

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

SPECIAL CALLED MEETING
112 EAST STATE STREET

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

ARRIL 24, 2006

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

Joseph Steffen
Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring
John L. Deering
Ned Gay
Eric Meyerhoff
Gene Hutchinson
Swann Seiler
John Mitchell
John L. Neely
Dr. Gerald Caplan

HDBR/MPC Staff Present:

Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner
Janine Person, Administrative Assistant

RE: CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m.

RE: REFLECTION

RE: SIGN POSTING

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

RE: Petition of Debra Caldwell
H-06-3573-2
514 East Bryan Street
Rear Addition

The Preservation Officer recommends a continuance.

Present for the petition was Richard Rolland.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for exterior alterations and construction of an addition on the building at 514 East Bryan Street. Alterations consist of adding a new window opening on the east elevation and a dormer on the west slope of the gable roof. The proposed two-story addition will be located at the rear of the building on the south elevation.

FINDINGS:

The historic building at 514 East Bryan Street was constructed in 1899, and is a rated structure within Savannah’s Landmark Historic District. The property is zoned RIP-A, Residential, Medium-Density. Currently, a one-story non-historic ca. 1975 addition is located on the rear of the building at the location of the proposed addition. The proposed wood frame addition will extend another 12-foot from this portion of the residence and is 8 feet – 5-inches wide. The addition will be surfaced in wood lap siding, painted to match the historic building, with a flat roof on a continuous brick foundation.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
<i>Building Coverage</i> (Section 8-3025): Maximum 75% in RIP-A.	The proposed building coverage is 52%	The standard is met.
<i>Additions</i> (Section 8-3030(I)(12)): Additions shall be constructed on the rear of the structure or the most inconspicuous side of the building. Where possible, the addition shall be sited such that it is clearly as appendage and distinguishable from the existing main structure.	The two-story addition is located on the rear of the building and will not be visible from Bryan Street, only the lane. The addition will be distinguished from the main residence by a reduction in height, below the historic cornice and brackets, paired windows instead of independent openings, and a different brick in the foundation.	Staff recommends approval. The existing corner board on the main residence should be retained to further distinguish the original from the addition.
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	The addition will be below the height of the main roof and cornice retaining the character defining bracketed eave of the historic residence. The window which will be covered over as a result of the construction will be installed on the second floor of the east elevation, aligning vertically and horizontally with the other windows on the building.	Staff recommends approval.
Additions shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.	An 8'-5" wide two-story addition is proposed.	The standard is met.
<i>Windows</i> (Sec. 8-3030 (I)(9)): Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction, provided that the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8", the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing, the lower sash shall be wider	Paired one-over-one, Monarch, true-divided-light, double-hung sash, wood clad windows are proposed for the addition.	Staff recommends approval. The Monarch windows have been previously approved in the historic district and meet the design standards.

than the meeting and top rails, and extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding. Windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.		
The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically.	The openings on the east side of the addition have been reconfigured and align vertically.	The standard is met.
<i>Roofs</i>	A flat roof is proposed with a ½” slope per foot toward the backyard.	Staff recommends restudying the roof. While it is located under the decorative historic elements or the main building, the flat roof appears out of character for the wood frame addition and does not relate to the historic residence.

RECOMMENDATION:

Previously, Staff recommended a continuance to restudy the placement of the openings, window light pattern, and roof shape. A majority of these issues have been addressed by the petitioner during the period between the Regular Meeting (April 12, 2006), and the Special Called Meeting. Therefore, Staff is recommending approval pending Board discussion of the roof element.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Rolland stated that they took the Staff comments and restudied the roof configuration. He stated that the original flat-roof proposal was intended to preserve the historic cornice. He stated that following the comment from Staff, they first studied putting a hip roof on the structure, but that it wouldn’t work because it was hiding the elements that they were trying to preserve. They tried to do another option with a gable roof, but that didn’t work either, and it created two technical difficulties. He stated that after restudying and meeting with Staff several times, that they feel that the first submission was the right one and are asking for the Board’s comments.

BOARD’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that raising the roof to the current roofline and continuing the depth of the eave and the eave brackets, or, leaving the roof where it is and then making an eave that is more in keeping with the other eave as a possible solution.

Mr. Rolland stated that he agreed with the comment and that it was a detail that they can add.

Mr. Deering stated that it would make it more successful and look less boxy; that it is very boxy with no overhang at all. He stated that it would better protect the wood siding with some overhang, because wood siding does not hold up to water very well unless it is protected.

Mr. Rolland stated that he agreed and that it is a detail they can add. He asked that since the flat doesn’t fit if it is possible to have a flat roof.

Mr. Deering stated that the flat roof is a fine solution as long as they have a more substantial eave and a cornice below the existing bracket level. He stated that they can bring the details back to Staff.

HDBR ACTION: Mr. Meyerhoff made the motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that they resubmit a revised eave line to Staff. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Petition of BKDW, LLC
 Ryan Bacha
 H-06-3574-2
 319 Abercorn Street
 New Construction Part I Height and Mass of a Carriage House; Demolition of Shed; Fence

The Preservation Officer recommends approval to demolish shed; continuance of Part I Height and Mass; approval of fence.

Present for the petition was Ryan Bacha.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for the following alterations and additions to the property at 319 Abercorn Street:

- 1) Demolition of a non-historic metal shed in the rear.
- 2) New construction Part I, Height and Mass, of a two-story carriage house, fronting East Liberty Lane.
- 3) Removal of an 11-foot – 9-inch non-historic wooden fence and replace with an 8-foot masonry wall.

FINDINGS:

The historic building at 319 Abercorn Street was constructed in 1888, and is a rated structure within Savannah’s Landmark Historic District. The adjacent property at 126 East Harris Street is owned by the same property owner and currently contains an addition for the residence at 319 Abercorn and numerous garden features including an eight-foot tall masonry wall along Harris Street and 11-foot – 9-inch wood fence along East Liberty Lane. Historically, the adjacent lot at 126 East Harris Street contained a carriage house at the rear of the property in the location of the proposed garage. Both properties are zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density).

NOTE: A minor recombination subdivision plat should be filed and recorded prior to issuance of a building permit.

The following standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) apply for the Part I **New Construction of the Carriage House:**

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<i>Height:</i> New construction shall be within the height limits shown on the height map (4 stories). Secondary	A 26’-2” tall two-story carriage house is proposed	The standard is met.

<p>structures which front a lane shall be no taller than two-stories.</p>		
<p><i>Proportion of structure's front facade:</i> The relationship of the width of a structure to the height of its front façade shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which it is visually related.</p>	<p>The proposed carriage house is 26'-8" wide and 26'-2", extending 24'-8" into the lot with a 7'-4" deep two-story porch on the south. A three story residence is located immediately east and a 26' tall two-story carriage house is located immediately west.</p>	<p>Staff recommends reducing the overall height of the proposed building. The second floor appears elongated due to the strong verticality of the windows. Although the intent is to match the first floor windows on the existing building to which it relates, the windows appear out of character for a carriage house and for a second floor.</p>
<p><i>Proportion of Openings:</i> The relationship of the width of the windows to the height of windows within a structure shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.</p>	<p>The proposed windows are 9'-1" tall and match the first floor windows on the existing historic residence to which this building relates. The windows on the second floor of the existing house are reduced in height to two-over-two panes of glass.</p>	<p>Staff recommends reducing the height of the windows from three panes of glass in height to two. Although the windows correspond to the first floor of the main residence, they should correspond to the second floor indicating the hierarchy of the building façade. Currently, the proposed openings do not relate to the neighboring structures and cause the building to have a second floor which is taller than the first. The plans indicate that the second floor windows at 9'-1" are taller than the garage doors on the first floor which are 8' tall.</p>
<p><i>Rhythm of solids to voids:</i> 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.</p>	<p>The north façade is broken into two symmetrical bays with two window openings over each garage.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p><i>Roof shapes:</i> The roof shape of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which it is visually related. Carriage house roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapet.</p>	<p>A low shed roof behind a parapet is proposed. The neighboring carriage house has a pitched roof behind a parapet.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>

<p><i>Scale of a building:</i> 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.</p>	<p>The window openings are 9'-1" in height and are much taller than neighboring buildings. The side stairs on the east elevation dominate the façade and lead to unknown destinations.</p>	<p>Staff recommends reducing the window height as stated previously and restudying the stair element to reduce the number of stairs needed on this elevation. Possibly relocating one on the south façade or internally within the building may solve this.</p>
<p><i>Lanes & Carriage Houses:</i> Carriage houses, garages, and auxiliary structures must be located to the rear of the property.</p>	<p>The proposed carriage house is located at the rear, lane side, of the property at 126 E. Harris Street.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>

Fence:

	<p>A 7' brick wall separated by 8' piers topped with a pre-cast concrete cap is proposed for the side yard on the west, next to the adjacent brick rowhouse. The wall will match the existing masonry wall along Harris Street and will be surfaced in Savannah Gray brick.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
--	---	-----------------------------------

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Approval for the demolition of the non-historic metal shed.
2. Continuance for Part I, Height and Mass, of the Carriage House to restudy the overall height, proportion of window openings, and exterior stair element. A minor recombination subdivision plat should be filed and recorded prior to the issuance of a building permit for the new construction.
3. Approval for the masonry garden wall.

BOARD'S COMMENTS:

Ms. Seiler stated that on Page 1A, that it looked like a floating dock and looked Venetian. She asked if it looked like that to them, with the light post.

Mr. Deering stated that it doesn't look like that to him but that it is in the spirit of some of the stairs that used to be in the lanes years ago. He stated that it is a modern interpretation of some of the old stairs.

Mr. Gay stated that you don't see any stairs but that it looks like a ramp and that instead of being perpendicular to the ground that they are at an angle.

Mr. Deering stated that they are things that they need to talk to the petitioner about, but that you won't see it because the end that was rehabilitated right in front, that the stair fits in where it can only be seen from the right-hand side. He stated that the space was completely filled with the stair and you should only see the end of the stair.

Ms. Seiler stated that Ms. Ward had suggested that one of them be moved inside.

Ms. Ward stated yes.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if it was the back of stairs.

Mr. Deering stated that it won't be seen from an angle walking down the lane because it is tucked in.

Dr. Caplan asked if Ms. Ward is recommending that the height of the windows on the second floor be reduced; and in commensurate to that reduce the height of the building. Not just for the windows because the windows would come under Part II. He asked if she wanted both done.

Ms. Ward stated the Dr. Caplan was right because she thinks that it affects the overall height of the building, and it creates a second floor, which is taller than the ground floor which isn't typical of carriage houses found in this ward.

Dr. Caplan asked about how much Ms. Ward felt that it needed to be reduced.

Ms Ward stated that the floor-to-floor height should be equal to the ground floor-to-floor height and what they have for the parapet.

Dr. Caplan stated that the first floor was eight feet and the second floor...

Ms. Ward stated that it be reduced by a foot and one-half or two feet.

Dr. Caplan stated that it is nine-foot – one-inch or something.

Mr. Deering stated that they are equal in height as they are.

Dr. Caplan stated that they are both at 11-foot 4-inches.

Ms. Ward stated yes, that they are both at 11 feet 4-inches and that the extra pane of window, if they were a foot tall, that she would recommend that they reduce the second floor by one foot.

Mr. Gay stated that if you look at the carriage house next door, it looks like it is six feet shorter. That it is obviously a totally different scale.

Dr. Caplan stated that it doesn't look like they are the same height, but that they may be according to the drawing.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Bacha stated that the physical model has been changed with the window heights and that they are one-foot lower than what was proposed in the drawings. That they are eight feet high and it can be seen from the lane side. He stated that the front side has been reduced to eight feet in height. That the finished floor-to-floor height is as it is because they have a proposed veranda that faces the courtyard, and the client wants it to connect to the courtyard. He stated that there were concerns about the stairs from the existing house going into the garage. That it was not going to be used as an apartment, that the client wants a two-car garage for the main house, and that the proposed second floor is going to be a guest suite and will never be used as rental property. He stated that he took the finished floor height of the new addition that is on the backside of the house, and used it as the finished floor height for the proposed veranda. He stated that there is a 2-foot 4-inch ground floor height for the proposed veranda which is part of the carriage house, and underneath is a schematic (Height and Mass), of a semi-enclosed area

to connect to the courtyard to keep it at the same elevation of the existing home's finished floor. He stated that the veranda area height is 7 feet 8-inches, 11 feet 4-inches from the garage finished floor to the second story finished floor, and keeping the 11 feet 4-inches for the inside proposed guest suite. He stated that there is a roof deck on top of the roof with a parapet wall. He could try to reduce the height by placing a wrought iron railing at the top so that the parapet is not as high. He stated that they are trying to reduce the height by having a railing at the top of the roof deck to reduce the mass of the building.

He stated that with the stairs they did not want to bring them to the front of the building, which would detract from the façade. He stated that they were trying to keep the stairs sandwiched between the existing neighboring building and the proposed carriage house so that it would not be seen. The railing will be reduced with stainless steel and vines for a light screen element. He stated that they were trying to keep it on the side elevation so that it would not interrupt the main façade facing the square, and that this façade was the least visible since it is such a tight area. He stated that since one could see the façade from the square, it is an inappropriate place to put a set of stairs. He stated that the second set of stairs provides access to the roof deck element. There would be a gate to get to the trash and the utilities. He stated that they are in the process of getting the two sites recombined so that it is one address.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Gay asked if the purpose of rail was so that there wouldn't be a solid parapet going all the way up.

Mr. Bacha stated yes, to reduce the height.

Mr. Gay asked if there were going to be people walking around on the roof.

Mr. Bacha stated yes.

Mr. Deering stated that he admires the attempt of the design and that it is a very good transitional building that is not quite modern and not quite historical. He stated that he does agree with Staff's comments that it is too large for its site and that it does not read as a carriage house. It is competing with the deteriorated wooden stucco building in front of it, and that it looks like it is piano nobile with the main level being above the garage doors, and the windows are out-of-scale with the neighboring windows. He stated that it is an interesting approach but that it doesn't suit its context as well as it could. He stated that he liked the garden elevations, the height needs to be reduced, and they might have to get eliminate the terrace at the same level as the addition that was put on the back. That the Board's charge is not with new architecture but with making it visually compatible with what is surrounding it that is historic.

Mr. Bacha stated that in talking with the client, and that they are so cramped in the back, and for what the client's needs are for the courtyard, that the terrace element opens up the area. He stated that in the site plan configuration, they are losing a lot of space if they don't pump up the veranda area.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he feels it is out of character with the surrounding buildings. He stated that the open railings above the parapet is out of character, that the number of windows on each of the elevations is out of character squeezing four windows in when three would be much more in character, and the five windows by the stairs to three windows would be much more in character. He stated that the rear end of the stairs would be seen from the north elevation, and they should be closed so that they can't be seen. He stated that he didn't know if they plan to have risers and treads, or just treads with an open riser, but that he feels that the north side should not be visible and should be totally enclosed by some type of material. He

stated that there are too many windows, the windows are too large to be in character, and the railing above the parapet is totally out of character.

Mr. Bacha stated that the guest suites overall height from finished floor to ceiling can be reduced which will reduce the mass of the carriage house. He stated that if they keep the roof deck then they have to extend the parapet wall up another six inches, so that if the railing is removed then it will increase the overall brick mass up to a total height of 26 feet 2 inches. He stated that they were trying to keep a modest ceiling height inside the proposed guest suite since it is a small square footage (900 square feet) for the proposed guest suite. That it is not a lot of room, so they are trying to keep it as large as possible when it comes to finished floor to ceiling height. He stated that if they had to they could reduce it to approximately a nine-foot ceiling height, and will reduce the overall height by one-foot overall.

Dr. Caplan asked if they propose to reduce the height of the second floor but not the garage floor. That it wasn't addressed but kept it the same.

Mr. Bacha stated that considering the age of the client and not having the stairs to go up and down to try to get from the garage to the veranda, which is why they were trying to keep the transition from going to the garage back to the addition minimal because there is minimal floor space. He stated that the client was not willing to change it. He stated that they would like to try to keep the garage at the ground floor height because it is needed for the veranda area. He stated that if they had to, the guest suite could become lower in height to try to avoid the amount of stairs on the courtyard side. He stated that on the façade with the stairs, they want to keep it light and not make it brick because then the overall structure becomes even greater in mass. That it could be an element that will allow light to pass through. Some type of grade or something to conceal the stairs would be fine. He stated they could place the landing on one elevation further back.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if they were planning to have risers and treads, or are they planning to just have the treads with an open riser.

Mr. Bacha stated that he would be up for suggestions. That he had a client meeting and has talked about the set of stairs coming further back to engage the veranda area. He stated that they could play with moving away from the lane elevation, and if the stairs were to be open it would be fine, or enclosed.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that in either case, the north side of the stairs should be enclosed so that they are not visible from the lane.

Mr. Bacha asked if Mr. Meyerhoff was referring to a conditioned space or a visual enclosure like for an air conditioner.

Mr. Deering stated that some sort of screening element would be fine.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that it could be an element that is compatible with whatever the finish is on the building so that it reads, instead of just having the stair treads showing with the railing.

Mr. Bacha stated that the back gate material that will lead into the stairwell could be used as a screen element.

Mr. Steffen stated that he would invite Mr. Bacha to ask the Board for a continuance on the Height and Mass issues so that he could digest the comments and come back to Staff with solutions, then they can go ahead and grant the approval for the demolition of the shed and the fence.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the demolition of the shed and approve the new fence, and that the petition be continued to further study Height and Mass. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects
H-06-3575-2
528 Selma Street
Part I and Part II New Construction of Three
Buildings for Residential Use and Rehabilitation
of a Railroad Switching Building**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions; recommends that the Board make a finding of fact that the requested height is visually compatible; recommends approval to Board of Zoning Appeals for a height variance and approval of rehabilitation.

Present for the petitioner was Jerry Lominack.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of three new residential buildings with 15, 12, and 6 units respectively. An existing 1947 railroad switching station will be restored and converted into six units.

FINDINGS:

The applicant has provided a thorough explanation of the design using the standards. The table below discusses only staff comments. The following Standards apply:

New Construction Part I Height and Mass and Part II Materials and Design

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: There shall be no front yard setbacks except on tithing lots where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided.	The new buildings follow the setbacks of the existing structures on each block face including the historic structure on Selma and the existing Church on Berrien.	This standard is met.
Dwelling unit type	Loft condominiums are proposed within contemporary row house type dwellings.	The primary types of structures in the vicinity are industrial in nature, suitable for loft development. The type is compatible.
Street elevation type	A high stoop is proposed.	This provides a reference to the Historic District townhouses but with an industrial reference also. There is one high stoop railroad building in the vicinity.
Entrances: None of the standards pertain exactly to this area but the guidelines	The unit entrances are oriented to Selma and Berrien Streets.	The intent of the standard is met.

<p>suggest that streets in the Historic District should be animated with the presence of dwellings and shops and not lifeless processions of blank walls, parking lots, driveways and garage doors.</p>		
<p>Building Height: The project is located in a four-story zone.</p>	<p>The main buildings are proposed are three and four stories. The four story buildings, however, have a penthouse with habitable space which in staff's opinion consists of a fifth floor. The applicant construes this story to be a mezzanine.</p>	<p>It is staff's opinion that the penthouse counts as a story, but is compatible because of the use of monitors on the railroad-related industrial buildings nearby. It is recommended that the Board make a finding of compatibility and the Board of Appeals grant a variance. The applicant's interpretation of a mezzanine could set adverse precedents for future projects elsewhere in the district.</p>
<p>Proportion of openings</p>	<p>Large expanses of glass are proposed with smaller divisions.</p>	<p>This is reflective of nearby industrial buildings.</p>
<p>Rhythm of solids to voids</p>	<p>The existing railroad building has been used to establish a theme for the fenestration.</p>	<p>The rhythm of solids to voids is reflective of the industrial buildings in the vicinity.</p>
<p>Rhythm of structure on the street</p>		<p>The rhythm along the street suggests a single building divided into regular bays.</p>
<p>Rhythm of porches</p>		<p>The stoops help establish a pedestrian-friendly environment.</p>
<p>Roof Shapes</p>	<p>A flat roof with parapet is proposed.</p>	<p>This is compatible with nearby industrial buildings.</p>
<p>Walls of Continuity</p>	<p>Historically these streets were lined with one and two story structures rather tightly related. The Selma Street block was directly across from various buildings related to the Union Passenger station. On Jones Street were two story row houses, industrial buildings and the shop buildings for the Central of Georgia RR.</p>	<p>The proposed alignment of structures, recreates a wall of continuity along these streets, and helps reestablish a neighborhood torn down for the I-16 off ramp.</p>
<p>Scale</p>		<p>The scale relates both to the switching building and nearby industrial buildings.</p>
<p>Materials</p>	<p>Walls: Pre-cast insulated structural concrete panels with natural finish.</p>	<p>The materials are all compatible with the industrial surroundings. Their use</p>

	<p>Windows: Brushed mill-finish color aluminum window wall system with Solex Green tinted glass. Railings painted steel, color to be submitted later with steel cable system. Glass paneled aluminum garage door system. Solid core wood entry door.</p>	<p>helps reduce the overall scale of the project.</p>
	<p>Zinc Clad penthouse Slate Blue glass mosaic tile within window system Wood siding such as Brazilian Cherry at penthouse level and on Selma Street unit.</p>	

Rehabilitation of the Switching Building:

The portion of this building visible from the public right-of-way – principally Selma Street – is to be repaired in-kind. The wire and opaque glass will be replaced with clear, insulated glazing.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. That the Board find that the penthouses are compatible based on the industrial precedent in the area and recommend approval of the penthouse to the Board of Zoning Appeals.
2. Approval of Part I Height and Mass and Part II design details as submitted for the three new construction buildings on Selma and Berrien Streets.
3. Approval of the renovation of the Switching building.
4. Railing and door colors to be brought to Staff for approval.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Lominack stated that they agree with all of Staff’s comments, but they do take exception to the interpretation of the height and the mezzanine. He stated that the design standards, when they address the top floor say, “The space between the floor and the ceiling above the floor of such story” constitutes a story. He stated that it does not say that the ceiling has to be all at the same level. He stated that the same section defines a mezzanine that doesn’t exceed one-third of the floor that it is open below. He stated that in this case the amount of floor area that opens to the fourth floor is 29.9 percent. They do take issue with Staff’s comments, and that their interpretation of the ordinance is different from Staff’s interpretation. Other than that, they agreed with the recommendations of Staff. He stated that they are still searching for an awning window that actually meets egress requirements and that they have not been able to find one. He stated that the proportions of the proposed double-hung or single-hung window are the same, they fit within the same framework, and they are not changing sizes as far as proportions are concerned.

Mr. Steffen stated that it is their contention that there is no need to send it to the Board of Zoning Appeals and that the Board can approve it as it is.

Mr. Lominack stated that it was his interpretation, and that he recognized that it is different from Staff's interpretation.

Mr. Steffen stated that he just wanted to make sure he understood.

Ms. Seiler stated that she sees the decks off the bigger condominium apartments and asked why they decided not to add decks or balconies off the others.

Mr. Lominack stated that there were a couple of reasons. He stated that the view toward the I-16 ramp is not as impressive as the view back toward the Historic District and the bridge. That the client wanted a broader range of price options and the upper units facing north are much higher priced units.

Ms. Seiler stated that she sees them getting decks.

Mr. Lominack stated that there wasn't any real reason for not doing it.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if it is because it is a bedroom that they need egress out on the balcony.

Mr. Lominack stated that the Building Code requires that all sleeping rooms have an egress.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if there was an egress at the stairs.

Mr. Lominack stated that an alternate means of escape is what it is referred to in the code; a second means of escape.

Mr. Deering asked if he proposed to put the double-hung windows within the proposed framework.

Mr. Lominack stated yes; within the aluminum framework and it is a standard option by Kawneer and by YKK. He stated that it is the same way that you fit casements or awnings within a system. He stated that they are not creating a new window.

Mr. Steffen inquired as to the name "Frog Town".

Mr. Lominack stated that when the plans were originally submitted that it was called "Union", but historically it is within the Frog Town area, and everyone liked the name Frog Town better. He stated that the client informed him that they are going to petition for a historical marker to commemorate the history of the Frog Town area.

Ms. Fortson-Waring asked where the part about the penthouses is in the ordinance or guidelines to see the petitioner's opinions versus the Staff's opinions.

Mr. Lominack stated that it is Number 1 under the Design Standards, Height. He stated that the issue that deals with the mezzanine is Item (C) in the Design Standards. That it should be in the second page of the package that they submitted.

Mr. Neely asked if it was geared for condominium sales or apartment rentals.

Mr. Lominack stated that it would be condominium.

Ms. Reiter stated that her interpretation was that there would be a fifth floor of which the part of the ceiling and the walls are gone. She stated that it is a fifth story; that it works to have the penthouse in this location, but it would not work in other sections of the Historic District. She stated that there is a phantom story from which a mezzanine has been carved, and the process that was set up was that it goes to Board of Zoning Appeals, the Board recommend approval, and they approve the fifth story.

Dr. Caplan asked if they move for approval pending clearance of the floor.

Ms. Fortson-Waring stated that Mr. Lominack's whole point is that it is not needed.

Mr. Steffen stated that the issued to decide is relatively clear. They can accept Staff's interpretation of that particular section, or they can accept Mr. Lominack's interpretation of the section. He stated that if they accepted Staff's interpretation then the process would be that the Board of Zoning Appeals would have to determine or allow them a variance for this project. He stated that is what the question is and that candidly there are two competing views of the same section and that it is up to the Board to determine in their best judgment which one is correct.

Mr. Lominack stated that they were friendly differences of opinions.

Mr. Steffen stated absolutely, and that is the way that he hopes he is describing it.

Mr. Lominack stated that there is a cross-section in the package of information that was submitted that cuts right through the area.

Mr. Steffen thanked Mr. Lominack for submitting the information because it is helpful.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that if Staff's recommendation is out of concern for precedent that he thinks it is a unique site, in a unique situation, and that if they make a motion that they can use the work unique in it, but that he doesn't see anything wrong in this particular instance; that it is compatible to the area. He stated that it doesn't necessarily have to set a precedent in any other area.

Ms. Fortson-Waring stated that Section 8-3030, Page 10 (G), states that penthouses used other than to enclose stairways or elevator machinery shall be considered a story. She stated that it was pretty clear and that it appears that Staff is right.

Mr. Deering stated that it's not to disagree with anyone's intent in this, but that he sees them as penthouses as well. He stated that a mezzanine to him is a bigger space with a floor floating within it and this is a projection. He stated that they have simply changed the rules and said that the ceiling steps up, and that they could say that, but he thinks that in their purview that it counts as a penthouse and if the Board feels so, that they could just go the BZA and get approval.

Mr. Lominack stated that his reasoning for the opinion is that it does open to the floor below. That it constitutes less than a one-third area of the floor to which it opens, and that the ordinance did not say anywhere that a ceiling had to be flat. He stated that when working on the Height Map that he became concerned that the Height Map would create situations and funny looking parapets and things occurred to try and add interest.

Mr. Deering stated that he doesn't disagree with what the petitioner is doing but that he agrees with Ms. Reiter that the whole think works in a context.

Mr. Lominack stated that in order to move through the process they would have to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals and they would do that. He stated that they have already been delayed, they would prefer not to, but if they have to they will.

Mr. Steffen stated that if they decide that Staff's interpretation, that Ms. Fortson-Waring has given them additional ammunition for the position, that the Board can still follow the Staff's recommendation which is to recommend approval to the Board of Zoning Appeals. He stated that if they do so that they do it enthusiastically given the Board's compliments on the project.

Ms. Fortson-Waring stated that she was not absolutely convinced that it is a penthouse, given Mr. Lominack's comments. She stated that if they determine that it is a mezzanine, then she would defer to the architects, because it is really an issue of design as opposed to statutory construction. She stated that it is either a penthouse or mezzanine. That if it's a penthouse it's a story and if it's a mezzanine it's not.

Mr. Steffen stated that they should not be overly concerned with precedent, because people would always raise precedent, but they were dealing with issues of interpretation and issues of architectural design. He stated that Mr. Meyerhoff stated that they have a lot of authority to decide what precedent is and what is not.

Ms. Fortson-Waring stated that the By-Laws or guidelines stated that nothing that they did set precedence. That each petition was viewed upon its own merits.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that it was unique and that it seemed appropriate.

HDBR ACTION: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as presented. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Coastal Canvas
H-06-3557(S)-2
6 East Liberty Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
2. Petition of Coastal Canvas
H-06-3558(S)-2
9 West Drayton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
3. Petition of Irene Cochran
H-06-3561(S)-2
312 East Huntingdon Street
Exchange Windows
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
4. Petition of Carlton & Beth Ann Gibson
H-06-3572(S)-2
523 East Gaston
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

5. Petition of Coastal Canvas
H-06-3576(S)-2
51 Barnard Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Amended Petition of Hansen Architects
Patrick Phelps
H-06-3548-2
215 York Street
Alteration
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

RE: OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Fortson-Waring asked if anyone was going to Bainbridge for Preservation, especially any of the new members. That they could send one person and it would really be helpful for those who are new. She stated that they have some interesting things planned for Bainbridge, but if they can't make it, there will be another training session in the fall. That they can send two people in the fall and it will be in the northern part of the state as opposed to the southern part.

Mr. Steffen stated that it is a wonderful opportunity, and that he would encourage them to go, having attended the last one.

*(Mrs. Fortson-Waring left at approximately 3:10 p.m.)

**RE: WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT CERTIFICATE
OF APPROPRIATENESS**

RE: MINUTES

RE: ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Historic Preservation Director

BR/jnp