

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

REGULAR MEETING  
112 EAST STATE STREET

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

AUGUST 9, 2006

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

Joseph Steffen, Chairman  
Swann Seiler, Vice-Chairman  
John L. Deering, III  
Ned Gay  
Gene Hutchinson  
Lester Johnson  
W. John Mitchell

HDRB Members Not Present:

Gerald E. Caplan  
Eric Meyerhoff  
John Neely

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director  
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner  
Dewayne Stephens, Historic Preservation Intern  
Janine N. Person, Administrative Assistant

RE: REFLECTION

RE: SIGN POSTING

**Ms. Ledvina** stated the continued petition of Gonzalez Architects was not properly posted. She showed pictures of the building, with signs that stated the meeting date of June 14, 2006. Therefore, she did not feel the public had been given proper notice. She felt that the Board needed to continue this item until September's meeting.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated his name and said he was there on behalf of the applicant. He said it was his understanding that if a project had been noticed and continued, that notice had been served. He said this was a legal issue but it had been his finding anywhere he had practiced in the country, and it had always been the case here on continued items.

**Mr. Yellin** stated it was the law in Georgia. That you are not required to continually post and post and post. When you do in fact, continue a meeting to a date certain, it does not require reposting or readvertising. All due process requirements had been met by the Zoning Procedural Law.

**Ms. Reiter** stated it had been posted on the MPC web page.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if the change was posted on the web page.

**Ms. Reiter** stated both the preliminary and the final agenda had been posted on the web page.

**Ms. Ledvina** stated she was just going to read right from the guidelines. It said, “Except for minor repairs as defined in Section F(3)(a), at least ten days notice of a public hearing on a Request for Certificate of Appropriateness shall be erected on the premise of the building or structure for which a certificate is being requested. Such signs shall be furnished by the Preservation Officer, shall be weather resistant, shall have a minimum size of 22 by 28, shall show the application number, a statement of the proposed action, the scheduled date, time, and place of the hearing, and the telephone number for further information. Such sign shall be erected within ten feet of any traveled public right-of-way or lane onto which a structure abuts and/or faces. The lower edge of the sign shall be of efficient height to be read from the roadway.”

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that addressed the initial application, it did not address the continued situation.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if anyone wanted to add anything or comment on this. He said it was a bit of an unusual procedure that the Board was asked to make that type of interpretation, and he was not certain whether the procedure would be best served by him, ruling as a chair on this, or whether the Board would vote on it. He said he was going to make a ruling on it, and if any Board members disagree with that ruling, he would entertain a motion otherwise. He ruled that the code section that had been sited required the initial posting to be done exactly as Ms. Ledvina indicated, but as a matter of continuance, due process would simply require what they had done. Which was, the continuance was made during the meeting, and it was also posted on the website. He did not find anything in the ordinance that told the Board they have to do anything more for a continuance.

**Mr. Deering** said if the Board continued it to a date certain, the Board would hear it.

**RE: CONSENT AGENDA**

**RE: Petition of Image Is Everything  
Heath Moore  
H-05-3360-2  
223 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
One-year extension of previous approval for  
exterior alterations and a sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Continued Petition of Ciphers Design Company  
H-06-3608-2  
104 West Jones Street  
Rear Porch Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Continued Petition of Coverall Construction  
Rickey Basko  
H-06-3633-2  
408 East Hall Street  
Demolition/New Construction of a Carriage  
House**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

RE: Petition of Dawson + Wissmach Architects  
H-06-3649-2  
318 East Liberty Street  
Rehabilitation

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the Consent Agenda items as submitted. Dr. Deering seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

RE: Continued Petition of Lee Meyer, AIA  
H-06-3530-2  
417 East Jones Street  
Alteration of Rear Servant's Quarters

Continued to September 13, 2006.

RE: Continued Petition of Steve Day  
H-06-3562-2  
20 East Taylor Street  
Rehabilitation/Addition

Continued to September 13, 2006.

RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
H-06-3566-2  
14 – 22 West Liberty Street  
New Construction Part I Height and Mass of a  
Five-Story Mixed Use Building (Hotel,  
Condominiums, and Retail)

Continued to September 13, 2006.

RE: Continued Petition of Sign Mart, Incorporated  
Bill Norton  
H-06-3630-2  
2 West Bay Street  
Sign

Continued to September 13, 2006.

RE: Continued Petition of David Blich  
Custom Construction Company  
H-06-3637-2  
433 Tattnell Street  
Alterations

Continued to September 13, 2006.

RE: Continued Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay  
H-06-3588-2  
508 – 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue  
Demolition/New Construction, Part II Height and  
Mass of a Five-Story Hotel

Continued to September 13, 2006

RE: Continued Petition of Sottile & Sottile, LLC  
Christian Sottile  
H-06-3626-2  
38 Habersham Street  
409 & 413 Congress Street  
418 – 422 Congress Lane  
New Construction Part I Height and Mass

Continued indefinitely at the request of the petitioner.

RE: Continued Petition of Hansen Architects  
Erik E. Puljung  
H-06-3635-2  
400 Block of McDonough Street  
New Construction

Continued to September 13, 2006

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Mitchell made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the Continued Agenda as submitted. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

RE: Amended Petition of Hansen Architects  
Erik Puljung  
H-05-3423-2  
9, 11, 13, and 15 East Macon Street  
New Construction, Part I Height and Mass of a  
Four-Unit Row

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Erik Puljung.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval for four three-story townhouses at 9 – 15 East Macon Street.

**FINDINGS:**

In November 2000, the Review Board approved Part I Height and Mass for a six-unit development to be built in three phases. A Part II design approval was granted on January

2001, for 5 and 7 East Macon Street. Phase I is now complete. In July 2005, a revised Phase II was approved. The current submittal replaces that approval with a request for a new approval of a revised Phase II and III.

See attached table for discussion of standards.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval of Height and Mass, with the comment that the third floor be lowered one-foot to eliminate the “high brow” look of the space between the top of the window and the projecting brick corbelling.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Puljung** stated they had responded to Staff’s comments about the parapet height. He said they had actually lowered the parapet 12 inches and added one more layer of fenestration in the space above the upper windows. They had added a layer of vents in the attic space and a double row lock that would come up in design detail. They planned to articulate the façade and it would apply to the Drayton Street elevation as well as the Charlton Street elevation.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Joe Saseen** expressed concern about the garage openings on Charlton Street.

**Mr. Deering** asked if there was any possibility of varying the south elevation. He said he knew Phase II would be built first and asked what Mr. Puljung was calling Phase III was certain.

**Mr. Puljung** stated it was as certain as they could be so that things would progress in the future. He said that was the plan to proceed.

**Mr. Deering** stated there were the existing two townhouses that Mr. Shaver had built, the two that Mr. Puljung had recently done, and then these two. The Charlton Street elevation does vary on each pair, and if Mr. Puljung could do it again in Phase III with the back elevation, it would help alleviate the facades.

**Mr. Puljung** stated the guidelines said this was what they were supposed to do. They were supposed to face the interior street. He said he would be more than happy to look at Phase III.

**HDRB ACTION:** **Mr. Deering made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the Phase III south elevation be restudied. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: Continued Petition of Gonzalez Architects  
Jose Gonzalez  
H-06-3550-2  
304 East Bryan Street  
New Construction, Part I Height and Mass of a  
Four-Story Hotel**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval** for Part I.

Present for the petition was Mr. Jose Gonzalez.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval of a proposed four-story extended stay hotel on the lots between 304 East Bryan Street and 324 East Bryan Street.

**FINDINGS:**

The site is zoned Residential-Business-Commercial (R-B-C) and adjoins a Residential-Institutional-Professional-Amended (R-I-P-A) zone in Warren Ward. An existing one-story historic building at the corner of Bryan and Lincoln Streets is also to be renovated. The maximum building lot coverage in an R-B-C is 50 percent.

The applicant has amended the proposal deleting the pool deck and covered construction on the northeast corner of the parcel. The project now meets the 50 percent lot coverage and a lot coverage variance is no longer required. The item was removed from the Board of Appeals agenda at the applicant's request.

The footprint is now less than 11,000 square feet and no longer meets the definition of large-scale development.

**The following Part I Height and Mass Standards apply to the revised project:**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.	A ten-foot setback is proposed between the structure and the neighboring fence.	The standard is met.
Dwelling Unit Type	This is a suites hotel in the form of a row of townhouses.	
Street elevation Type	The high stoop form has been chosen.	
Entrances	There are three pedestrian entrances at ground level to the parking garage on Bryan Street and three entrances at the second level from high stoops on Bryan Street.	This standard has been met.
Building Height:	The overall height is 43 feet +/- . Some sections are about three feet lower. The existing historic building is one story. The floor-to-floor heights meet the intent of the ordinance. Comments were made in a previous Board meeting about the placement of a four-story-element on the lane behind the one story historic structure. Revisions have been made to the design as follows: The NW corner of the project adjacent to the historic building has been modified to step back from Lincoln Street.	The petitioner has attempted to address the concerns of the Board and public by stepping back from Lincoln and placing the pool court along the lane. This reduces the impact of the construction on the adjacent historic properties.

	A two-story “loggia” has been provided that is 4’-4” deep. Behind this is a three-story portion that in turn steps back another 4’-8”. This four-story portion extends 50’ along the lane. The remainder of the property along the lane is open for pool court and parking.	
Tall Building Principles and large scale development	Not applicable due to revised drawings.	
Proportion of structure’s front facade	The divisions appear taller than they are wide.	The divisions appear compatible.
Proportion of openings	The windows appear to have a 3:5 proportion except for three accent windows on the Bryan Street side. They align vertically. It is not clear that they meet the depth requirement in the ordinance.	It is important that the façade not have a flat appearance. See comments in Design section. Ground floor windows should be reduced in height and parlor level windows increased in height to better simulate traditional window proportions.
Rhythm of solids to voids	A three bay rhythm is utilized which reflects the neighborhood.	This appears compatible.
Rhythm of structure on street	The different sections of the building now have a 30’ rhythm or close to it	This appears compatible.
Rhythm of entrances, porch projections, balconies	Several covered high stoops are proposed along Bryan Street. A pair of glass doors is proposed to balconies on Bryan Street and porches are proposed on Bryan nearer Lincoln Street.	See Part II comments for design detail of proposed balconies and stoops.
Walls of continuity	A wall appears to be proposed for the lane. No design details given.	Need dimensions and detail of wall.
HVAC	HVAC is to be handle don the roof. Trash storage and pick up is not clear.	Need information on trash storage and pick up.
<b>PART II DESIGN DETAILS</b>		
Materials	<u>Windows:</u> Marvin Ultimate, Insulated aluminum clad, “storm plus” Medium Bronze. The lintels and sills will be Continental Cast stone in a cream color. Windows are recessed 6” from face of building. <u>Brick:</u> Century Plus Columbia 4 rough red with a red mortar.	<u>Windows:</u> Need more info. It appears this is storefront material. Are these what is on the main hotel? <u>Brick:</u> Staff recommends that a material sample board be installed on site to study the mortar and brick color. Recent projects elsewhere in the District lack contrast and

	<u>Stucco</u> : Provence Crème By Behr	depth because the brick and mortar are so monochromatic. <u>Stucco</u> : Is the stucco a true stucco or a Dryvit system.
Windows, Doors	The windows and doors appear to be storefront material.	The doors to the balconies would be more compatible if they were multi-paned and less like storefront material. Not enough information has been given about the front door assemblies or the ground floor doors, but they should not be storefront material.
Stoops	Brick piers, concrete stairs with stone treads and risers, cast iron railing, painted wood column and molding, wood cornice. The stoop canopy is designed to not have a roof in the traditional sense but is cut out with two drainpipes coming out the front of the stoop.	The stoop canopy needs to be redesigned to have a proper roof and eliminate the drainpipes. Staff has examples of properly detailed traditional stoop canopies. Provide a stoop section through the stairs to illustrate the profile of the tread and riser. It would be appropriate to add a finishing detail at the bottom of the railing such as a newel or curl back for the top railing.
Balconies	Concrete floors with iron railings. Discussion was had between staff and the applicant that the balconies on Bryan Street should project rather than be a railing across the window. Verify that this detail was revised.	There is opportunity to minimally address a little more detail on the balconies. Wood floors or simulated wood floors would be more appropriate than concrete.
Facades	A brick façade is proposed on most of the elevation. The brick is red and the mortar is red. There is contrast with the cast stone lintels and sills.	An enlarged materials sample on site would help determine whether the red brick and mortar are too monochromatic. The first floor rustication does help to break up the façade.
Renovation of the one story historic building	The renovation restores the arched opening on Bryan Street. Essentially, the existing openings on Lincoln are being infilled with storefront. The adjacent portion of the new building is setback some on Bryan Street so the old building “reads”.	The basic character of the building is retained.



**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval of Part I Height and Mass and discussion of Staff's concerns regarding Part II design details. If the Board agrees most of these could be resolved with revised drawings to Staff.

**Mr. Steffen** stated Staff did not have any qualifications in recommending Part I approval, but had voiced some specific concerns about items in Part II. He wanted to know if Staff had given the Board enough information to make a decision.

**Ms. Reiter** stated they were revised drawings addressing the concerns.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if they addressed all of the concerns.

**Ms. Reiter** stated they had, but she felt they needed to see a brick sample on-site.

**Mr. Steffen** stated Staff's only recommendation for a condition was to have a brick sample on-site.

**Ms. Reiter** answered that was right.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Jose Gonzalez** stated he had worked with Staff to address the issues. He wanted to make a comment for the record regarding the question of notice was brought before the Board. He said he had met with the petitioner in his office, and had reviewed the plans with her. He said they had modified the entire Lincoln Street elevation to suit her concerns, and she had picked up a revised copy of the plans from his office in person. He was shocked to have heard the whole issue of notice and thought it needed to be put into the record.

**STAFF COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Deering** stated he did not feel the Board had enough information to do a Part II design review. He thought there were too many things that needed designing that had not been addressed. He thought Ms. Reiter's point about the balconies was very good. The balconies appeared, just from the detailing that was received from Mr. Gonzalez, that they were just concrete motel balconies, and with tile on them it does not make it any more suitable to the district. He said he thought the parlor floor windows were entirely too short for this building and for the expression of the story. The front stoop column and entablature details were not very well thought out. They looked rather suburban and did not follow any particular order or any proportional method that you find in classical architecture. The stucco portions of the front façade resemble townhouses, but they have no direct entrance from the street. As far as Height and Mass goes, he thought the petitioner had done a good job in manipulating the project to where it works better on the site than it did when they first brought it, but he thought the design needed more work.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he wanted to go through the four concerns to make sure that Mr. Gonzalez and the rest of the Board understood what they were talking about. He said there was concern about the appearance of the balconies as it relates to tile being placed on them.

**Mr. Deering** stated there were no brackets; he thought the materials were wrong, he did not think exposed concrete should be seen that was finished like the stucco underneath. He thought it should actually be thought out and other balconies in the district should be looked out in reference to detailing the balconies.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if Mr. Deering said the parlor windows were too short so that they were not compatible.

**Mr. Deering** stated within the expression of the first story. He said if you have a story height that was that tall, you would have taller windows within it.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if Mr. Deering was talking about windows that are possibly as tall as a transom.

**Mr. Deering** answered as tall as the transoms on the doors, yes.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the third comment was about the stoop details, that they were too suburban.

**Mr. Deering** stated they were not very well detailed. He said they were just boxy and there was not enough thought being put into the stoop details. The columns and the entablature particularly, not the ground floor portion.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the last comment he thought everybody understood that there were no entrances to the street on the front facades.

**Mr. Gonzalez** answered that there were entrances on the street. There was only one part of the section that did not have openings. He said they could certainly do that and they did not have any objections.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated there were obviously issues of nuance and everyone sees these things slightly different. He said they would be willing to work on those specific sections, and Mr. Deering or Staff could come by and visit to see the changes they had made, to see if they had been addressed properly. They were trying to please as many people as they could.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Ms. Reiter about the four items that Mr. Deering had raised with the Board, did she still feel it was something the Board should approve on Part II, and was this something she could handle through Staff review, or was this something she believed the Board needed to have actual information on.

**Ms. Reiter** said it was up to the Board.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that Mr. Steffen assumed the Board had all agreed with Mr. Deering, which had not occurred yet. She said they had not heard from the public.

#### **COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated he objected to consideration of Part II on the basis that it was not properly noticed. As Ms. Ledvina read the posting requirements, which said the posting shall show the application, a statement of the proposed action, and the agenda went out just as a Part I review. The Architectural Review Committee of Historic Savannah held off any consideration of design details because they did not think it would be coming before the Board today, and they were not prepared to make any comments except to say they think the building lacks the attention to detail that buildings on Warren Square possess. He said he would object to hearing Part II, and in the future, Part I cannot be advertised, and then Part II heard.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated they had no objection to the issue of notice and they certainly did not want their projects to ever be questioned on notice.

**Mr. Doug Bean** stated he owned 324 East Bryan, the house adjacent to the project. He said he knew a lot of work had gone into the project so far, and he wanted to thank Ms. Reiter for tolerating his inquisitions as to what was going on and what it was going to look like. He wanted to congratulate the Board and prior Boards for being such good stewards of the Historic District. He said he and his wife were enthusiastic about the project. They were not looking forward to the construction phase, but they looked at their section of Bryan as a dark tunnel with a parking garage on one side and an old 1940's or 1950's block office building, and a beautiful old blacksmith shop at the end of the street. He wanted the Board to know he hoped the project would move along and they were excited to have it.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he would go ahead and rule that the Board was there to determine on Part I because of the notice issue. He asked if any member of the Board wished to have any discussion or comment specifically about the Staff's recommendation that the Board approve Part I.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated she thought there needed to be a motion to consider Part II for next month. She did not think Mr. Steffen could just rule on it. She thought a motion would be more proper.

**Mr. Steffen** asked about a motion to do what.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** answered to consider Part II design next month because it had been presented to the Board, and they had heard findings and evidence on it.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he was ruling that it had not been properly presented to the Board because it was not noticed. It would go through the regular course of business.

**Mr. Gay** stated the agenda did not say anything about Part II.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated the Board had heard evidence on Part II.

**Mr. Gay** stated the Board gets that all of the time.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the Board heard a lot of things here that were not proper, and they would just go ahead and leave it for now and asked for a motion.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Gay made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review accepted Staff's recommendation to approve Part I as submitted. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Continued Petition of Roy Ogletree  
H-06-3570-2  
543-547 East McDonough Street  
New Construction Part II, Design Details Phase I

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Roy Ogletree.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for new construction Part II, Design Details, of a semi-attached three and one-half-story duplex facing East Broad Street. Part I, Height and Mass was approved in a master plan of the entire trust lot on May 10, 2006. The following changes have been made for the Part II submittal for the East Broad Street building only:

1. Previously this area contained three attached townhouses on three parcels. The current proposal is for a semi-attached duplex fronting East Broad Street on two parcels. The lot coverage and density requirements were met.
2. Previously, the buildings were 32 feet deep by 20 feet wide and three and one-half stories tall with an overall height of 41 feet 10 inches. The new proposal is for two units that are 32 feet deep by 30 feet wide and three and one-half stories tall, for an overall height of 41 feet 2 inches.
3. The three bay rhythm of the previous row of townhomes has been maintained in the new proposal. Independent raised stoops have been combined into a paired stoop entrance at 9 feet 5¾ inches above grade. The basic form of the previous submittal has been maintained.
4. The site plan has been altered increasing the number of curb cuts from one on McDonough Street to one on each street, facing McDonough and Perry Streets. This was done to help mitigate the appearance of surface paving in the paved through driveway. The current plans call for two more intimate drives with green space for the residents.

**FINDINGS:**

The following Part II Design Standards (Section 8-3030) Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
<p><b>Exterior Walls (I)(8):</b> Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.</p>	<p>Exterior walls, chimneys, and portico base will be clad in brick. Brownish color brick “Swan Quarter”, by Hanson Brick, with a white mortar “Savannah Ivory” by Lafarge is proposed. The sample provided indicates a tight running bond with a clean joint appearance.</p> <p>Hardi-Trim will be placed at the fascia and sides of dormers. It will be painted Sherwin Williams “Dover White” SW6385 – as per chip submitted.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval with the condition that a sample panel (4’ x 4’) be constructed on the site to verify that the proposed exterior surface will be consistent with what is being proposed. The panel should remain on the site for the duration of construction to ensure quality control.</p>
Standard	Proposed	Comments
<p><b>Windows and Doors (I)(9):</b> Windows shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian. Double glazed</p>	<p>Six-over-six, double-hung sash, Jeld-Wen Caradco Collection, aluminum clad windows with simulated</p>	<p>Verify dimension and profile of muntin and the use of a spacer bar. Detail section of window should be provided</p>

<p>windows are permitted 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 than the meeting and top rails, and extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding. The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically. Window sashes shall be inset not less than 3” from the façade of a masonry building. Windows shall be wood or wood clad.</p>	<p>divided lights are proposed. The windows will be “French Vanilla” – as per color sample submitted. Cast stone lintels and brick sills will be used.</p> <p>Front entrance doors will be six panel solid wood doors painted Charleston Green.</p>	<p>to staff, verifying the placement of the window within the wall. Indicate material for rear French doors.</p>
<p><b>Shutters (I)(9):</b> Shutters shall be hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening. The placement of the horizontal rail shall correspond to the location or the meeting rail of the window. Shutters shall be constructed of durable wood or other materials as approved by the board.</p>	<p>Shutters will be operable louvered cedar shutters with copper cap and cast shutter dogs. Shutters will be painted Charleston Green. Center rails align with meeting rails in windows.</p>	<p>The standard was met.</p>
<p><b>Roof Shape (I)(10):</b> Gable roof pitches shall be between 4:12 and 8:12. Roofs shall be covered with standing seam, slate, and tile or asphalt shingles.</p>	<p>A side gable roof with a 6:12 pitch surfaced in architectural shingles “Estate Gray” is proposed.</p>	<p>Verify that dormers within the roof will feature the same material.</p>
<p><b>Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches(I)(11):</b> Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street. Infill between foundation piers shall be recessed so that the piers are expressed. Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, pre-cast stone, marble, sandstone or slate. Wood portico posts shall have a cap and base molding with the capital extending outward of the architrave. Balusters shall be place between upper and lower rails, and the</p>	<p>A paired high stoop entrance is proposed. It projects 4’-2” from the face of the building. The base is made of brick with cast stone treads and risers with a pronounced lip. A ground level entry with and iron gate and brick arch header is within the base of the portico. The balustrade is comprised of iron handrails, pickets, and newel painted Charleston Green. Ten-inch Tuscan perma-cast porch columns will support a wood entablature and shallow hip roof surfaced in painted metal.</p>	<p>Staff recommends separating the portico entries into two independent stoops with separate roof structures. The base should be comprised of expressed piers with recessed infill between the supports. The ground floor entries should be reduced in size to be consistent with historic ground floor entry openings and fit proportionately between support piers. The iron detailing should be decorative in nature to correspond to iron handrails and to soften the appearance. Echoing the</p>

<p>distances between shall not exceed 4". The height shall not exceed 36".</p>		<p>arch detail and eliminating the top rail of the gate would also enhance this opening. Verify roof material and paint color on entrance portico. Detail section drawings of stoops should be submitted to staff for final approval.</p>
<p><b>Standard</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed</b></p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p>
<p>Residential balconies shall not extend more than 3' in depth from the face of a building and shall be supported by brackets or other types of architectural support.</p>	<p>Balconies are located on the rear of the buildings. They project 4' from the building over the driveway and will have iron railings with a case and masonry brackets.</p>	<p>Verify material for base and brackets of balcony. Staff recommends approval for the 4' projection as it is overlooking the interior courtyard space and not over the public right-of-way.</p>
<p><b>Fences (I)(13):</b></p>	<p>A 6'-4" garden wall separates the properties in the interior of the lot. The wall was constructed of brick to match the main house and will feature a landscaped trellis.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval upon submittal of a section drawing of the wall.</p>
<p><b>Garages (I)(14):</b> Garage openings shall not exceed 12' in width.</p>	<p>Garage openings are 18' wide at the rear of the building facing the interior of the parcel. The will feature solid panel Heritage Series steel carriage house garage doors (not shown in elevations).</p>	<p>Staff recommends reducing the garage door opening to meet the standard or installing two sets of carriage style doors, side-by-side.</p>
<p><b>Utilities and Refuse (I)(15):</b> Electrical vaults, meter boxes, and communications devices shall be located on secondary and rear facades and be minimally visible from view. HVAC units shall be screened. Refuse storage areas shall be located within a building or shall be screened.</p>	<p>All electric meters and service boxes are located on the interior of the lot on the rear of the building. Refuse access and HVAC units are located within the building in the interior of the lot.</p>	<p>The standard was met.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval with the condition that Staff comments be considered and a revised site plan, elevations, and detail sections be submitted to Staff for final approval.

**Mr. Deering** asked if there were gates on the opening to the common driveway on the site.

**Ms. Ward** answered no.

**Mr. Deering** stated he thought the 18-foot garage doors were going to be extremely visible from both public rights-of-way.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated the panels on the garage doors really stood out.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Roy Ogletree** stated he had been there for the Height and Mass approval. He said he had worked with Staff on the issues that were talked about, and they were more than willing to come back with more detail on some of the items. He would like to address the garage doors. They were trying to make the motor courts very useable for the residents of the townhomes. As the Board recalled on the Height and Mass the first time that they came, they had carriage doors facing the street. They totally redesigned the project to internalize the parking, and in doing so, they created a condition that warrant garage doors or you physically cannot get into the units. By internalizing them they had not only taken the carriage doors off the street, they had turned them 90 degrees to the street and created courtyards. The walls along the street, which give some about of continuity, had been brought in as tight as they could get them and still get automobile access. Separating the two sides of the project with a curb cut on both McDonough and Perry Streets provided some greenspace and a garden wall. He said he thought they had made an effort to make a compromise between the automobile and the pedestrian experience.

**Mr. Deering** stated the Board appreciated Mr. Ogletree's efforts in doing that, and thought it was a much more successful project than the very first time he submitted it. He said Mr. Ogletree could mitigate the entire garage door issue if they put motorized gates where the public could not see the garage door. That would take it completely out of the Board's hands. As it is right now, you may not have a garage door wider than 12 feet visible from a public right-of-way. That is in the Zoning Ordinance, not a guideline, it was actually written in the ordinance. He said the Board was bound to uphold that, so the only suggestion he could make was to put gates on the wall so the public cannot see into the outer court.

**Mr. Roy Ogletree** said they had thought about it but asked how you would achieve is what he pondered on this. He asked how you achieve a gate that abuts the public right-of-way that doesn't look like a security gate that would prohibit you from viewing into there.

**Mr. Deering** stated it could be a solid wood vertical board carriage gate.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated she would have to agree with Mr. Deering. The Board was not going to approve, and she was certainly not going to vote to approve something that clearly violates the ordinance.

**Mr. Roy Ogletree** stated there were instances larger than 12-foot doors in the Historic District. He asked has this always been.

**Mr. Deering** stated no, it had not always been a part of the ordinance.

**Mr. Roy Ogletree** stated they had another option of not doing garage doors whatsoever, but it created an issue of security for the residents. He did not know if he would call it a variance, but they were looking for some relief on this issue because they had gone to pretty big extremes to get the doors off the street, which was a big effort to do that. They were just trying to make it so residents of today's time with automobiles had a way of getting in being secure, they could go back and put some sort of security gate in, but his opinion was that the security gate was to look much worse than a set of garage doors turned 90 degrees to the street.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated the Board did not have the power to let them side step an ordinance.

**Mr. Steffen** stated no, they could not. He said you cannot add a variance to ignore an ordinance, and the Board was bound by the ordinance.

**Mr. Roy Ogletree** asked if the ordinance would allow them to remove the garage doors and just have an opening.

**Mr. Deering** answered no, and said there could be no opening to an automobile storage wider than 12 feet, and asked other Board members if that was what it said.

Board members agreed.

**Mr. Roy Ogletree** stated they would work on it and see what they would come up with.

**Mr. Duncan Ogletree** asked if you put the wooden gates that were automatic, what type of a garage door would the Board require to be used on the building. He asked if it just did not matter then.

**Mr. Deering** stated he understood that. He said they could put flush metal painted doors.

**Mr. Gay** stated or no doors. He said if you cannot see them they could have no doors.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the Board did not have purview essentially, over anything that cannot be seen from the public way.

**Mr. Deering** stated if there were solid gates at the garden wall, you cannot see in there except for when it was opened up to let the car in and closed back.

**Mr. Duncan Ogletree** stated he was in agreement with what was recommended. Just use a nice door but a less expensive door to compensate some of the cost.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if the Board should let it go back to Staff, because the Board has ventured into designing the project for him.

**Mr. Deering** stated if the Board lets them get away with an 18-foot door, then all those people in the past six years where he had sat on the Board would be really angry at the Board.

**Mr. Duncan Ogletree** stated he thought it was a good idea to have a gated fence, because it prevented anybody from randomly going in.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that final details addressed in the comments be submitted to Staff, and the auto court wall have solid gates at the sidewalk to be resubmitted to Staff for final approval. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Continued Petition of Rowland Commercial  
Development  
H-06-3586-2  
229 Price Street  
Demolition/New Construction Part I and Part II  
of a Four-Story Condominium**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval** for demolition; **approval** for Part I with **conditions**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Richard Guerard.



Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

1. The applicant is requesting approval to demolish a non-rated commercial structure.
2. The applicant is requesting approval to construct a four-story 12-unit condominium building.

**FINDINGS:**

1. The non-rated commercial warehouse building was built in 1968 for Baker and Jarrell Electric Company. The structure is an iron frame building with a concrete floor. The walls are glass and cement block. One historic cottage was removed to St. Julian Street by the Lane Foundation in the 1960's or early 1970's. The present building is 38-years-old and does not appear to possess historic qualities.
2. The Board of Appeals granted a 7.7 percent lot coverage variance for a total of 82.7 percent coverage on an "L-shaped" lot. It is zoned R-I-P-C. The 28 feet by 33 feet "L" portion of the lot will be open. The lots will need to be recombined before a permit is issued.

The building footprint is 58-foot 8 inch by 88-foot 8 inch.

3. A dimensioned revised site plan needs to be submitted showing property lines, sidewalks, tree lawns and street, and the footprint of the proposed building with encroaching stoops, etc.

**The following Part I Height and Mass Standards apply:**

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIP-C zone.	No setbacks are proposed on the North, South or East elevations. The West elevation setback is not clear.	The setbacks are met
Dwelling Unit Type	Apartment Building	While rare, apartment building types are found in the Historic District.

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Street elevation Type	Raised Stoop – stoop floor at 6'.	Raised stoops are found on The old YWCA building, etc. See design comments below.
Entrances	The building has center entrances on McDonough and Perry Streets. The garage entrance is on Price Street and exit is on Perry Street.	There is no lane for this lot. Only one other historic building exists on this block, a double townhouse facing Habersham Street. It has two entrances with closely spaced high stoops.
Building Height: The structure is located in a four-	The stoop height appears to be 6'. The first full story is 11'.	(For comparison, the height of the State Street

<p>story zone.</p>	<p>The 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> stories are 11'-4" each. The parapet is 4'-2". The total height is 44'-8". The proposed height has been lowered 4' from the previous submission. The parking has been partially depressed.</p> <p>The applicant desires to protect an existing oak tree on McDonough Street.</p>	<p>condominiums on Columbia Square is 52' and the building is 90'-wide x 67' deep). The height of the new row across the street is at least 39'-8" and may in fact be taller.</p>
<p>Tall Building Principles and large scale development</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Proportion of openings</p>	<p>The windows have a 3:6 ratio. The garage level openings are rectangular, 2'-6" x 3'-6" with bars. The garage door openings are 12' on McDonough and Price Streets.</p>	<p>The entire ground floor is devoted to parking. Thus, passing pedestrians will see parked cars. A garage entrance has been provided on Perry Street. The applicant might consider louvered shutters on the ground floor windows rather than iron bars. Please submit curb cut approval from Traffic Engineering for file.</p>
<p>Rhythm of solids to voids</p>	<p>The window openings align vertically. A 12' garage opening faces town houses across Perry Street. Several versions of the front elevation have been provided, one with false bricked in windows, one with shuttered and one without windows at the center section of the façade.</p> <p>Brick piers divide the front and rear facades into bays. The piers project 1". The vertical piers are interrupted by a 13 ¾" tall projecting rowlock cornice.</p>	<p>Staff recommends the shuttered windows, but with louvered shutters.</p> <p>No details have been given for the garage doors.</p> <p>Staff recommends eliminating the projecting cornice across each pier in order to accent the bay divisions and verticality of the piers, which are not very prominent at 1". The piers should project more to reduce the flatness of the façade.</p>
<p>Rhythm of entrances, porch projections, balconies</p>	<p>3 foot projecting 7' and 8' balconies are proposed on the McDonough and Perry Street sides. A raised stoop is proposed on the McDonough Street side. A small covered stoop is also</p>	

	proposed on the Perry Street side.	
Walls of continuity	NA	NA
<b>PART II DESIGN DETAIL</b>		
Materials	<p><u>Walls:</u> Brick: Carolina Ceramics Tuscany</p> <p><u>Windows:</u> Limestone lintels and sills.</p> <p><u>Doors:</u> Divided light glass doors.</p> <p><u>Shutters:</u> Paneled shutters</p>	<p><u>Walls:</u> This is a rough-cut brick with a Savannah Grey color. It seems too “distressed” for the formal design of the building and on the sample board the joints are inappropriately tooled and wide. A finished material sample board should be provided on site.</p> <p><u>Windows:</u> No information given on the window manufacturer or design; single or double-glazed; size of muntins etc. Need same information for the doors.</p> <p><u>Shutters:</u> Louvered shutters are recommended. Clarify material and that the shutters will be operable.</p>
Roof and Parapet: 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 one-half feet from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum two-inch overhang.	A parapet is proposed with a projecting brick corbelled cornice. The projection is only 3”. The Ordinance requires a minimum of 4”.	The cornice needs to project more than 4” to break the flatness of the façade.
Balconies: Residential balconies shall not extend more than three feet in depth from the face of a building and shall be supported by brackets.	See Rhythm of Projections above	This standard is met.
Stoops: Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street.	Brick treads on pre-cast concrete stringers? Some of the drawings say Pre-cast treads but show what looks like brick. Wood Tuscan columns with iron railing. A metal balustrade is proposed over front stoop. A metal newel is shown at the foot of the stairs, but it is mid stair also.	<p>Moulded pre-cast treads would be more appropriate. Provide a detailed section of the steps. Brick treads and concrete risers are visually inappropriate.</p> <p>A “beefed up end newel would be appropriate, eliminating the intermediate post.</p>

	A metal bracket supported canopy is proposed for the Perry Street side.	The metal canopy appears inappropriate for the formality of the proposed building.
--	---	--

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval to demolish existing non-rated commercial structure. Approval Part I Height and Mass with the condition that the revised site plan is submitted. Discussion Part II Design staff concerns.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Guerard** stated he tried to address everything that was brought up at the last meeting. He said the rear stoop on Perry Street was designed as a downscaled version of the eight-inch columns on the front. They reduced the columns to six inches on the back. He thought one of the comments was to make it really simple in the rear, and he took the columns off. He did not have any problem agreeing to just about everything that Staff recommended. They could bring the roof out to match the other roof with just a smaller downscale so that it would not compete with McDonough Street. He said the one comment he had about the wrought iron for the parking garage was if he put the louvered shutters on, it would have an issue as far with the Fire Department regarding openings for air circulation.

**Mr. Deering** stated it was an open-air requirement for Building Code. He said the petitioner would have to calculate it and figure it out.

**Mr. Guerard** stated he thought if he put shutters on it, even the Manchester Atlantic shutters that were shown in the pamphlet, they considered it closed even if it was slatted as far as a fire goes, but he said he would be glad to look into it. He said the shutters in the Board’s packets that were shown on the drawing as panels are indicated as Manchester Atlantic (louvered). As far as the other comments, they did not have a problem with them. If you notice, there were three different choices on the front regarding the brick, and Staff would like the shutter version.

**Mr. Deering** asked if Mr. Guerard was asking for design review at this time also.

**Mr. Guerard** answered yes.

**Mr. Deering** asked what were the balconies going to be made of, not the railing, but the material.

**Mr. Guerard** said they were wood. He said it was the same company for the buildings that the Board approved on Montgomery Street. They were two brick buildings facing Montgomery, the same company would be making the steel brackets that were going on with the wrought iron, it would be the same brackets, same wrought iron handrail, same company, L. H. Welding.

**Mr. Deering** stated he thought it was really important that they get a site plan. He said they did the project across the street.

**Mr. Guerard** stated he understood the concerns with the elevation drop.

**Mr. Deering** stated if the Board had known it was dropping that much they would have had the petitioner step it like some of the row houses over on Macon off Troup Square. They go along like four and five, and then they step down, and then they go on.

**Mr. Guerard** stated it was an error on his part. He never dreamed that the ground would drop that far. He said what was there just for the Board's knowledge was a foot and one-half fall from the side closest to Habersham to the Price Street side. That side of the building would be approximately two and one-half to three feet into the ground, then when you get to the other end it would be only about one and one-half feet in the ground.

**Mr. Gay** asked for such a wide building, if they had considered widening the doorway in the front like the Hermitage where you come outside the first set of windows after the front door, and end up with four columns instead of two.

**Mr. Guerard** said he was not familiar with the Hermitage. He said the fact of the matter on McDonough Street there was a 50-inch oak sitting in front of it. The reason they did not put it on the color rendering was because the oak tree was so massive that you would not have been able to see the building.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated the Historic Savannah Foundation commends the petitioner for taking into account the comments of the Board and the public last month. The Architectural Review Committee agreed with the comments of Staff, especially the importance of submitting site plans. She said incomplete packets set a bad precedent.

**Mr. Joe Saseen** commented that the lintels should contrast with the brick.

**Mr. Guerard** stated they were changed to the recommendation of pre-case stone.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Seiler made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review approve the demolition of the existing non-historic structure, Part I Height and Mass, and Part II Design Details (with the exception of the brick and mortar), for a new four-story condominium with the petition with the following conditions. A dimensioned site plan showing streets, sidewalks, and building footprint. A revised elevation indicating deletion of moulding across piers; beefed up cornice and piers. A revised stoop for front and rear, a curb cut approval for file, detail of garage doors, and a brick sample board with mortar to be set up on-site prior to final brick selection. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Continued Petition of Kessler River Street, LLC  
Bryan Py  
H-06-3607-2  
102 West Bay Street  
New Construction, Part I Height and Mass &  
Part II Design for a Hotel

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Harold Yellin.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

#### **NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass, and Part II design approval for a 71-room full-service hotel and a Finding of Fact that a request for a three-story variance above Bay Street is visually compatible.

**FINDINGS:**

The site is located within the Factors Walk Riverfront Overlay District: Factors Walk presents a building typology even more tightly defined by precedent than does the Oglethorpe Plan area. There is no other interface between city and river like it in America...nothing should threaten its integrity. ...the insertion of tall and/or large-scale development in this area threatens its integrity both by singular action and by precedent for future action.

The site has conditions peculiar to the piece of property in that it is shaped like a parallelogram. It is also bounded by the Savannah River, and there is opportunity to recreate a Factors Walk to complement the recreated walk proposed farther to the west.

**The following Part I Height and Mass Standards apply:**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Buildings along Factors Walk shall front both Bay Street and River Street at their respective levels. Entrances to uses above River Street shall be from Upper and Lower Factors Walk or from private property, provided however, entrances to end units may front onto the public ramps.	Entrances are proposed at both levels. The two entrances on River Street are to a restaurant. Glass roll-up doors are proposed that open onto River Street. See drawings marked Item 1.	This standard is met.
Buildings shall be constructed of brick, ballast stone, or wood...	Brick is proposed.	This standard is met.
New construction on the south side of River Street shall not exceed three stories or 45 feet above Bay Street.	Six stories above Bay, for a total of 58'-2", is requested. This includes the recessed glass roof garden. On the roof there are two mechanical and elevator penthouses, which do not count as a story, but the glass-roofed sliding glass nana wall system between them is conditioned space and, therefore, counts as a story.	The Board of Appeals has approved a 3-story variance above Bay. The Review Board needs to make a Finding of Fact that this is visually compatible. Item 2 shows a section of the roof garden. The applicant's drawings indicate that it should not be visible from adjacent streets.
<b>Guideline:</b> Upper and Lower Factors Walk should be maintained as thoroughfares and not enclosed.	Upper and lower Factors Walk will be retained as thoroughfares.	See item three for an elevation of upper and lower Factors Walk.
<b>Guideline:</b> Factors Walk is exempt from the large scale and commercial development provisions	The applicant has chosen to follow the traditional commercial massing.	

requiring subdivision of upper floors into bays and differentiated massing.		
<b>Guideline:</b> Elevations fronting River Street or the River itself are exempt from the provisions regarding vertical articulation. Buildings with flat, rather than articulated facades can be consistent with the riverfront industrial character of the area.	The applicant has chosen to articulate bays.	
Streets and lanes cannot be bridged by development, except at Factors Walk. Such bridges shall be for pedestrian use only. Factors Walk bridges shall not be covered by a roof, awning, or any other type of extension from a building.	Two pedestrian-vehicular bridges are proposed. A plaza replicating that planned for the renovation of the Ryan Building is also planned.	The Board of Appeals would have to grant a variance upon a finding of fact regarding the compatibility of vehicular bridges at this location. A request for the vehicular bridge was not made to the Board of Appeals. Staff recommends that an alternate drop-off be designed, and that pedestrian bridges be used in compliance with the design standards.
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in B-B zone.	No setbacks are proposed. The building aligns with the historic range to the west.	
Dwelling Unit Type	A 71-room full-service hotel is proposed.	
Tall Building Principles and large scale development	NA	As perceived from Bay Street, this is not defined as a Tall building. It would be as perceived from River street. The Factors Walk overlay exempts construction from tall building principles. The footprint does not exceed the threshold area to qualify as Large-Scale Development.
Proportion of structure's front facade	The hotel really has two front facades. The Bay Street façade serves as a transition between historic and non-historic. The River Street elevation retains the character of the plainer Factors ranges, while affording dramatic views of the river.	
Proportion of openings	Because of the views of the	

	river, large window openings are proposed. The scale of these openings is reduced by the smaller-scale of the elements within the openings.	
Rhythm of solids to voids	The walls are viewed as a series of punched openings with an industrial flavor. This complements the renovation at the News Press across the street and the Ryan Building adjacent.	Glass Crittall Window systems are used at the corners to help separate the structure from the historic range to the west.
Rhythm of structure on street	The recreation of the bridges recreates the rhythm of Factors Walk seen on the eastern side of City Hall.	The recreation of the Factors Walk bridges will be a positive step.
Rhythm of entrances, porch projections, balconies	A suspended glass and metal canopy is provided over the Bay Street entrance and River Street entrances.	See Item 4 for detail of canopy. The River Street canopies do not extend over the full width of the sidewalk. See S-1 and A-1.1
Walls of continuity	The structure continues the line of the walls of the historic ranges to the west.	
Scale	The building provides a transition from the historic ranges to the west and the Hyatt on the east. The window divisions have a scale similar to the openings in the historic range.	The scale of the elements of the proposed hotel relate to the historic structures and provides a buffer to the Hyatt, which is not in scale with the historic ranges.

**The following Part II Design Standards Apply:**

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Commercial Design Standards	NA	
Windows and doors	Metal clad double-hung windows. Eagle Windows, metal clad e-tilt double-hung, 7/8" Muntin with spacer bar, Crittall window system, painted steel with industrial mullions. French style Crittall windows no mullions (Doors) Nana Wall doors. Glass panel garage doors.	The "casement" note on the elevations is a typo.
Roof shape	A parapet roof similar to that of the historic range is proposed.	See comments above about roof garden.
Balconies, stoops, stairs, porches	Balconies are not proposed. A steel and glass canopy is proposed over the doors.	See comments above regarding design.



Fences	Painted cast iron railing – see detail. To be used at bridges and plaza.	
Materials	Main body: Millbrook Signature Series brick. Wood mould, Queen size; red mortar. The lower two stories are a darker red brick than the upper stories at both the River Street and Bay Street levels. Sand finish stucco at mechanical parapet and roof garden walls. Cast stone window sills Metal clad double-hung casement windows.	The glass corner resolves how these lower story color changes “turn the corner”.
Color	A color schedule was submitted in greys through brown.	

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval of a Finding of Fact that the three additional stories above Bay are visually compatible as a transition between the Ryan Building and the Hyatt Hotel. The footprint of the Ryan building is maintained.

Approval of Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design Detail.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if the recommendation at the end was that the Board approve the visual compatibility, and approval of Part I Height and Mass and design detail, but Staff had a significant reservation with the vehicular bridge.

**Ms. Reiter** answered that was correct, and added a fourth condition that the bridge be pedestrian as opposed to vehicular.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Harold Yellin** stated he was present on behalf of the Kessler Group. He said with him were Mr. Brian Py who was a representative of the Kessler Group, Mr. Justin Reed the Project Manager, and Mr. Grey Reese, the Project Architect. He supposed that any specific architectural and design questions were best answered by the other three gentlemen. He stated he was probably up there because he was involved with the property in 1989, when it was the proposed Plimsoll Hotel. Back in 1989 he was a young man, and now it was odd that it was back before the Board 17 years later. As Ms. Reiter had told the Board, the property was genuinely unique. It was a unique size, it was a unique location, and it was a unique shape being a parallelogram. It even had some unique features such as a City-owned retaining wall. When Ms. Reiter had shown the overhead, there were actually brick walls that would need to be incorporated into the design of the building. Of course, it fronts three streets along Bay Street, River Street, and the Whitaker Street ramp.

He said in 1989, a variance was granted for the Plimsoll Club making it 123 feet high with mechanicals, and 96 feet without mechanicals. That decision was not binding on the Board at all, nor was it binding on the Board of Zoning Appeals which recently heard their petition, but it

did illustrate what had been approved, and it did illustrate he believed, how much smaller the Kessler hotel really was. Back in 1989, the Plimsoll Hotel was concerned about being bigger than the Hyatt, and smaller than City Hall

**Mr. Yellin** said it was interesting that back in 1989, the Ryan building was not even shown in rendering because no one cared about the Ryan building. People were looking in an easterly direction; how did they measure up against City Hall? He suspected now that they were back 17 years later, they were looking very much to pattern themselves after the Ryan Building and not the Hyatt. What it had become was a transition, and it was a transition between the two buildings. The Ryan building, stepping up gradually, and then stepping up again to the Hyatt. He believed that for this reason, the Board of Zoning Appeals just a few weeks ago did approve the height variance for the property. It was, of course, substantially lower than 1989. He believed that it was Ms. Reiter's finding that the hotel was visually compatible as a transition between the Ryan building and the Hyatt. He said he would also request that the Board make this finding as well, and that was visual compatibility based on the transition.

He stated he wanted to keep his comments as brief as possible to get right to questions, but he wanted to offer one more thought. They do agree with all of Staff's recommendations, with the one exception being pedestrian versus pedestrian and vehicular access. From their prospective, having pedestrian and vehicular access made sense for a variety of reasons. Perhaps, the most important reason was operations. It was important for the hotel to get traffic off the street, rather than having cars lingering, and they had seen Bay Street get busier and busier, not less busy. If you look next door to the Hyatt, in terms of how cars come off Bay Street, it did make sense from a safety and operational prospective to get the cars off Bay Street, put the cars in front of the hotel, they could unpack, and from there they could go to parking. Having vehicles access this building from River Street would be a disaster. Having guests and vehicles access this from Factors Walk would be probably even more disastrous. He said he knew they had to come in from Bay Street. They could also take advantage of the traffic light at the corner of Whitaker and Bay Streets, which of course, services the Hyatt coming in a westerly direction. They believe it would also serve to keep the cars safe and off Bay Street. He stated if the Board looked at the drawing in front of them, the design with the vehicles and the pedestrians simply made the passageway a little bit wider, but it preserved Factors Walk. It was their intention to restore the Factors Walk look to the street. Lastly, they were mindful that no matter what the Board decided today, they would need to go to the City of Savannah to get an easement or an encroachment permit. Whether they go vehicle and pedestrian, or just pedestrian, they would need to get that easement.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he had a question on the issue of bridging. It seemed clear in the Historic District Zoning Ordinance Guidelines that the language used there was "shall be for pedestrian use only". He said he was not sure the Board had any authority to grant a variance from the ordinance.

**Mr. Yellin** stated he supposed what would happen was if they went to City Hall first and City Hall granted the easement, he did not know what posture that puts them in regarding the Historic Review Board as far as vehicle versus pedestrian. Obviously, if they went to City Hall, the statement they would make to City Hall would be that this was what we would like to do. It was not as if they would be hiding their intent. If that was something that the Board would prefer them to go to City Hall first, they could do that, in much the same way that they went to the Zoning Board to get the height variance before coming before the Board as well. He thought, ultimately, what they would find was they were looking for something that was very safe. They were also not required to rebuild Factor's Walk. That was not in the code either, but they knew it would be the right thing to do. He stated the Hyatt sort of drops off, and he took a walk down there and was somewhat surprised at how long the hole had remained in the ground. He stated

they were very much aware of what they could do to create a fabulous Factors Walk that keeps on going.

**Ms. Reiter** stated it was not the City it was the Board of Appeals, and there was a section of the Historic District Ordinance that you can make a Finding of Fact, which is what they had to do for the height. Make Finding of Fact that a vehicular bridge would be visually compatible, that would then have to go to the Board of Appeals, and they would have to grant the variance.

**Mr. Steffen** stated they were limited to the authority to make the Finding of Fact that it would be visually compatible or not.

**Ms. Reiter** stated the Board of Appeals makes the variance.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated the specific section of the ordinance was found on Page 23 at Number 4, where it talked about variances granted by the Board of Appeals. Then it refers to Page 8, where you see (k)(6), the Visual Compatibility Factors. Previously, things that had come before the Board as to height, the ordinance had said, "...that it shall be allowed up to the maximum." However, this specifically addressed when the Board could decide or determine as a Finding of Fact that the height was not visually compatible. In this instance, where they were not building up to the maximum, but they had already gotten a variance, the Board did not have to accept the variance. She said the Board could determine that it was not visually compatible pursuant to Page 8, Visually Compatible Factors. That would also go to any type of decision that the City made. She just wanted to make it clear because she had been quoting the ordinance as to height restrictions. This was when the Board had the authority to address the height as to visual compatibility.

**Mr. Yellin** stated he would agree with that statement very much; it was exactly right.

**Mr. Steffen** stated it was correct, and that was why the petitioner had asked the Board to make that finding.

**Mr. Deering** stated he had two comments. One, he really liked the design direction they were taking with the hotel, that it was a nice direction that suited the site very well, and it was a nice blend of modern and the other historic elements surrounding it. There was one thing that bothered him though. He did not think they should use a mortar color that was close to the brick color.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated he commended the petitioner and the architect for the design direction. He thought it was compatible, but had one question that they did not understand at the Architectural Review Committee, regarding the canopy detail that showed the steel frame with beveled glass. They did not really understand the drawing and was wondering what the character of that was and how it was compatible with the waterfront.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Mr. McDonald regarding the issue of the pedestrian versus the vehicular bridge, was that something that Historic Savannah had a position on.

**Mr. McDonald** stated they did not take a position on it, but he agreed with the way that Ms. Fortson-Waring characterized what the procedure should be.

**Mr. Mark Marshalok** stated he wanted to comment on the aesthetic that was being seen here, and wanted to commend the group. He thought they had demonstrated and really lifted the bars as far as hotel design in the town, respectively, with the Mansion, this falls into that same

category. He wanted to ask if there was another view of the modern element he had seen. He wanted to comment along with Mr. Deering's comments that it was a very attractive feature. His only question was the use of the beams in the structure, with the transition to a modern structure; suddenly they were using beams and a rather busy glass façade. He asked would it not be potentially more dramatic to continue the brick instead of the beam structure, and clean up the glass potentially. He was not sure if the Board saw some of those features, or did they think it was a very compatible element.

**Mr. Deering** stated with the right paint color on the horizontal beam members and the corner column, it could read as just one element. He thought that was a more successful solution than continuing the brick.

**Mr. Marshalok** stated he thought it was a good comment. It looked like on the visual, what he had seen before was rather abrupt, but when you see the real photograph it looked a little cleaner.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated she wanted to discuss the compatibility. She said Staff commented that the Bay Street side was not compatible as to height. Whether or not the Board wanted to discuss that, it concerned her. She agreed with Staff that Factors Walk should be maintained for pedestrian use with the lanes.

**Mr. Yellin** stated he did not believe Ms. Reiter said that. He thought she had said that it was compatible.

**Mr. Fortson-Waring** stated it said, "...as perceived from Bay Street this was not defined as a tall..." then she apologized and said that it was River Street, but it would be perceived as a tall building from River Street. It was not Bay Street it was River Street that it was perceived as a tall building, and that was her concern. The only other thing was that she would agree, she would personally like to the Board be in accordance with the ordinance.

**Mr. Deering** stated regarding vehicular versus pedestrian bridges, it removes all of the activity and use onto air space over Factors Walk, and frees up the vehicular circulation to the access street.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated he liked the ability to drive up in front, and that aesthetically it was a very nice feature. It appeared to him that there was enough frontage out front where the red brick was, to accommodate both pedestrian and the automobile access, because you do not have the park like in front of the Hyatt. It seemed to him that there was enough space out there to accommodate both.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** said she thought technically the Board could determine that it was visually compatible, because if you look at Page 8 again the language says the Board could compare the rhythm of solids to voids in the facades, we could look at the proportion, we could look at the structure. We do not have to say necessarily that it looked like something already in existence, as long as it meets the rhythm of solids as opposed to the voids in the structure. She would be willing to say that it was not in error, but the Board could find that it was visually compatible based on a rhythm of solid to void if, in fact, the Board felt that.

**Mr. Deering** stated Mr. Yellin had put up a drawing that showed the restored Factors Walk area in front of the Ryan building, the area in front of the liquor store that would not be redeveloped, and then the hotel development on the right. You could see the open spaces in front of the plaza in front of the Ryan building that they were going to recreate.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** asked if they were visually compatible if you look at rhythm to solids.

**Mr. Deering** stated he thought the spacing of the bridges over Factors Walk for the hotel project were visually compatible. The only thing that he agreed with Ms. Reiter on was they were a little wide; they were wider than pedestrian bridges by two-fold.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated those would be the Findings of Fact if the Board was going to suggest that it was visually compatible.

**Mr. Deering** answered yes.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Mr. Yellin if he wanted to make a comment on behalf of his client on any of the Board's comments before they entertained a motion.

**Mr. Yellin** stated the only thing he could possibly add was to the extent, of course, they could make the bridges narrower they would do that. He thought Mr. Deering said they are twice as wide as they need to be and he was probably right. Whatever minimum they could make it to bring them narrower and yet still have the vehicles, they would certainly do that. He said they were not looking to make it as wide as possible but, in fact, as narrow as possible. He would hope that the Board would consider a finding of visual compatibility, and they knew that the finding was subject to approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals. They know that it was not the end of the road, that they still had more to do. He suspected they would need Zoning Board of Appeals approval and City of Savannah approval for an easement, so they had at least two more groups that needed to decide.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated she would personally prefer that the petitioner go and get the variances, given the Board's comments as to what it would take to be visually compatible. Then, perhaps, come back with a design that reflected some of the comments that were made about visual compatibility. Then you would have the variance like you have for the height.

**Mr. Deering** stated if the Board could make a motion to vote on the Height and Mass and the design of the building, removing the terrace and the Factors Walk bridging completely from the project until the petitioner went to the City.

**Ms. Reiter** stated from a Staff perspective she begged to differ with the approach. She said it was this Board's job to find the visual compatibility of the bridges. She thought the Board should make the finding and send it on to the Board of Appeals to help them in their deliberation. It was what this Board was charged to do.

**Mr. Gay** asked about the height. He said Ms. Reiter said the same thing about the height.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that she did when she did her write up. She stated that the Board should have made the Finding of Fact about the height before it went to the Board of Appeals.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated she would differ.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he wanted to add for the Board's benefit, and he hated to bring it up now as opposed to the end of the meeting which was where he was going to, but they have had that discussion with Mr. Thomson and with Ms. Reiter about what the role of the Board was on the specific issue about visual compatibility. He said he still believed the Board needed further clarification, and some things that still need to be done on some of the larger projects. In the meantime, he thought that after having reviewed the entire section, it was his opinion that the Board ought to exercise its function and make factual findings on visual compatibility first as a matter of moving these things further, and not necessarily delaying them. Although, at the same

time he wanted to say that Ms. Fortson-Waring's interpretation, some of the rest of the Board on the fact that this section could be read another way was absolutely true, it could be read two ways. He said there was the lengthy discussion just the other day with Ms. Reiter, Mr. Thomson, and himself, but he thought in the interest of the Board performing their function in the most efficient way that they could for the benefit for the citizens of Savannah, they ought to go ahead and make those findings when they could, and make them as Findings of Fact, and then allow the other Boards to take on their functions and continue to ask for the City to provide the Board with better and clearer guidance as to what the Board's function was.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated she thought it was another issue the Board needed to really flush out at a retreat or somewhere, and come to a consensus because they were not at a consensus and have not had an opportunity. She said the Board did not need to take all day today debating back and forth what they thought their role was. She thought it would be very, very right, especially paired with the height restrictions, for the Board to come to a consensus outside of this meeting.

**Mr. Steffen** said he agreed.

**Mr. Yellin** stated he thought a possibility might be if the Board does not decide today, it was conceivable that they could go to Zoning Board of Appeals and get approved, go to the City of Savannah and get approved for an easement, come back here and get turned down, and then we end up having an awkward procedure. He thought the City of Savannah, before they take the time to look into the easement, and the ZBA before they decide whether or not its something they should grant, he thought Ms. Reiter was correct, they were looking for something from the Board. The Board's indication of what they would do. Otherwise, from his perspective as a petitioner, they do not quite know where to go, and they get the chicken and the egg all of the time up here. At least he could see what was going to happen here. The City of Savannah would say no; we're not going to decide until the Board decided, then the Board would say they were not going to decide until the City decided. He said they were trying to avoid all of that and he thought that was why Ms. Reiter's comment did make good sense to, if the Board chose to, define visual compatibility so that they could proceed.

**Mr. Steffen** said let's move forward. He wanted to say to things. One, the Board was going to have a retreat at some point soon to discuss this because they do need a consensus. There were other Board members who were not present today, and they have not been heard from. Secondly, the ultimate answer was going to be when the Board have better guidance from the statute and the ordinance, which were a bit contradictory, but he would continue with his recommendation that the Board would go ahead, although he would not vote on it, of course, unless it was tied. He said to go ahead and find out what the Board wanted to do.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review does hereby make a Finding of Fact that the three additional stories above Bay Street is visually compatible, creating a transition between the height of the historic range to the west and the Hyatt to the east. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design Details are visually compatible, with the exception of the design details for the bridges, lighting, and adjacent fence to be brought back to the Review Board after the Board of Appeals variance and the City of Savannah encroachment approvals. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**Mr. Deering** stated he did not like the brick piers. He thought they did not suit Factors Walk. He said they were bulky and created an imbalance between the rest of Factors Walk.

**Mr. Yellin** stated he would remove them.

**Mr. Deering** stated if they get rid of the brick piers and you have a nicely designed iron railing like they had otherwise, then he found that it was visually compatible and make that Finding a Fact and move so.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if Mr. Deering was talking about the brick piers with the lights on top.

**Mr. Deering** answered yes.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated she seconded the motion but would like to discuss it.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the Board was going to discuss it, but he wanted to make sure he understood the motion. He asked Mr. Deering what the motion was.

**Mr. Deering** stated the Board approve it as presented with the exception of the brick piers.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if that was the motion and it had been seconded.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** answered yes.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if there was discussion on the motion that the Board make a Finding of Fact that the vehicular/pedestrian bridge and all of that element was visually compatible, with the exception of the brick piers. He asked Mr. Deering if that was correct.

**Mr. Gay** added that they would make them as narrow as possible.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that was why she wanted to discuss it. She said it was discussed earlier about the narrowing.

**Mr. Deering** stated he did not believe they could make it narrower and make it work.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated there was objection to the piers. He said the lighting in some form or fashion could remain and asked if that was correct.

**Mr. Deering** stated the petitioner could come back with another lighting solution.

**Mr. Mitchell** agreed, as long as they were not talking about eliminating the lighting.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if Mr. Deering would want the solution to come back to Staff or to the Board.

**Mr. Deering** stated he wanted it to come back to Staff.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Ms. Fortson-Waring if it was o.k. with the second.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** answered yes. She said Mr. Deering discussed that the bridge should be narrower. Whether or not they could do it she thought it was their problem to come back because a narrower walkway would be more visually compatible as was stated earlier. She said she would be opposed to the wide vehicular bridges because they would not create the rhythm to solids that would make it visually compatible.

**Mr. Deering** stated he had another discussion point on it. He said what they were doing with the Ryan building, and the exception of the liquor store which was the part of the building that they do not own, and then the building of this structure, it so reinforces and rebuilds what is happening on River Street and Factors Walk that he really could not be opposed to cars going across the bridges. He said it was such a nice thing to have happen again, and he never thought in his lifetime he would ever see any of this happen.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated the Board could not just willy-nilly decide to make it narrower or wider. You have to consider turning radius', or what was going to be coming across there. You know that stretch limousines' were going to be coming across there.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated her whole point was she would like the petitioner to come back to the Board with a better design for that. In the meantime, they can go and get their variances'.

**Mr. Deering** asked if that was how Ms. Fortson-Waring wanted to change the motion.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated this was discussion, and if no one else agreed with her than the Board won't change the motion.

**Mr. Gay** said the petitioner brought it up and they offered to try to narrow it. They were the ones that would get their engineers and say what cars can do and what can they not do.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he wanted to ask Mr. Deering a question because he was still a little bit troubled by the motion. He said the motion was to approve the visual compatibility of that element, and yet, he was saying that the brick piers go away which to him was the visual element, or the predominate part of the visual element.

**Mr. Deering** stated that in three dimensions you would really experience that. It would be very much like the remainder of Factors Walk, the east City Hall.

**Mr. Steffen** asked just by doing a railing.

**Mr. Deering** answered just by doing a railing.

**Ms. Reiter** asked why couldn't the Board approve the concept of a vehicular bridge, because that was what the Boards of Appeals was going to be concerned with, not whether it had brick, slate, or whatever, and then bring the actual design back.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated it was her point if Mr. Deering would agree to mend the motion.

**Mr. Deering** stated it was fine and he would amend the motion.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the Board had put a motion on the floor, or a redone motion that was saying the concept of doing a vehicular and pedestrian bridge was visually compatible, but that the Board wanted the specific design elements of that structure to come back to the Board after obtaining approval from the other boards.

**Mr. Deering** said it was sort of like Height and Mass. The concept of the bridge and the terrace in front of the hotel was visually compatible, but the details need to come back.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby make a Finding of Fact that the concept of vehicular/pedestrian bridges over the recreated Factors Walk are visually compatible at this location. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.



Mr. Steffen stated to Mr. Yellin, his clients had the approval of the concept from the Board of the vehicular/pedestrian bridge in that form, but they want the design details to come back to the Board after they had obtained approval from the other Boards.

Mr. Yellin asked if it was just to the vehicular and pedestrian walkway and the pillars.

Mr. Steffen answered yes sir. He said everything else had been approved.

**RE: Petition of Mark K. Marshalok  
H-06-3646-2  
312 West Charlton Street  
Addition Over Garage**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Mark K. Marshalok.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for a second floor addition above the existing side garage on the building at 312 West Charlton Street. The proposed addition is 18 feet wide by 22 feet deep.

**FINDINGS:**

The non-historic building was constructed circa 2002, and is not a rated building within Savannah’s Landmark Historic District. Neither the building lot coverage nor density will be increased by the proposed addition. The property is in a maximum four-story height zone on the Historic District Height Map. The rear elevation will not be visible from the public right-of-way as it faces the interior of the lot and not a lane. The following standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p><b>Windows:</b> Residential windows facing a street shall be double- or triple-hung, casement or Palladian.</p> <p>Double-glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted 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 than the meeting and top rails, and extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding.</p>	<p>Proposed windows are six-over-six, double-hung sash, Norco, simulated divided light windows to match the existing windows on the newly constructed residence. Although 8/8 windows are show in the elevation, the applicant is requesting 6/6 which is noted on the building section and photographs show that this is what is existing on the main residence.</p> <p>The proposed windows are 2.5’ wide by 6’ tall and are to</p>	<p>Verify the material, dimensions of the muntin, and use of spacer bar. Norco windows have been previously approved in the district, and certain styles have proven to be visually compatible.</p>

<p>Window sashes shall be inset not less than 3” from the façade of a masonry building.</p> <p>In new residential construction, windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.</p>	<p>match the windows on the existing residence in material and dimensions.</p>	
<p><b>Roof:</b></p>	<p>A flat roof is proposed to match the existing residence.</p>	<p>The minimal cornice/fascia should be reinstated on the top of the addition.</p>
<p><b>Materials:</b></p>	<p>A stucco finish to match the existing building and garage is proposed. It is Magnolia Buff in color.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval upon verification of window and parapet details.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if Ms. Ward request that the window and parapet details be sent back to Staff.

**Ms. Ward** answered correct.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark Marshalok** stated he did have the actual order on the particular window, which references the Norco window, and he would make sure to leave it with Ms. Reiter. It showed the 6/6 configuration with the specific model number, which is the identical window that he had in place. As far as the cornice treatment, it was intention to have the cornice, but it was an oversight that it was not drawn near the top. He said he could clearly redo it and resubmit it, and he had no problem with it.

**Mr. Hutchinson** asked what the Board was looking at on the east elevation. He said on the drawing in the package it said east elevation.

**Ms. Ward** stated she did not address it, but it was a blank wall to be stuccoed to match the existing, and there would be no windows on the side elevation.

**Mr. Marshalok** stated there would be no windows on that total blank wall facing the east elevation.

**Mr. Deering** stated you would not see a lot of the visibility that was two feet six inches between the wood and the historic structure that was there, and the proposed addition.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated Historic Savanna does not really have any problem with the alteration of the building. They felt that the submission was

inadequate in terms of the drawings; they could not really tell what they were looking at, where the new addition was taking place where the old building was.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Deering** stated it was an anomaly, it was not a building typology that could be found anywhere in the district, but it was a very peculiar site, and that was why the garage doors had to be on the street. He said he did not have any problem with the addition, he just thought it was very peculiar.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Gay made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with final details on the windows and parapet to be submitted to Staff for final approval. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Peter Thompson  
H-06-3647-2  
514 East Oglethorpe Avenue  
Porch Addition and Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Peter Thompson.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to construct a two-story porch on the rear of the building at 514 East Oglethorpe Avenue, replace the existing wooden fence along the rear and side of the property, install shutters, and change the exterior paint color.

1. The proposed porch will be located within the existing footprint of an existing porch. It will be constructed of 6-inch square wood posts with 2-inch square pickets on top of a masonry pier foundation. The proposed porch is in keeping with the traditional character of the main residence, and is simple in design as to not detract from the architectural significance of the building.
2. The proposed replacement fencing consists of 1-inch by 6-inch by 8-inch treated wood in a board-and-batten configuration. It will be 8-foot-tall with a 3-foot-wide pedestrian gate. The existing fence is not historic and is in disrepair.
3. The proposed shutters will be made of wood, operable, and sized to fit the window opening.
4. Proposed paint colors are:
  - Body: Glidden, Brown Bag 10YY 35/196
  - Trim: Benjamin Moore, Super White
  - Shutters: Charleston Green (custom paint color submitted)

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval with the condition that the porch be painted to match the trim of the building, and that the fence be of vertical plank construction and not board-and-batten, which is not typical of the

area. The horizontal rail of the shutters should correspond to the location of the meeting rail of the window.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Deering** asked if Mr. Thompson agreed with Staff’s recommendation that the porch be painted and the fence be just boards and not board-and-batten.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated the Board needed to be more specific about the type of boards, not the ½ inch thick boards found at Home Depot. The ones that were already assembled panels.

**Mr. Thompson** stated that was what was there now. He said they were going to use ¾ inch.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if it was standard ¾ inch.

**Mr. Thompson** answered yes.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Seiler made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the porch be painted to match the trim of the building, and that the fence be of vertical plank construction and not board-and-batten. The horizontal rail of the shutters should correspond to the location of the meeting rail of the window. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Mark Loudermilch & Joanne Forkin  
H-06-3648-2  
21 West Liberty Lane/22 West Harris Street  
Sign/Rehabilitation of a Carriage House**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval** with **conditions**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Mark Loudermilch.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval of a 3-foot by 2-foot projecting principal use sign attached to the porch column 10 feet above the sidewalk. Colors: teal and brick copy on a background of clouds in a gold frame. Metal bracket detail included. Alterations to the carriage house include widening the existing door from 7 feet 9 inches to 11 feet, and to install a second 11-foot-wide door. Install Flat (Ranch) panel overhead door by Wayne Dalton; install arched trim above the doors; reduce size of upper window to match existing, and install a Pella, Pro-Line wood, double-hung, single-pane, non-insulated casement window. Relocate meters to between the garage doors.

**FINDINGS:**

1. The carriage house is listed on the Historic Building Map and appears to have been built in 1842.

**The following standards apply:**

Section 8-3030 (k) (1) An historic structure and any out		
--	--	--

<p>buildings...shall only be altered in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior architectural features of the historic structure.</p>		
<p>(I) (14) In existing carriage houses original entries shall not be enlarged. Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.</p>	<p>The petitioner proposes to enlarge what appears to be an original opening and add a second garage opening. The applicant has submitted a photograph of a large single adjacent garage door. This is a new carriage house built before the adoption of the new regulations and is not a compatible treatment.</p>	<p>A second opening may be added, however the drawings are not specific enough to review the construction. Barn-style garage doors are preferred. Doors similar to the existing fold out doors are made for overhead use, however, if other doors are proposed they should be entirely flat, not flat panels.</p>
<p>(I) (9) Replacement windows on historic buildings shall replicate the original historic windows in composition, design and material.</p>	<p>The applicant is replacing a fixed window with a double-hung true divided light window to match the other two existing windows.</p>	<p>The proposed window specs indicate that the rails and vertical sash pieces all appear the same size. The proposed window does not appear to replicate the original. Please verify. Also, verify that this is a wood window or is it aluminum clad. If new shutters are proposed, they should be hinged and able to be closed over the window. The current shutters appear to be nailed to the building as ornament.</p>
<p>Sign</p>	<p>A projecting 6-square-foot sign with bracket is proposed to project from the porch column over the sidewalk.</p>	<p>The sign ordinance appears to be met, however a non-illuminated sign less than three square feet would not require Board approval and might be more visually compatible with the Greek Revival townhouse.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval of the design and placement of the sign, with consideration to reducing its size to three square feet or less. Approval pending the clarification of the window replacement. Further discussion and clarification for the Board regarding the Staff concerns on the carriage house alterations.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Ms. Reiter regarding the carriage house door itself, given the historic nature of that structure and what the ordinance says, was there any reason that Staff was not just simply recommending denial of that portion of it.

**Ms. Reiter** said the petitioner could add another arched opening. She would suggest they get some help with the drawing.

**Mr. Gay** asked of the same size or a different size or what.

**Ms. Reiter** answered it could be wider. It was just that you cannot widen an existing opening that was historic, but they have up to 12 feet, they could put in 11 feet and the meters could be moved.

Ms. Fortson-Waring left at 3:25 p.m.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated it appeared to him that many things were being done to this particular building that were no-no's. Widening a door, cutting in another door, the garage doors appear to him to be something out of suburbia, reduce the size of a window, why, and a double-hung single-paned window seemed to be inappropriate to the building. That was how it appeared to him. Maybe he should have introduced that at another time, but those were the things that jump out to him and it seemed like the petitioner was trying to make a new building here.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she was concerned about losing the garage door. It seemed sort of in conflict with doing that to an old building and opening an antique art market. It just rather seemed at odds with each other.

**Mr. Gay** stated it could not be changed period.

**Ms. Reiter** stated she was not recommending that it be changed. One point that she would make since the petitioner had submitted the picture of the one next door. She said it was a new structure; it was done before the Board had the ordinance, which said they cannot be wider than 12 feet, and she thought that showed why they did that. The ordinance was changed in 1997.

**Mr. Steffen** said he took it the property was not subject to a preservation easement currently.

#### **PETITIONER'S COMMENT:**

**Mr. Mark Loudermilch** introduced himself for the record.

**Mr. Deering** asked the petitioner if he minded the Board asking him to continue the project until he had a better definition of what he would like to do with the structure, and present a better drawing to the Board of that.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated he should consult with someone who was familiar with doing these types of buildings, because some of the things that were being proposed, like the garage doors were very inappropriate for the building. That was an 1842 building, and they were putting on garage doors that look like they belong in 2006 suburbia, very contemporary.

**Mr. Deering** stated Mr. Loudermilch might consider talking with his neighbor, the Morrison's, about hanging the sign on the center column. He said they might not agree to that.

**Mr. Steffen** suggested if the petitioner did not know Mr. McDonald, he might want to chat with him about a preservation easement. He said there might be a way to generate some significant money for you and keep this thing the way it was.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the alterations to the carriage house for revised design. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the recommendation of Staff was to approve the design and placement of the sign, as long as it was reduced in size of three feet square or less. He asked Mr. Loudermilch if he was in concurrence with reducing the size to three feet square.

**Mr. Loudermilch** answered no.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if he would rather have it bigger.

**Mr. Loudermilch** answered three feet by two feet.

**Mr. Steffen** clarified it was three feet by two feet.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the sign for the petition as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Poticny, Deering, Felder Architects  
H-06-3650-2  
528 East Jones Street  
Alterations to Rear Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends denial.

Mr. Deering recused himself for the next three petitions of H-06-3650-2, H-06-3651-2, and H-06-3652-2.

Present for the petition was Mr. Jim Wubbena.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting revisions to a previously denied rear addition at 528 East Jones Street.

**FINDINGS:**

The rear addition was erected by the property owner without a Certificate of Appropriateness, and was subsequently denied by the Board of Review. The addition extends over a shed roof addition to the main house and has been altered to come below the main eave of the house.

The proposed revisions include the addition of Hardi-Plank siding on the second story in lieu of the vinyl siding and the installation of Azek trim board pilasters. The vinyl windows are being replaced with double-paned six/six windows, with 7/8 inch muntins and spacer bar. Brand and material not specified. A false window is being placed on the western side of the second-story addition.

It appears that trim board and moldings are being placed around the existing first-story posts. A shutter-style privacy screen is being installed at the end of the first-story enclosure.

Additional trim and moldings are being applied to the addition. Hardi-Plank is proposed for the siding.

In Staff's opinion, the revisions do not mitigate the incompatibility of the addition in terms of mass and scale and relationship with the house to which it is attached, and adjacent properties. No site plan was submitted that shows the footprint of the addition in relation to the properties on either side, and to verify if the lot coverage standards are met. The enclosure of a porch with siding would not be recommended, and neither is a false enclosure "look". The installation of the addition over the shed roof is not visually compatible.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Denial of the revisions and removal of the addition per the original decision, based on incompatible mass, scale, and design.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Jim Wubbena** stated there were a couple of things he wanted to clarify before the Board decided. He said they not only trimmed out the existing columns, they actually added a fourth column to the back façade. They had reduced the overall height of the building to help with the scale problem. The footprint, however, of the addition that was built would stay the same according to their drawings. He stated he had some pictures of some of the additions that were existing along that lane and other lanes that were nearby, that come very close to the full width addition that they were proposing. One of the particular additions was two doors down that were not only a full-width addition, it was two stories tall and it had a porch that was two stories tall that had been added. The depth of that particular addition was very close to the depth of the addition that they were discussing. He showed a different angle of the photographs to show how far back a particular addition went. On the other side of the house, you could see there was a single-story with a porch addition right next door, and then two doors down there was a two-story addition that, again, was the full width of the building. Massing width wise was common as far as what was going on with the lane.

**Mr. Gay** stated it appears that Mr. Wubbena's sticks out much further.

**Mr. Wubbena** agreed that it did stick out further than the others depth wise coming back, but as far as lot coverage goes, it was still within the ordinance for lot coverage. He said what they were trying to do in helping with the scale was to break up the mass by using the Azek pilasters, trim it out, and bring down the height so that the historic buildings eave line was not interrupted. They could still do that and still have a decent head height inside of the building. There were fences that run the property line between both neighbors on both sides, so by using the shutter partitions on the porch below, they were not actually adding any kind of divisions or trying to make it look enclosed, they were just trying to enhance it. In their opinion, obviously, it would probably be the nicest addition on that lane.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if the current owner of the project they were doing now, built the addition onto it.

**Mr. Wubbena** said yes.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated the one that was upon the stilts, they built it without a permit and asked if someone had suggested to them if they just start all over again.

**Mr. Wubbena** stated what they were trying to do was to salvage as much as possible if they could, even though they were still lowering the overall roof height. He said they were trying to basically give them an addition that was going to be compatible with the additions that were already on the lane, but not tear the whole thing down and revamp the entire thing.



**Mr. Mitchell** stated he did have a point there.

**Mr. Gay** asked if the pilasters were going to be curved or flat.

**Mr. Wubbena** stated they would be flat. He said the existing columns right now were 6 by 6 pressure treated columns, and they would build those out to actually be thicker just so they were not so slender and end up looking like stilts. Then they would trim them out again and they would end up being 12 by 12 columns, and the pilasters would interrupt the siding and be 12 inches wide going up the side of the building.

**Mr. Gay** stated they were not rounded but they were flat.

**Mr. Wubbena** answered correct.

**Mr. Gay** asked if the columns downstairs holding up the thing were round or flat.

**Mr. Wubbena** said they were square. He said they were the 6 by 6 pressure treated. They were currently 6 by 6 and they were going to enlarge them and turn trim them out to 12 by 12.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated the petitioner was asking the Board to reward him for breaking the law. Although we all have sympathy for these situations, he would suggest that the sympathy should be with those who go through the process who come down every month and pull their building permits after they get permission from the Board. He said he did not believe the Board would have approved it if it had been submitted to them as a concept, and he certainly did not think the Board should approve it now. He felt that the petitioner should pay the consequences of his actions, and he asked the Board to deny and order them to remove it as recommended by the Preservation Officer.

**Ms. Sheila Winders** stated her brother and she owned two houses on the same lane. She wanted to address the lane and asked the Board to give her a few minutes. The two houses that she and her brother own were actually two-story townhouses she thought were built within the last two years. She said they had just bought them less than a year ago. They were in the backyard of a house on east Charlton Street, which was a one-story structure. Therefore, from east Charlton Street you can see the back of the townhouses, and it was not her fault because they were already there when she bought it, but they were obviously approved. Additionally, the house on east Charlton Street that was behind their houses had been added on. She stated she grew up in Downtown Savannah at 411 East Hall Street. She knew Savannah lanes, and the addition that the Carroll's have, even as it was right now, was an improvement over their lane. When she was growing up in the 40's many lanes had either rickety wooden sheds as her grandmother's house did, or very small houses in the back lanes that were usually unpainted. What happened was as families grew, additions were made, porches were closed in, and usually it was not charm but necessity that was the mother of invention. The lanes were mostly dirt and they had garbage cans out there, and if you had something to throw away, you piled it beside the garbage can. The lanes were uneven and unkempt, and smelly in the summer. The backs of the houses were often covered with tarpaper that looked like brick. Such was the lane down to the tarpaper on the side of one of the Jones Street houses. She stated she just had tenants move into her house and the smell in the lane from the trash was atrocious. There is a broken down futon, a mattress, broken furniture; all of this is in the lane. The lane is not paved, it is uneven, there were weeds growing everywhere. Never in our lifetime would this lane ever be on a tour of historic Savannah. People drive down it to get to their houses, most people have parking on the sides because there were no garages. The Carroll addition when it is modified would actually be prettier than some of the facades of some of the houses on east

Charlton Street, definitely their lane. Even on east Jones Street where some of the houses were very modern-looking when you get right down to Martin Luther King Boulevard. She said what they were talking about here were not the big beautiful houses that she loved walking by. We were talking about a working-class neighborhood. We were talking about a neighborhood that was trying to come together. They have community meeting that the church sponsors every once in a while where they try to clean up the neighborhood. It was a neighborhood that could use the Carroll's who actually plan to live there. He was a City fireman and she teaches Kindergarten. He was protecting the houses that historic Savannah was talking about, and she was teaching future citizens of Savannah, a nice mix to have there. The problem was if they had to tear this down they had pretty much invested everything they can. Mrs. Carroll told Ms. Winders they had taken a loan to pay for the changes that the architect and the attorney that they had to hire suggested. They went to one of the best firms in town, and chose one that worked with historic Savannah. She stated they made a mistake, and making them take that house down was the equivalent to taking them out and shooting them, because if they had to tear that down they have gone into so much debt they would have to sell the house; the dream of living Downtown would be over. She asked how did it happen that they did this. They hired a contractor that a realtor friend told them about who worked for SCAD. They do not have a lot of experience with construction and assumed, as she would have, that the contractor got the permit. He did not; he assumed that they would. Why, she did not know. At the time that all of this was going down, Mr. Carroll happened to be suffering from a back injury that occurred during a fire. They acted in haste. They were, unless the Board could show some pity on them and accept what was a really nice plan, going to have to repent at leisure. What she was asking the Board for, was that they had laws, and they all know something that was called the "Spirit of the Law". She did not think the Board would hear these people saying, "Oh, did I put one over on them!" No; they had done everything they could with a great deal of expense to rectify their mistake. If this were Iran maybe, you would have them cut off a hand. She thought they had paid enough and she thought if they had the improvements made that the architect suggested, she would be really happy because it would improve their neighborhood. She asked the Board to look at it that way and to consider the "Spirit of the Law", not the letter.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated he was not usually swayed by comments like that, but certainly some of the comments that were made by the Board about not rewarding people who broke the law, and in this case these people actually did not.

**Mr. Gay** stated what was around them certainly did not measure up to this. At least the photographs they showed to the Board of the backs of the other houses were not this nice.

**Mr. Mitchell** said the Board takes it on a project-by-project basis.

**Mr. Gay** said it would be an improvement.

**Mr. Gay** asked if the petitioner had a permit for this.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that they would have one now.

**Mr. Gay** asked if they had not even have a building permit for what they had already done.

**Mr. Wubbena** stated that was correct. They were trying to get approval through the Board, and then they would be getting the permit. He said construction had been stopped.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated the Board was not being asked to do something that they become complicit in something that should not be done.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he wanted to remind those who spoke out so eloquently and so passionately on behalf of their neighbors, first of all, it was a wonderful human characteristic. They asked the Board to show mercy. When you see somebody speeding on the highway, you always ask for justice. When the police car is behind you and you are speeding you beg for mercy. Remember to give mercy if you receive it.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Mitchell made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion, Ms. Seiler was opposed. Mr. Deering recused himself. The motion carried four to one.

**Mr. Brian Felder** stated as part of a court ordered agreement, they basically brought it back as if it were a new project to be heard by the Board first for compatibility in the district. Then they would prepare drawings for permit. The stamp from the Preservation Officer goes on the permit drawings after this, and then they would go forward with reconstruction.

**RE: Petition of Poticny, Deering, Felder Architects  
H-06-3651-2  
501 West Harris Street - Battlefield Park  
New Construction of Part I Height & Mass of a  
Hotel Development**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Mr. Deering recused himself.

Present for the petition was Mr. John Deering.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part I Height and Mass of a hotel development containing 102 rooms. The proposed plan consists of a three- and four-story hotel, divided into two buildings fronting Charlton Street, and three two-story and two and one-half story semi-attached cottages facing Harris Street. The buildings are labeled A through E in the submittal as noted on the drawings. The proposed new construction is sited on five vacant parcels zoned B-C (Community-Business). A recombination subdivision plat will need to be filed and recorded prior to issuance of a building permit.

Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps from 1898 and 1916 provide some reference to what this block was like historically. It featured mostly one- and two-story residences, both duplexes and detached dwellings, facing Harris and Charlton Streets. Most structures were wood frame with the exception of six three-story buildings present in the block. Buildings were placed directly on the front yard lot line, with front entrance stoops projecting beyond.

**FINDINGS:**

**The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:**

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Development Standards: No setbacks are required. No minimum lot area or maximum lot coverage is	The main building frontage on Harris Street maintains a 10' front yard setback, with porches projecting forward	Staff recommends approval. Sidewalks and setback dimensions should be indicated on the site plan.

<p>required for non-residential uses in a B-C zone.</p>	<p>from that point. The setback on Charlton Street is minimal. There are no other contributing buildings within the block face and, as such, no front yard setback is established. New parking spaces are proposed on both Harris and Charlton Streets.</p>	
<p>Dwelling Unit Type</p>	<p>Suite hotel</p>	
<p>Street Elevation Type</p>	<p>Two four-story hotel structures (commercial building type), connected by a recessed glass hyphen, and three two-story hotel buildings in the form of semi-attached duplexes (residential building types).</p>	<p>Historically, semi-attached dwellings were present within the block.</p>
<p>Entrances</p>	<p>Entrances for the main hotel building (A) are located on Harris and Charlton Streets within projecting bays on each elevation. Building B is entered</p>	<p>Staff recommends incorporating an entrance facing Charlton Street on Building B within the proposed storefront-type openings during the design</p>
<p><b>Standard</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed</b></p>	<p><b>Comment</b></p>
	<p>by a glass hyphen on either side of the building. No entrances are located on the 85' wide main façade of the structure. Buildings C, D, and E have single and double stoop entrances along Harris Street.</p>	<p>submittal. Staff also recommends restudy of the double entrance on Buildings D and E during the Part II submittal. The wide span of the buildings call for a wider or more substantial entry.</p>
<p>Building Height: Three-story maximum height zone.</p>	<p>Building A: Four-stories (46'-4") – the partial fourth floor is setback from the edge of the building 15' on the east, 30' on the south, and 31' on the north                  Building B: Three-stories (38')                  Buildings C and E: 2.5 Stories (29'-4")                  Building D: 2 Stories (29')</p>	<p>On July 25<sup>th</sup>, the Board of Appeals granted a one-story height variance for this project to be four-stories in height. There are no historic buildings within the block. The Roundhouse is approx. 26' tall and the Visitor's Center is approx. 56' tall. The top of the third-story expression is at 41' with the fourth floor behind. Staff recommends approval of the height as the fourth floor is setback and will be minimally visible, because there are no neighboring historic structures which will be impacted by the increase in height. The buildings closest to the Roundhouse are reduced in</p>

<p>Commercial: Ground floor not less than 14'-6"; second story not less than 12'; each story above not less than 10'</p> <p>Residential: First floor not less than 11'; each floor above, not less than 10'.</p>	<p>Buildings A &amp; B fall under commercial standards. Building A has a ground floor of 14'-4" and Building B is around 12'. The upper floors meet the standards.</p> <p>Buildings C, D, &amp; E fall under residential standards. Buildings C &amp; E have similar forms with 10' first floors and 8' second floors with a half story in the roof. Building D has a slightly taller second floor but a much lower roof pitch.</p>	<p>height, stepping down to the historic structures.</p> <p>Due to the overall height of Building A, Staff recommends approval of the proposed floor-to-floor heights. The parapet on the third floor helps to mitigate the height of the partial fourth floor above. The spring course on Building B could be raised to meet the 14' minimum and a more substantial cornice could be introduced to meet the standards during the Part II submittal.</p> <p>There is very little historic context in the area. Similar residential buildings have survived to the south, but are smaller in scale. Justification for the lower floor-to-floor heights should be provided, or the standards should be met. It appears that historic buildings in the area have lower floor heights but more information is needed.</p>
<p>Large-Scale Development</p>	<p>The hotel has been broken up into five separate buildings reducing the overall mass of the project. The east elevation,</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. This façade is internal, not street facing and could potentially be shielded from view by any new</p>
<p><b>Standard</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed</b></p>	<p><b>Comment</b></p>
	<p>behind the existing non-historic gas station, has the longest uninterrupted facade extending over 100'.</p>	<p>construction on the lot to the east.</p>
<p>Proportion of Structure's Front Façade</p>	<p>Building A: Facades on Charlton and Harris Street are 3 stories tall and 102' wide with an internal courtyard. The facades have projecting entrance bays, which break up the mass of the building.</p> <p>Building B: The Charlton Street elevation is 3 stories tall by 85'-8" wide and is divided into symmetrical bays.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>

	Buildings C, D, & E: Each building is 43' wide and 2 to 2.5 stories tall.	The height and shape of the roof, in composition with the second floor porch on Building D, appears out of proportion for the width and height of the overall building.
Proportion of Openings	<p>Building A: Ground floor openings have a ratio of 4:7, while upper floor windows are 3:5.</p> <p>Building B: Storefront ground floor openings are proposed with paired 3:5 windows. Upper floors have openings of 3:5.</p> <p>Buildings C, D, &amp; E: Window openings are 2.5:4.5</p>	Although there are no historic structures within the block, the openings are similar to others found within the Historic District.
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	<p>Building A: Charlton Street and Harris Street elevations are comprised of 10' wide bays equally spaced vertically and horizontally with an offset 33' wide projecting bay at the entrance.</p> <p>Building B continues the four bay rhythms, with pairs of openings, present in Building A, but is separated by a recessed glass hyphen, reminiscent of the old railroad building on Jones and Boundary.</p> <p>Buildings C and D are comprised of five bays with a central entry.</p> <p>Building E is comprised of four bays with independent side entries.</p>	<p>The style and rhythm of bays is reflective of the industrial railroad buildings present in the Central of Georgia Railroad complex.</p> <p>The number of bays appears incongruent with the width of the building. Staff recommends restudy during Part II, Design submittal.</p>
<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Rhythm of Structure on Street	The Charlton Street buildings maintain 10'-4" space in between the two structures where a recessed stair is located. The building is adjacent to the existing gas station on the east and vacant land is to the west.	The non-historic gas station fronting MLK is the only existing building on the block. Jones Street to the south is the nearest block with continuous street frontage and although buildings appear closer together, they are still separated by vacant lots and

	The Harris Street side maintains 6' to 9' of open space between the buildings.	surface parking. Historically, this block was filled with numerous dwellings with various ranges of open space between structures.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	The main portion of the hotel has a porch within the interior courtyard. The buildings along Harris Street feature entrance stoops which project approximately 5' from the face of the building.	Historically, buildings in this block were built to the lot line with porches encroaching into the public right-of-way. The sidewalks and street lawns are being reconfigured to provide on-street parking. The location of sidewalks on the site plan would verify how far the buildings will be set back.
Walls of Continuity	No walls or fences are indicated on the plans.	

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval of a Finding of Fact for the visual compatibility of an additional story based on the setback of the partial story in the manner of a monitor, which was common on railroad structures in the area, and because it will have no adverse impact on nearby historic buildings.

Approval for Part I, Height and Mass, with the condition that a revised site plan be provided to Staff, and that Staff comments are considered during the Part II Design submittal.

**Mr. Gay** asked if he heard something about parking.

**Ms. Ward** stated in the BC zone she was not sure what the parking requirements were. They were providing on-street parking, and she thought they were sharing some off-street parking with the Courtyard Marriott, but they would be able to address that.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mitchell** stated he liked what was being done. He said it was something they obviously did not have any purview over. He asked what kind of parking situation were they talking about.

**Mr. Deering** stated parking was completely handled, and the City Zoning Administrator had already given them a letter saying it had been satisfied. He stated they worked hard to try to maintain the spirit of Frog Town and the Central Georgia Historic Railroad Complex because it was very important to them. He thought it was a unique site and they have nothing like it. He would have to say in response to some of Ms. Ward’s comments that some of the things they had done such as lowering the floor-to-floor heights on the cottages were done as a result of the types of structures that used to exist in that neighborhood. They were smaller-scale structures very much like the Beach Institute. Both of the neighborhoods were developed at the same time, and they have very similar architecture. He said one was on the east side for that railroad and one was on the west side for this railroad. Unfortunately, we have lost most of the historic fabric in this area.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if there were tin roofs on the cottages.

**Mr. Deering** said they were intending to have a mixture of roofs. Some of them would be metal and some would probably be some other shingle material.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated it could be authentic and keep the dirt streets they used to have in Frog Town.

**Mr. Deering** stated on the larger buildings, there were many large buildings in that area that existed. He said Coastal Heritage Society (CHS) that administered all of the property provided the photograph he showed. They had been in a lot of discussion with CHS about the project, and they were happy that it was happening. Some of the architecture like the middle cottage has a low-slope roof with a bracket eave because one of the buildings did exist there. The two and one-half story houses were actually two-story houses with very high-pitched roofs that did exist there. Looking at the Sanborn, there were many other examples of double houses right next to each other throughout the neighborhood, and some were actually three stories. There were three-story double townhouses, and everywhere there was the number two, there was a double townhouse or was two floors. It was not an anomaly historically for the neighborhood. The zoning for the site that had allowed three floors on 100 percent lot coverage, the developer could have asked us to design something that was more compatible. It would completely fill this entire block, and with CHS and Ms. Reiter wanting it to blend in with the neighborhood, they really tried to break it up. He commended the developer for allowing that to happen, and having the hotel put into several different structures.

**Mr. Gay** stated the smaller buildings were great and sort of had the feel of some of the other hotels in Savannah. He stated he had hoped the petitioner would do a lot better job than that.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she was glad they had the vision to break it up.

**Dr. Johnson** stated he was some 30 years ago he served on a committee, on the Battlefield Park Technical Committee, and this was the vision of the committee. He said he was glad that he was still living to see it come into its fruition.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** said the HSF supported the Part I application wholeheartedly, and commended the developer and the architect for being sensitive to the historic character of this old neighborhood.

**HDBR ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition, with a Finding of Fact that the proposed height is visually compatible based on the setback of the partial story in the manner of a monitor, which was common on railroad structures in the area, and because it will have no adverse impact on nearby historic buildings. Also, approval for Part I Height and Mass with the condition that a revised site plan be provided to Staff, and that Staff comments are considered during the Part II Design submittal. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Poticny, Deering, Felder Architects  
H-06-3652-2  
4 West Liberty Street  
Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval** for elevator and porch additions; **continuance** for parking structure/terrace.

Mr. Deering recused himself.



Present for the petition was Mr. John Deering.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for exterior alterations and additions to the building at 4 West Liberty Street as follows:

1. Addition of an elevator shaft at the rear of the building. The exterior will be surfaced in a true stucco finish to match the existing historic building in color and texture. The non-historic metal fire escape on the neighboring property will be removed.
2. Add a second-level porch to the existing side porch on the southeast corner with a decorative handrail above.
3. One-story parking structure on adjacent surface parking lot at 8 West Liberty Street with a brick terrace above.

**FINDINGS:**

The historic building at 4 West Liberty Street was constructed in 1879, and is one of the most well-preserved Second Empire style residences in the Landmark Historic District. The historic building maintains a high level of historic integrity having undergone few alterations, with the exception of the ground floor commercial conversion. Both this property and the vacant lot at 8 West Liberty Street are zoned RIP-C (Residential, Institutional, Professional). Historically the vacant lot contained a three-story townhouse, which was razed sometime between 1916 and 1954 for a parking lot.

**The following standards apply:**

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p><b>Building Coverage:</b> Maximum 75% in a RIP-C zoning district.</p>	<p>It is unclear if the proposed elevator shaft will take up additional building coverage or if a portion of the building exists there currently.</p> <p>The lot at 8 W. Liberty appears to be 30' x 90' (2,700 SF). The proposed carport/terrace appears to be 32.5' x 76.5' (2295 SF) for a building lot coverage of 85%.</p>	<p>Dimensions should be noted on site plan. It appears that the addition of an elevator shaft may require a variance for building lot coverage as the lot is currently covered by over 90%.</p> <p>It appears that a 10% lot coverage variance will be required from the Zoning Board of Appeals. Staff recommends restudy of this structure to meet the standards. It is unclear where the property lines are in relation to the proposed structure as the lot appears to be 30' wide and the building is 32' wide.</p>

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p><b>Elevator addition:</b> Additions shall be located to the rear of the structure of the most inconspicuous side of the building.</p>	<p>The 10' deep by 8' wide addition will be located between the rear of the main building and the rear of the adjacent building to be minimally visible from the public right of way. False window openings are located on each story of the shaft, which is surfaced in stucco to match the main house. A railing and parapet top the addition to obscure HVAC units. The neighboring fire escape will be removed as they will now have access to the elevator.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval with the condition that the false openings be deleted. The addition is already minimally visible and a blank wall will allow the shaft to further recess into the structures.</p>
<p><b>Porch addition:</b> 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.</p>	<p>A second-story porch and balcony above are proposed over the existing historic porch at the corner of Bull and Liberty Streets. It will match the existing porch in dimension, design, and materials. The design for the iron railing above was taken from other details within the main house. All openings, lintels, corbels, and character defining features are to be retained. One window within the mansard roof will be replaced with a casement type window to provide entrance onto the balcony, but the original opening will remain intact.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval with the condition that a section drawing of the porch with noted materials be submitted to Staff for final approval. The proposed porch addition is compatible with the building and does not obscure or adversely impact any character defining features of the building. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that designing and installing additional porches when required for the new use is recommended, when done in a manner that preserves the historic character of the building.</p>
<p><b>Carpport/terrace:</b> Buildings throughout the Historic District shall be at least two stories, except in the Beach Institute, or for secondary structures which front a lane. 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. The relationship of solids to voids in the facades visible from the public right-of-way</p>	<p>A one-story parking structure with a landscaped terrace above is proposed for the neighboring lot at 8 West Liberty Street. Currently, the lot is used for surface parking, and a curb cut exists on Liberty Street. The structure is approximately 32' wide by 76' deep and 9.75' tall with an iron railing above. Railings will extend around the terrace at the windows on the historic structure. It is comprised of three arched bays between</p>	<p>Staff recommends a continuance to restudy alternative solutions to address for greenspace and parking. The proposed one-story building serves as a secondary structure, but in addition to fronting the lane, it also fronts Liberty Street and maintains the same setbacks as the existing structures. If it is going to front Liberty Street, it should appear as a two-story structure with a ratio of solids</p>

<p>of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.</p>	<p>pilasters with an opening for automobile traffic adjacent to the historic residence. It is unclear if the grade change in the sidewalk is existing or proposed. A new metal railing will be installed at the ground floor entrance of the residence to provide a buffer against the traffic.</p>	<p>to voids and openings that are visually compatible with neighboring historic structures. The introduction of new automobile entrances along Liberty Street between two historically significant residences is not appropriate. The one-story Soho South Café nearby is only one-story, but is equal in height visually to two-stories on the neighboring structure and the reuse this building has</p>
<p><b>Standard</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed</b></p>	<p><b>Comment</b></p>
		<p>eliminated the auto entry from Liberty Street. Dimensions should be noted on site plan and clarification of the existing grade changes on the sidewalk should be provided. Automobile traffic should be directed toward the lane and not Liberty Street.</p>
<p><b>Windows and doors:</b></p>	<p>It appears that the fixed windows in the Mansard roof will be replaced with double-hung windows. In addition, plans indicated that some windows will be replaced with doors on the west elevation and a new door (or casement window) will be installed at the balcony on the top floor.</p>	<p>All windows and doors to be replaced should be indicated on elevations and manufacturer's specifications and/or materials should be noted.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Approval for the elevator shaft with the condition that a lot coverage variance be approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals.
2. Approval for the porch addition and exterior alterations with the condition that no character defining features be obscured, and that the addition be as reversible as possible. A section drawing of the porch and detailed elevations noting where windows and doors will be replaced should be submitted to Staff for final approval, with manufacturer's specifications and/or materials noted.
3. Continuance for the one-story carport/terrace to restudy any alternative solutions, and to eliminate the parking entrance off Liberty Street. Green space could possibly be obtained by the introduction of side balconies or porches. The Height and Mass appear out-of-scale and character with the significant and well-preserved

neighboring historic properties, and the building does not meet the lot coverage requirements for RIP-C zoning district.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Deering** stated he wanted to address the comments on the main building. On the elevator shaft that occurred, they wanted to keep the recessed window openings because they did add some kind of dimensional difference in the tower, but if the Board really did not like them, they could certainly eliminate them.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if the view looking from the parking lot was looking east.

**Mr. Deering** answered yes. He said it was the west elevation but you would be looking east. He thought Staff misinterpreted their design direction to what Ms. Ward called a parking structure. They would like to call it a garden wall. If you think about large houses in the Historic District that did have side gardens, they had garden walls. The Scarborough House was one of them and was a perfect example on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard (MLK). It was a large stucco grand house that had a garden wall and a carriage gate that went right through it. That was really what they were envisioning here. They do not want to call it a parking structure; they do want to provide and continue to provide parking behind it, have it roofed, and have it gated with a wood board gate.

**Mr. Gay** asked if there would be a gate there.

**Mr. Deering** stated a wood board gate was what they were proposing so that it did have that same feeling of the grand house with the side yard and that sort of thing. The terrace beyond, and if it helped to mitigate that this looked like a structure, they could move the iron railing back four, five, or eight feet or whatever. To have a view from one of these apartments and from the neighboring brick three-story townhouse down onto a terrace roof with all of the greenery and a nice planted area he thought was far more desirable than the view of a parking lot. Also, from Liberty Street with this in mind, he thought it was much more pleasant to look at a stuccoed garden wall, rather than a parking structure, than it was to look at an open parking lot. They really do not want to lose the parking because he thought it was important.

**Mr. Gay** stated there was already an entrance to the parking lot right now.

**Mr. Deering** said there was a curb cut that existed, and he thought it was the natural and the development process for this project to have parking and maintain the existing curb cut.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated it was a parking facility. You put a wall up, you put a roof on it, and it would become like an outdoor greenery terrace-type thing.

**Mr. Gay** said or you it could be a garden behind there.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated as far as you know as soon as the door opened you realize that was not the case here. He had no problem with the whole concept at all.

**Mr. Deering** stated he apologized for their site plans on both this project and the Battlefield Park project. They were having problem with the civil engineer who had not provided them with all of that information just yet. If they do not have to slope the grade to get into the garage, they would not do it any more than they have to. There may be a possibility that it might happen.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked what was at the far end.

**Mr. Deering** said at the far end where it faces the lane you come out, and there would be two parking spaces on the lane. He wanted to make a point about that too regarding the lot coverage that they were at 83 percent lot coverage on this particular lot. When you look at the Sanborn at 4 West Liberty, the Sixpence Building was not built there at the time. He said it was a two-story structure, there was another two-story structure, and then there was a three-story structure that had some addition on the back of it. Most of the lot was covered historically, and they were not really changing the lot coverage that much. In their plan for the parking, it was covered to one point, and from one point back it was open to the lane. He said not all of it was built on.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if the Board was considering the lot next to the building where the parking currently was. He asked if it was lot coverage for that piece only.

**Mr. Deering** stated there was an issue with lot coverage on the 4 West Liberty building.

**Mr. Mitchell** said he was talking about where there was currently parking. He asked if they were talking about coverage for that piece only.

**Mr. Deering** stated that was all he was talking about right now. It was an 82.7 percent was what they had covered so far.

**Mr. Gay** asked if there was any possibility the existing building behind the main building would be gone some day.

**Mr. Deering** stated it was probably on the City's historic building map at present. He was sure that Staff had put that on there.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated he would like to observe that one of the ordinances that was not enforced in the City, and they had asked for it to be enforced many times, were that in the Landmark District all parking lots were required to be screened with either landscaping or walls. Taking that into account, he felt it was an appropriate thing to do, and that the petitioner was taking advantage of the roof as space to serve the building as greenspace. The Architectural Review Committee (ARC) had no problem with it. If there were problems with the scale and the detailing of it, he thought the petitioner should be open to hearing suggestions. Being as concerned as they had been at HSF about the variances for lot coverage, it was important that the variance was obtained, and that it was distinguished somehow from building on 190 percent of the lot as some of the other projects they were opposed to.

**Mr. Gay** suggested making a motion with all of the recommendations that the Board made.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that they had been discussing the petition so long and asked what the specific changes were.

**Mr. Deering** stated they were happy to provide a more detailed site plan for record and section through the addition to the side porch.

**Mr. Gay** stated they would have to get approval for the lot coverage and for the things that were out of the Board's purview.

**Mr. Deering** stated they did have to do that. He said Staff addressed the windows on the top floor, and they were the single-pane fixed glass windows. It was discovered in the building that

most of those historic window sashes were stored there, and they were going to put the historic window sashes back in place.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Gay made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the condition that a revised site plan and section through the side porch be submitted to Staff for final approval. Building lot coverage variance requests will need to be approved by the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects  
Erik E. Puljung  
H-06-3653-2  
14 East Taylor Street  
Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval** for demolition of non-historic addition, new porch addition and carriage house addition; **restudy** of carriage house alterations.

Present for the petition was Mr. Erik E. Puljung.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if there was a typo in the file number. He said the agenda read, “3655-2” and the Staff report read, “3653-2”.

**Ms. Ward** stated that “3653-2” was the correct number.

**Ms. Ward** gave the Staff report.

#### **NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for the following work at 14 East Taylor Street:

1. Demolition of a circa 1975 addition in the rear to restore the original courtyard.
2. Exterior alterations and an addition to the existing carriage house.
3. Rehabilitation of the main residence.
4. Four-story porch addition and elevator shaft on the rear of the house.

#### **FINDINGS:**

The building at 14 East Taylor Street was originally constructed in 1869 as a semi-attached townhouse with a sister building to the west. The carriage houses at the rear of the townhouses as 12-14 East Taylor Street were constructed in 1894. The historic residence and carriage house are rated structures within Savannah’s Landmark Historic District.

1. The existing rear addition does not appear on the 1954 (revised through 1973) Sanborn Fire Insurance Map and does not possess any significant historic or architectural value. Demolition of this addition would restore the original courtyard to the property.
2. The proposed 6-foot 2½ inch deep, 24-foot-wide, carriage house addition will be located on the interior of the lot and will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

The addition will contain an exterior chimney and parapet, which will extend above the existing roofline.

The proposed exterior alterations to the lane facing elevation consist of installing two new auto and pedestrian entrances on the ground floor and window openings which align above on the second floor. A stucco surface is proposed to obscure the old openings and different brick colors. The carriage house has undergone insensitive non-historic alterations, which have undermined its historic integrity. Arch openings on the ground floor are still visible but were enclosed at some point. They are 7 feet and 6-foot 6-inches wide which is insufficient for automobile access. It is unclear if the arch openings were original or a later alteration based on photographic documentation of the Western arch and the adjacent carriage house. The sister carriage house has also been altered but is more intact. It exhibits four equally spaced window openings on the second floor with segmental arch lintels. The standards state (Section 8-3030 (l)(14) that, in existing carriage houses, original entries shall not be enlarged.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition and restudy of the proposed alterations to restore the historic integrity of the building and reinstate the original fenestration if possible. Manufacturer's specifications on the proposed windows and garage doors should be provided. Staff recommends that traditional "barn-type" garage doors be utilized to reference what would have historically been in the openings.

3. Exterior renovations to the main house include applying stucco to the front façade to match what was historically on the building, portions of the original stucco are still evident on the side elevations and chimney as well as on the neighboring sister building. In addition, all windows, metal work, and stone work are to be repaired or replaced in kind as needed.

Staff recommends approval with the condition that an elevation be provided to staff noting what exactly will be repaired and what will be replaced.

4. The proposed four-story porch will be on the rear of the main residence. A metal spiral stair will be removed and openings will be reconfigured. New windows will be double-hung sash and match the original trim detail. French doors will be wood with matching trim. An elevator shaft will be constructed on the west side of the porch. The porch addition is comprised of pilasters on columns with two-inch square pickets on a CMU base, surfaced with a sand finish stucco. The elevator shaft is surfaced in stucco to match the existing building. A staircase extends from the parlor level down to the courtyard and will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

Manufacturer's information should be provided to Staff for the proposed doors and sidelights.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval for demolition of the non-historic addition, the proposed additions on the carriage house and main residence, and rehabilitation of the main residence upon submittal of a noted elevation to be provided to staff indicating repairs to occur and manufacturer's specifications on the French doors.

Continuance for the proposed alterations to the carriage house to restudy the proposed fenestration. This is an excellent opportunity to restore the original openings, which are character defining features of the carriage house. Although this building has undergone unsympathetic alterations, the proposed alterations do not respect the historic fenestration pattern of the building, and further undermine the integrity of the building. If the original openings are maintained and four window openings are reinstated on the second floor, the need to stucco the exterior may not be warranted; however, Staff does not feel that it would undermine the integrity of the building since the main residence was originally stuccoed. Manufacturer's information on the windows and garage doors should be provided.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked on the window that was shown, what was originally there. He asked if there were two mullions and three four over four windows.

**Ms. Ward** stated they were looking to the neighbor sister carriage house for what was there historically. As far as the opening was concerned, it would have been a segmental arch opening, but she doubted that the window was original. What was proposed was simply a one over one. She thought they were going to restore the floor height because of what was done before. It was a revised drawing that showed the shadow line of what was there now and it was a really low floor height. She said the applicant would be able to address that question.

#### **PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Erik Puljung** stated the whole interior of the carriage house was gutted and removed. He said the addition they were proposing to be removed, was added to connect the parlor level to the carriage house. The second floor carriage house has 11-foot ceilings in it, and they were going back and putting in a new floor system with the addition they were proposing. They had an 8-foot ceiling proposed for the automobile portion of the garage, and then they would be able to put their window headers back up where they were originally located. They do prefer the four windows over the three. Working with the openings they do have and the edges of some of the openings they could actually do less brick work by doing this. This way you could see that the edges line up with some of the openings. He said it was so twisted and mangled that it was hard to identify all of the different pieces and parts. You could see that there were some arches in the carriage house, and there was evidence that those had been put in over time. He thought arches were great, but he had a hard time believing they were the original historic arches. It seemed like it had been one of the layers in the modifications. He said in their proposal they do have two automobile doors and two man doors as well. In the spirit of an original historical carriage house opening being arched, the two man doors were combined so they would have something representing a double gate, much like the Board saw in the proposal from Taylor Street.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if he was talking about putting the two arches back in.

**Mr. Puljung** stated he was talking about creating a new arch.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated he was talking about the two arches that were bricked and closed in.

**Mr. Puljung** stated they would be removed.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if there would not be any arches at all.

**Mr. Puljung** stated except for the new arch. Which is more in proportion.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if they were going to put the arches back.



**Ms. Seiler** said one arch.

**Mr. Puljung** stated it would be one arch and two garage doors, and the line weight was showing up a little bit flat, but they had reviewed it and would go back with the vertical board garage doors that were more of the barn style. He said there was another feature of the building that was not addressed in the submittal. The eastern stucco wall on the side was very faded, but it had evidence of scoring in it. The scoring goes up the entire height of the building, very large rectangles that were almost 30-inches tall and just over four feet wide. The front of the twin house was scored in a different pattern because it had a much smaller rectangle. Mr. Duncan, the owner of the neighboring house, told him that he had photographs of and would be presenting them to Staff to document anything they would want to pursue as far as the scoring goes. That was an element they did not have defined right now, but they would definitely be coming back to Staff with just in case there was any concern on it. He said if the Board wanted to discuss the scoring at all he would be happy to hear their opinions.

**Mr. Deering** stated the front scoring was more compact and refined, and sometimes the side scoring could have been different.

#### **BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Deering** said he really liked the big window on the carriage house and have always liked it since he was a teenager running around Downtown Savannah. He said he understood the petitioner wanting to change it because he had been told that the floor height had been changed in there at one point. After looking at the building, he thought the arch on the left-hand side might have been original. It felt more authentic than the one on the right-hand side, and it does not look as mangled. With as much as the carriage house had suffered and it had been altered so much that he did not know what there was to really save.

**Mr. Gay** asked what was there first or last.

**Mr. Deering** said he did feel the left arch might have been original but that it was really hard to say.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if the right arch was going to be a completely new arch. Instead of opening up one, another one would be created a little further over. He said there had definitely been some unsympathetic work done on this project.

**Mr. Gay** said if he understood the carriage house right now, the arched doorway that Mr. Deering thought was probably original was being done away with completely, and then they were going over to the other side and somewhat duplicating the one that obviously been altered dramatically.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated they were not going to duplicate it but they were going to cut a new one and it was going to be moved over a little bit.

**Mr. Gay** asked why not turn it around. He said it looked as though the one on the left was original because it had not been so beat up, and the other one, which does not add anything to the exterior, that maybe they could put the two garage doors over to the side and have the arch on that side.

**Mr. Steffen** stated there were two requests. There was a request for approval of demolition of a non-historic addition which was something the Board could accomplish. The second thing was the recommendations from Staff were for a continuance, but they had received the additional information. He did not know how many issues were still out there whether the Board needed

more information or not. It was not to put a time limit on anything, but a five minutes to six it was probably late to be engaging in a wide-ranging discussion of what all of the alternatives were in this project.

**Mr. Deering** asked Mr. Puljung if they would consider restudying the carriage house lane elevation.

**Mr. Puljung** asked from what perspective.

**Mr. Deering** stated from trying to maintain the existing arch that was back there. The one that had been less altered and manipulated.

**Mr. Puljung** stated he thought the photograph showed it, but he thought there was a through-wall unit opening that was already violating the vertical portion of the arch. He said it was destroyed.

**Ms. Seiler** stated giving the arch; she thought everything else looked fine.

**Mr. Deering** stated it was a personal opinion, but what had happened with the lanes Downtown was that they were once an interesting Bohemian conglomeration of stuff that were fun and interesting. Now they were becoming very suburban, very sterile, antiseptic, stucco, four windows across the top carriage houses with garage doors that meet the standards and there was no interest. It was all going away. He said where the carriage houses had been built, you could kind of except those kinds of things, but when you have historic interesting things going on, it was important to keep them.

**Mr. Gay** agreed and said it had some character.

**Ms. Seiler** asked as evidenced from Jones Street.

**Mr. Puljung** stated in the vein of trying to keep the interest there, that was what caused him to go for creating something a little bit more than just two door and the pedestrian entrances, and it was more in-scale of the arches that were found in the lane.

**Mr. Gay** stated if you look at the what little portion of the carriage house next door, you see the arch on the left looked in tact and very original, but then it had the little square thing to the side.

**Mr. Deering** stated it had been manipulated also.

**Mr. Puljung** stated from a design standpoint, if he could go back and figure out how to use one of the original arches and still provide what was a requirement of getting two cars in there. He said he would come back to the Board with that.

**Mr. Deering** stated to at least alter it some more, but keep the left-hand side of what he thought was the original arch and just make it wider.

**Mr. Puljung** asked if he meant to expand on the original arch; potential original arch.

**HDBR ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for demolition of the non-historic addition, approve a new addition and rehabilitation for the main residence, and a new addition on the carriage house. A continuance was granted for the exterior alterations to the carriage house to restudy the proposed openings and submit to Staff for final approval. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**F. STAFF REVIEWS**

1. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
H-06-3638(S)-2  
19 East Bay Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
2. Petition of Mopper-Stapen  
Jessica Pedigo  
H-06-3639(S)-2  
306 East President Street  
Color/Shutters  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
3. Petition of Charlie Angell  
The House Doctor  
H-06-3640(S)-2  
121 Barnard Street  
Alteration  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
4. Petition of Louis A. Thomann  
H-06-3641(S)-2  
120, 122 & 124 East Jones Street  
347 Abercorn  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
5. Petition of Gary Crews  
H-06-3642(S)-2  
546 – 548 East President Street  
Alterations  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
6. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
H-06-3643(S)-2  
313 – 319 West River Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
7. Petition of Angus C. Sawyer  
H-06-3644(S)-2  
515 East Perry Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
8. Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc.  
Doug Bean  
H-06-3645(S)-2  
201 West Bay Street  
Color/Alterations to a Sign  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

- 9. Petition of Dallas & Leslie Washburn  
H-06-3654(S)-2  
213 West Gaston Street  
Color

**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

- 10. Petition of Don Moore  
H-06-3655(S)-2  
413 East Jones Street  
Color

**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

- 11. Petition of Meryl Truett & John Meyer  
H-06-3656(S)-2  
209 West Hall Street  
Color

**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

**RE: MINUTES**

- 1. Distribution of Regular Meeting Minutes – August 9, 2006

**HDRB ACTION: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: OTHER BUSINESS**

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

**RE: ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 4:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp