the side elevation they eliminated the bay window, and the garage door which was here they moved to the Jefferson elevation to create a three car garage. He said they also made the inset porch higher. He said they also removed the dormers on this elevation and again the building height was 5'-4" lower. He said the rear entrance has also been relocated around the corner within their courtyard. He stated on the elevation facing north they brought the porch around to this side, which they could also do the same here by eliminating the window.

He further stated in regard to the site, the road cuts in a little on the corner and they were concerned that the portico might stick out too far to have the City 5'-6" required sidewalk width in front of a portico that extended beyond the lot line.

**Mrs. Reiter** commented that the stoop could not be higher than 9'-6".

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they could elaborate on what they did at the southwest corner where they incorporated the porch at the second level with the window at the third level?

**Mr. Callejas** stated they will be set back a few inches from the brick as if it was once an open porch and later infilled.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated on the second floor they had a railing with shutters.

**Mr. Callejas** stated this was more like a solid wall and they wanted to have a porch that they could enclose with operable shutters.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked what was the material on the third level in the opening around the window brick?

**Mr. Callejas** stated they intended it to be a vertical tongue-in-groove 1 X 6 cedar or something like that. He further stated they wanted this porch and originally they had on an earlier version a one story inset porch. He said they could easily go back to that, but he wanted the Board's feedback.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he liked their taking away the projection next to the porch and putting a window because it gave it more congruity. But he did not see what the decorating of the window on the third floor above the porch did. He said he felt they should emphasize that was a porch on the second level and carry the house over it unless they put a porch on the third level.

**Mr. Callejas** stated he was fine with that.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** asked if the petitioner would consider a continuance?

**Mr. Callejas** stated yes.

**HDBR Action:** **Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition until next month. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

\*Dr. Johnson left the meeting approximately 4:50 p.m.

**RE: Staff Reviews**

1. Petition of William Rhangos  
HBR 05-3321(S)-2  
232 East Broughton Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
2. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
Jim Morehouse  
HBR 05-3325(S)-2  
411 East Congress Street  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

3. Petition of Cummings Signs  
HBR 05-3335(S)-2  
415 West Liberty Street  
Sign Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

**RE: Other Business**

1. Petition of Dirk Hardison, for  
St. Luke's Baptist Church  
HBR 04-3149-2  
622 – 624 Ruben Court  
Request for 1 Year Extension  
Approved 02-11-2004

**HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the request for a 1-Year extension. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

2. Retreat

**Mr. Mitchell** asked the Board when would they like to schedule their retreat?

**Mrs. Seiler** stated due to the Bay Street and the gas company cleanup Savannah Electric will not have parking for their building until June 2005. She said if the Board was still willing to have the retreat in June then they could use Savannah Electric's facilities.

**Mr. Deering** asked why did the Board need to have a retreat?

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated it will help to orientate Mr. Steffen their new Board member as well as help the Board to regroup and remember certain things, such as not to redesign projects.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the Board could get a copy of what the City approved in regard to demolition?

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that a retreat was an excellent time to bring those issues up. He said may be there was room for some changes that might improve some things.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** added that not all the Board members are able to go to continuing education seminars. She said the retreat was one way they could get speakers to come and talk to the Board, like Jennifer Martin Lewis. She said she has attended a couple of seminars and she would be glad to share the materials.

**Mr. Webb** stated one thing that he and Mrs. Reiter have discussed in regard to demolition and how they now will approach the new demolition laws. He said this was also a state wide issue so they could have someone else come in to speak on that as well. He also suggested that any topics the Board thinks of to get them to Mrs. Reiter or himself so they could put together an agenda.

**Mr. Mitchell** encouraged the Board to email Mrs. Reiter or Mr. Webb with topics that they wanted to be on the agenda for the retreat.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated one issue that came up today was the Board used to review what they received in their packets. He said today there were two projects where the Preservation Officer was handed revisions this morning for the Board to look at the meeting. He said he did not like that idea. He said he felt the drawings needed to be submitted in accordance with ordinance.

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

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated at the Metropole it looked like something was going on outside, but she was not sure what they were doing. She asked Staff if they could check it out?

**Mrs. Brownfield** also stated that she wanted to thank Mrs. Reiter for giving the Board the names, addresses, and emails. She asked Mrs. Reiter and Mr. Webb to add their emails to the list.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated for Board members who wanted a parking pass to get that information into Mrs. Reiter. He said that would include their license plate number as well as make/model of their car.

**Mr. Mitchell** also announced that Dr. Johnson had to leave the meeting a little early today. He said Dr. Johnson will be absent at the next meeting (March) because he will be having knee replacement surgery and hope that he will be able to make the April meeting.

**RE: Minutes**

1. Distribution of Regular Meeting Minutes – January 12, 2005

**Mr. Mitchell** stated the January meeting minutes have been distributed to the Board. He said the Board will vote on the January meeting minutes at their next regularly scheduled meeting.

**RE: Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

**BR:ca**