

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

**REGULAR MEETING
112 EAST STATE STREET**

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

DECEMBER 13, 2006

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

**Joseph Steffen, Chairman
Swann Seiler, Vice-Chairman
Dr. Gerald Caplan
John L. Deering, III
Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring
Ned Gay
Dr. Lester Johnson
Eric Meyerhoff
W. John Mitchell
John Neely**

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

**Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner
Janita Thompson**

RE: CALL TO ORDER

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

RE: REFLECTION

RE: SIGN POSTING

All signs were properly posted.

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

**RE: Amended Petition of Lominack, Kolman, Smith
Steve Day, Day and Day Construction
H-06-3521-2
418 East Bryan Street
New Construction of a Carriage House,
Amending Windows and HVAC**

Continued to January 10, 2007

**RE: Petition of BMW Architects
H-06-3713-2
18 West Bryan Street
Rehabilitation/Alteration**

Continued to January 10, 2007

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve that the Continued Agenda items be moved to the January 10, 2007, meeting. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

RE: ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA

No items were removed from the agenda.

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

**RE: Petition of Ralph C. Anderson
H-06-3725-2 (ref. H-03-2977-2)
520 - 522 East Harris Street
Amendment to previous application for new
construction– door replacement**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Jessica Wooschlager
H-06-3728-2
19 East York Street
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Diversified Construction
Jeff Kramer
H-06-3730-2
30 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Rehabilitation/Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Watkins Architects
H-06-3731-2
623 - 625 Montgomery Street
402 - 410 West Hall Street
Rehabilitation/Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of B. Matthews
Brian Huskey
H-06-3736-2
325 East Bay Street
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the Consent Agenda items as presented. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it was passed. Mr. Deering abstained from Item No. 1, H-06-3725-2 (Ref. H-03-2977-2)

**RE: Amended Petition of R. K. Construction – Agent
for American Commercial Developers
H-05-3394-2
513 East Oglethorpe Avenue
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval of window, door, and paint color change. Relocate as many HVAC units to the roof as possible. Denial of encroachment onto sidewalk.**

Present for the petition was Mr. Ramsey Khalidi and Mr. Lee Meyer.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to amend a previous submittal for exterior alterations to the buildings at 513 East Oglethorpe Avenue. Alterations to the approved plans were made in the field during the course of construction without approval from the Board or Staff. The petitioner has submitted an application at the request of Staff to help mitigate some of alterations that are not in compliance with the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030). This item was continued at the November 8, 2006, Historic Review Board meeting for the applicant to submit a complete application with drawings.

Alterations include the following:

1. **Doors:** Change the doors on the rear, fronting Houston and Hull Streets from the previously approved solid steel doors to metal frame doors with ¼-inch commercial grade clear plate glass. Commercial doors with between-the-glass muntins were installed without approval.
2. **Windows:** Change the windows in the southeastern building from the previously approved Anderson 400 series, nine-over-nine, true divided light, double-hung sash windows to fixed single-light metal frame windows to match the doors and storefront material. Fixed, metal windows with between-the-glass muntins and exterior iron bars were installed without approval.
3. **Shutters:** Delete approved paneled shutters from the previous submittal.
4. **HVAC:** 19 condenser units were installed along Houston and Hull Streets without approval. The applicant is requesting approval to keep the units in place, surround them with a “green screen”, and plant ivy to screen them from view.
5. **Electrical:** Numerous electrical panels were installed on the Houston and Hull Streets elevations without approval. The petitioner is requesting to surround each of the electrical panels with a privacy fence and security door.
6. **Parapet:** The petitioner received Staff approval to paint the metal parapet Charleston Green. It was then painted a lighter pastel green color. The petitioner intends to paint the parapet Charleston Green as was previously applied and approved for, along with all exterior metal trim along Houston and Hull Streets.

FINDINGS:

The one-story commercial building and industrial building located at 513 East Oglethorpe Avenue are not rated structures within Savannah's National Landmark Historic District. The following standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) apply:

(I)(9) Windows: Double-glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction [provided that they meet certain standards]; "Snap-in" or between-the-glass muntins shall not be used.

The standards are met provided that the petitioner removes the between-the-glass muntins from the windows and doors. Since this is a non-rated commercial structure, there are no requirements that the windows be double-hung or made of wood.

(I)(15) Utilities and Refuse: Electrical vaults, meter boxes, and communications devices shall be located on secondary and rear facades and shall be minimally visible from view. HVAC units shall be screened from the public right-of-way.

Staff identified four electrical panels on the exterior of the building (three facing Houston Street and one facing Hull Street). The screen for these is an 8-foot 10-inch wide by 3-foot deep masonry addition with wooden double doors for access. While these are on secondary facades, they still face a square and are clearly visible. It appears that these screens would project right out to the sidewalk, if not over it. The site plan submitted shows approximately 1-foot of space between the face of the building and the property line. Revised drawings indicate that a 3' tall wooden fence may be replacing the proposed electrical screens. Please clarify.

It appears that the "green screen" surrounding the HVAC units has been modified into a 3' tall wood fence made of vertical boards and 4"x4" wood posts. The units are located on the ground within close proximity to the sidewalk. Field inspection indicated that several of the condenser units installed actually encroach onto the existing sidewalk. As such, it appears that the proposed screens would also be in the sidewalk. Please clarify. Staff recommends that an attempt to relocate some of the 19 condenser units to the roof be made.

Although Hull and McDonough Streets occupy the rear spaces for the tenants of these buildings, these facades front directly onto Crawford Square. The corner building at the intersection of these streets does have an entrance across from the square. By placing all of the 19 HVAC condenser units and numerous electric meters and boxes on these elevations, the building completely turns its back on a square which has had a recent resurgence of activity and development. More should be done to enhance these elevations instead of detract from them.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the window and door change as they meet the standards. Approval of the paint color change. Staff recommends that as many of the HVAC units be relocated to the roof as possible. Staff does not recommend approval for any HVAC units and/or screening of any kind that encroaches onto the sidewalk. Staff has consistently recommended restudy of HVAC units and electrical meters proposed on the front of buildings facing a street. While these utilities have been placed at the rear of the building, they are located adjacent to the sidewalk and within close proximity to Crawford Square. The location of these items does not meet the intent of the ordinance.

Mr. Steffen stated he understood Staff's recommendation on the HVAC units, but did not see a recommendation for the privacy fence security door along the electrical box.

Ms. Ward stated Staff was fine with it. Previously the applicant had submitted for taller panels to screen and they were not shown on the elevations, and asked the applicant to clarify.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Ramsey Khalidi stated that the electrical was shown on the site plan but that it was not on the elevations. The proposed fence was similar in scale, nature, and materials to other fences in the neighborhood. It was a recommendation at the last meeting that they screen electrical panels, and in their opinion, if they do a fence with sliding gates that most of the mechanical units would be shielded from view.

Ms. Seiler asked if they would or would not be doing a fence.

Mr. Khalidi answered yes, as is shown on the drawing. He stated HVAC units would be off the right-of-way so there would be no encroachment on the roof of any type.

Mr. Lee Meyer stated if you try to put air conditioning units on the roof of a small building, you would have to drill holes through the roof to get the refrigeration lines and the conduits up there. Within the project, they thought that the fence would look good and conceal everything.

Mr. Neely asked if Mr. Meyer could explain the sliding gate, how it would work, and what the mechanism was.

Mr. Meyer stated if anyone had seen the Great Savannah Market Place on River Street, and if the Board was familiar with any farm structures, there are sliding barn doors. It would be a sliding gate that fits behind the front of the material

Mr. Deering said Mr. Meyer stated it would be a three-foot-tall wood fence.

Mr. Meyerhoff added it was four-foot-one on the drawing.

Mr. Deering asked if the section was correct.

Mr. Meyer stated four-one was correct.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated before the changes were made, contrary to what the Board had approved, the back doors to all the shops were glass doors and it was fine. Now, Mr. Meyer was telling the Board they wanted to put a fence in and have a gate for security to the doors. He said it didn't make sense to him and if they wanted a gate with security in front of the doors before that it should have been done initially. He asked why they now have to have sliding gates to get to the door when there was an issue with hiding the air conditioning units. He pointed out that the continuing fence as shown on Hull and Houston Streets accentuates the problem more than it deters the problem. He said he would strongly recommend Mr. Meyer reconsider and put the fencing in groups around two units so that there would be a gap in between, rather than having an accentuated total fence down the whole side of the elevation.

Mr. Meyer stated they could have to fence to go over two units, stop, and then have a gap, but the Board got excited about someone walking by and noticing the air conditioning unit as if it was a sin to put an air conditioning unit adjacent to a building.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that was not the unit. He said any air conditioning unit was unsightly, and a fence that was properly done can be part of the building. There was not an air conditioning unit, there were ten air conditioning units. The building had about three or four air conditioning units previously, now there are 21.

Mr. Khalidi stated that initially it was the back side of the grocery store and they were steel doors. They decided to make the change to a mullion door which was incorrect. The decision to keep the glass was to let more natural light pass into the building. He said he liked the idea of compartmentizing and going in pairs of the A/C units.

Mr. Gay stated he believed they could use fewer units, and in the ductwork have baffles or things that could be shut off, and individual thermostats for each store where they could control the temperature. When it gets to a certain temperature, then the vent would shut off and the air goes somewhere else, then they would have fewer units than they have right now.

Mr. Khalidi stated they could if it was single tenancy because the River Street Inn was done in zones. He said it happened to be 15 separate tenants, and it went from seven to 19 units.

Mr. Neely stated they could co-locate and put two together.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that for a small additional cost they could put two units closer together rather than having them 25 feet apart on the Hull street side. The fencing would be 10 or 12 feet rather than continuously.

Mr. Meyer stated they could do that and asked what would happen if they were only four feet apart.

Mr. Neely stated perhaps a special panel could be used to cover the electrical unit.

Mr. Khalidi stated he had heard from their client, and there were a number of things such as being placed where they were for energy efficiency. They wanted them to be as close as possible to the unit for each space, and that was why they ended up with 15 or 19 units behind each unit all the way around. If it was a new building it could be dealt with, but an existing building had compromises.

Mr. Gay asked if they were moved closer together would there be piping that would protrude past the fences.

Mr. Meyer stated they would have to have refrigeration lines and a disconnect switch on each unit.

Mr. Khalidi stated if they were going to change to smaller units, they could extend the line sets and consolidate.

Mr. Bill Steube (Downtown Neighborhood Association) stated they were concerned about the presence of the air conditioning units at street level blasting hot air on passersby, and wanted to know what kind of fencing material would be used. They wanted to see them on the roof, out of view, and out of public right-of-way.

Mr. Joe Sasseen stated the Board needed to ride around town and look at the roof lines on the old buildings. That they were being ruined with the equipment on the top of the buildings.

Mr. Khalidi stated all the roofs were gabled roofs and there were no flat areas.

Ms. Seiler stated the Board had looked at it, it was Staff's recommendation the Board go back and look at doing something else with the HVAC units, and she maintained it was what needed to be done and it would not be covered today.

HDRB DECISION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the window and door change, and the paint and color change. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and was passed unanimously.

Mr. Steffen stated to Mr. Khalidi there was a suggestion from a Board member that the balance of the issue involving the HVAC units, the potential encroachment of the sidewalk, and the potential enclosure of the electrical box need further study. He said if the applicant wished to request a continuance then the Board would grant one. If they did not want a continuance, then the Board would continue the discussion and reach a decision.

Mr. Khalidi asked if it could be done at a Staff level.

Mr. Steffen stated not if there was a continuance

Mr. Meyerhoff said if they did that, the Board would need to see the drawings before it was approved. Consequently, he did not see other options except to do that and have a continuance.

Mr. Khalidi asked if they could begin work on the other issues.

Mr. Steffen stated they had approval on the other issues because the Board just voted on them.

Mr. Khalidi stated they would come back on the fence and the air conditioning units.

Mr. Steffen asked Mr. Khalidi if he was asking for a request on the continuance on the fencing and the HVAC units.

Mr. Khalidi answered yes.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition for the fencing and location of the HVAC units and screening of the electrical panels. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

RE: Amended Petition of Poticny, Deering, Felder
Pete Callejas
H-05-3436-2
20 West Gaston Street
Rehabilitation/Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. John Deering.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

Mr. Deering recused himself.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting to amend a previous approval for exterior alterations and an addition to 20 West Gaston Street as follows:

1. Alterations to the previously approved third story porch to have wood columns instead of stucco.
2. Alterations to the louvered paneled balustrade to have fixed upper panels and three privacy panels.
3. Infill an existing non-historic French door opening along the lane to match the existing exterior wall.
4. Exterior walls on the third floor addition on the rear of the residence have been changed from scored stucco to stucco with expansion joints containing recessed 1” “blind” windows.
5. HVAC units are depicted above this addition and the screening mechanism is not clear.
6. Alterations to the proposed stucco wall and gate facing the lane. The applicant is requesting to have an 8’ tall brick wall with a vertical plank wooden gate.

FINDINGS:

The historic structure at 20 West Gaston Street was designed in 1857 by John S. Norris. The building, which contributes to Savannah’s Historic Landmark District, is significant for its architecture and retains a high degree of historic integrity. The property is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density) and received approval from the Historic District Board of Review for a series of two-story additions on the rear, a privacy wall, and new garage openings on the carriage house in August 2005 and May 2006.

The following standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p><i>Side Porches (I)(11):</i> Wood portico posts shall have cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave.</p>	<p>Wooden columns will divide the porch addition into four bays and are located directly above the existing stucco columns below.</p> <p>A 3’ tall wood louvered railing system is proposed for the porches. The ground floor porch will be infilled with operable louvers.</p>	<p>Staff recommends incorporating a base molding on the wood porch columns.</p> <p>Staff recommends approval. The original design for the balustrade is unknown and the proposed design is simplified and is compatible with the historic residence. The first floor porch is currently infilled with operable louvers.</p>
<p><i>Exterior Walls (I)(8):</i> Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco. The</p>	<p>The third story rear addition is surfaced in stucco with control joints and 1” recessed blind windows.</p>	<p>The rear elevation may be visible from the lane. Staff recommends that the addition should remain as</p>

<p>historic review board may approve other materials upon a showing by the applicant that the product is visually compatible with historic building materials and has performed satisfactorily in the local climate.</p>		<p>previously approved with scored stucco to match the existing residence. Expansion joints are not appropriate on additions to historic buildings and the blind windows have no relation to any other openings on the building.</p>
<p><i>Fences and Garden Walls(l)(13):</i> Walls and fences facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building; provided, however, iron fencing may be used with a masonry structure.</p>	<p>An 8' tall brick wall with a vertical plank wood gate is proposed at the rear of the property facing the lane.</p>	<p>Verify what is existing and color and texture of brick.</p>
<p><i>Utilities and refuse (l)(15):</i> HVAC units shall be screened from the public right-of-way.</p>	<p>Two HVAC units are depicted above the rear addition on the main house.</p>	<p>Verify screening mechanism.</p>

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the condition that the columns feature a base molding, the stucco exterior be scored to match the existing residence, and verify the brick wall color and screening mechanism for the HVAC units.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. John Deering stated they initially designed the side porch with stucco piers. He said the State Preservation Office does not want them to use stucco columns because it might confuse the viewer that the porch might have been there all along. They wanted the applicant to change it to wood. They were happy to put base moldings on the columns. He stated on the rear addition that Staff had shown the original scoring pattern on the elevation. The State Preservation Office wanted them to change that because it was an addition to the building and they don’t want it to be confused with the original building. They changed the scoring pattern and included two recessed openings for interest. They don’t have to use control joints because they could use score lines in the stucco. He stated the HVAC units have been on the roof since the initial submittal, and they had never intended to screen them. He thought the screening might draw more attention to them then leaving them as they were. On the brick wall, they had intended to use salvaged Savannah grey bricks.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mitchell stated a concern about screening the HVAC units.

Mr. Deering stated it was only visible from the lane and was not visible from the major streets.

HDRB DECISION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted, with the condition that a base molding be incorporated into the new columns. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion.

Ms. Fortson-Waring stated the Board had gotten away from the proper motions and to remember the motions are supposed to say that they were either in accordance with the ordinance or the guidelines

Ms. Reiter stated it would be simpler to say the Board approved the petition as submitted with an amendment to the column.

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay Architects
Patrick Shay
H-06-3588-2
508 - 511 West Oglethorpe Avenue
New Construction, Part II, Design Details for a
Hotel Development**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. gave the Staff report.

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to:

1. Part II Design Details Phase II Cambria Hotel Ann and Oglethorpe Avenue.

FINDINGS:

1. Part I Height and Mass for both phases was approved July 12, 2006. Part II Design for Phase I was approved September 13, 2006.
2. The applicant has addressed staff concerns by placing the restaurant with public entrances on both streets at the corner of Ann and Oglethorpe Avenue.

The following Part II Design Standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Windows	Anodized aluminum frames with Juniper Berry 501-6, LRV 14 as per Pittsburg Paints. Metal louvers for PTAC system below. Glass Blue-Green Eclipse Advantage by Pilkington Eclipse advantage glass.	Although a slightly different shade this ties the windows of the second hotel to the first.
Doors	Aluminum storefront entries and storefront glass doors at balconies.	
Roof	Stucco parapet and band; brick at corner. At ground floor entrances on Ann and Oglethorpe & Ann corner projecting canopies are proposed.	Please describe these canopies for the record. Staff was unable to correlate the sections with the elevation numbers for some reason.
Materials	Walls: Ground floor Arriscraft masonry units: Smooth and rock finish, Carmel color.	Use color board samples for true colors.

	<p>Portion of Ann Street wall and Corner Red wirecut brick 222 Carolina Collection by “Hanson” Company with “pumpkin” color mortar joints by Holcim mortarmix. Other walls Stucco sand finish with color no. Craker Bitz 317-5, LRV 45 for walls and Copper Beech 327-6 LRV 21 for bands as per Pittsburgh Paints.</p>	<p>Staff strongly recommends that a large color and material sample be erected on site prior to the final selection of the color. It is very difficult to abstract the effect of the proposed colors onto a large expanse of stucco.</p>
<p>Balconies:</p>	<p>Recessed balconies with metal railings Color: Juniper Berry 501-6 LRV 14 as per Pittsburgh Paints.</p>	

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of Part II Design Details with continuation of color until a larger wall sample can be erected on site.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay stated the project was brought to the Board for Height and Mass as two hotels at one time. Then because the franchise for the Phase I was identified earlier in the process, it was approved for design detail. He said today would be the Phase II Design Detail which would be Cambria Suites.

Mr. Saad Al Jassar apologized for the keying on the elevations, and gave Staff a set of corrected keys to the section. They had two canopies on the last set of details on Oglethorpe, which were metal canopies that were very similar. The canopy on the northwest side is a glass canopy.

Mr. Steffen asked if they had a problem with the color sample being continued.

Mr. Al Jassar stated they usually ask the contractor to provide an actual sample on-site before they approve it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Ardis Wood (Citizen) asked if there were any curb cuts for bus parking proposed.

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated the ARC Committee agreed with the comments from Staff about the color board, noted there was no detail provided of the main entry doorway, and that there was a discrepancy in the expansion joints. No expansion joints were shown on the north elevation, but they were shown on the other elevations. They would like to thank the petitioner for the refreshing use of materials.

Mr. Al Jassar stated the sidewalk around the building had entrances from Ann Street and Oglethorpe Avenue. There was a continuous sidewalk around, except on the existing gas station site.

Mr. Al Jassar stated the two separating staircases between the buildings would run the expansion joint between two short walls. It would not be seen.

Mr. Deering stated Ms. Dolecki was speaking of the control joints within the stucco on the north elevation.

Mr. Al Jassar stated that the north elevation was the other hotel; Hotel Indigo.

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

**RE: Continued Petition of Charles Oxford
H-06-3669-2
601 – 605 Tattnell Street
(Southwest Corner of Tattnell & Huntingdon
Streets)
New Construction Part I Height and Mass of
Four Residential Townhomes**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval Part I, Height and Mass.

Present for the petition was Mr. Charles Oxford.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction Part I, Height and Mass, of four attached two-story townhomes at 601-605 Tattnell Street. The vacant property is at the southwest corner of Tattnell and Huntingdon Streets. Three townhomes will be oriented to front Tattnell as do the other structures within the block face and one will front Huntingdon, similar to the buildings across that street. As part of this development, the parcel will be subdivided into four parcels. The residence to the south on Tattnell will also have a home office for which an additional parking space is being provided.

FINDINGS:

The parcel at 601-605 Tattnell Street is a large lot which has been vacant (without structures) for decades. Historic 1916 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps indicate that three semi-attached two-story buildings once stood on this parcel and extended the full depth of the lot, similar to what is being proposed. By 1954, no buildings are located within this parcel. The property is zoned RIP-A (residential, medium density) and will be subdivided into three lots. Building 1 will be on a lot that is 45.21' wide by 70' deep. Building 2 will be on a lot that is 25' wide by 70' deep. Buildings 3 and 4 will be on lots that are also 25' wide and 35' deep, divided along the 70' lot line where parking will be provided. A recombination subdivision plat will need to be filed and recorded prior to the release of a building permit.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIP-A zone.	The structures are all located at the 0' lot line along Tattnell and Huntingdon Streets. Building 1 maintains an open space on the southeast corner to preserve an existing Live Oak tree in the street yard.	The standard is met.

	Building 2 maintains an interior courtyard and Buildings 3 and 4 maintain open space on Huntingdon for parking.	
Building Lot Coverage: 75% maximum in RIP-A zone.	Building 1 has a lot coverage of 72.4% with a side garden to the south of the building. Building 2 has a lot coverage of 80% with a central courtyard between the garage and the main residence.	The standard is met. A 5% building lot coverage variance from the standard will need to be approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals. The applicant has submitted an application to this board.
	Building 3 has a lot coverage of 79% with an open space for parking on Huntingdon. Building 4 has a lot coverage of 75% with an open space for parking on Huntingdon.	A 4% building lot coverage variance from the standard will need to be approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals. The standard is met.
Dwelling Unit Type	Residential townhouse.	Staff recommends approval. Surrounding buildings consist of detached residences and several semi-attached duplexes similar to what is proposed.
Street Elevation Type	Two-story masonry row house.	Staff recommends approval. One and two story residences surround the property, both in the form of duplexes (similar to what is proposed) and detached structures.
Entrances	Each residence maintains a low stoop entrance that projects from the face of the building.	Staff recommends approval. Neighboring buildings feature mostly low stoop entrances both paired and independent of one another.
Building Height: 3-story height zone. First floor height for residential buildings shall be not less than 11'; each story above shall not be less than 10'.	The proposed buildings are two-stories at a height of 26.5' to the top of the parapet. The foundation height is 2'; First floor height is 11'; Second floor height is 10'.	The standard is met.
Proportion of Structure's Front Facade	The buildings are 25' wide at the street and 26.5' tall. Neighboring structures are generally two-stories tall on elevated foundations between 20' and 25' in width and 25' to	Staff recommends approval. The proportions are very similar to the new construction directly across Huntingdon Street and historic rows in Gaston and neighboring

	35' in height.	Charlton Ward.
Proportion of Openings	Window openings are maintain a 3:6 ratio which is common on historic buildings in the district.	Staff recommends approval.
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	A three bay rhythm is proposed. This is common within the vicinity.	Staff recommends approval.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	The footprint of these buildings within the parcel is similar to what was historically on the lot. A 19' side yard is proposed on the south of Building 1, adjacent to an existing historic residence. A two-story office is at the rear of the lot behind the garden. A 22'-4" wide by 16.75' deep parking pad will be located on the Huntingdon Street elevation.	Staff recommends approval. The open space will allow the neighbor to access his side porch and assist in preserving the Live Oak present in the street yard. Staff recommends approval with the condition that use of a fence be studied during the Part II submittal. This configuration of open space was used in the buildings immediately across the street.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	Entrance porches project 4' from the face of the building into the sidewalk.	Verify projection of neighboring entrance porches.
Walls of Continuity	A 10.5' tall, 20.5' long stucco privacy wall creates a wall of continuity along the street to the south of Building 1.	Staff recommends conceptual approval. A decorative treatment at the top and the opening help mitigate the massiveness of the wall; however brick with a sloped cap may be more compatible with the buildings.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval for Part I, Height and Mass.

For the Part II submittal, staff recommends that a fence along Huntingdon Street be studied and the roof shapes on the wood frame carriage houses be restudied. A side gable roof is more appropriate on clapboard carriage houses.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the owner was currently going to MPC for land coverage variance.

Ms. Ward said yes.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated whatever motion the Board made that if it was not approved for the current configuration that it come back to the Board.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Charles Oxford stated he changed the plans on the back of the garages. Instead of siding he was going to brick them all of the way up, to keep from having to do a gabled roof. He reduced the size of the building on the front corner of Tattnall and Huntingdon Streets, and he won't need a variance. He said he looked at the porches in the area, and between his lot going east on the south side of Huntingdon Street there were two buildings with four porches coming out onto the sidewalk. The lot on the corner of Jefferson and Huntingdon Streets had a porch extending out. Going north on Tattnall Street there were two or three buildings on the right that had porches projecting out from the building, and none of them projected onto the sidewalk. The two buildings on the west side of Tattnall Street had porches that projected onto the sidewalk.

Mr. Deering stated the massing was good for the site.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked how much sidewalk was left between the street curb and the porches on the Tattnall Street side where the porches were.

Mr. Oxford stated there was a right-of-way there, there was a concrete sidewalk he was going to dig up and replace with brick, and he was going to make the sidewalk wider. He said it was about a four- or five-foot sidewalk.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Bill Stuebe (Downtown Neighborhood Association) stated the DNA was opposed to buildings that violate the zoning variance with lot coverage. He understood it was not the Board's purview, but the overall design was, and he thought that anything that could be done to reduce the apparent mass of the building would be great. He said one thought would be that one building could be reversed so a wall could be put in, and the parking relocated, as one was looking into the space they would see the break and it would reduce the apparent mass of the whole complex and it would be helpful.

Dr. Caplan asked if Mr. Oxford was going to decrease the massing so it would be only a 75 percent lot coverage.

Mr. Oxford said on Building 3, and that he had already done it on one lot. The lot where Building 2 was he applied for a lot coverage variance.

Mr. Steffen stated if there was a motion it should include that Mr. Oxford had made a reduction in Building 3 on the lot coverage, and that he was placing brick instead of siding on the structures.

Mr. Oxford stated the overall lot coverage was going to be less than 75 because he had a little extra on the first lot, and it was a bigger lot.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated if Mr. Oxford was to reduce the courtyard from 17 feet to 15 feet and slide unit two westward, there would be an indentation on Tattnall Street that would take away some of the mass of three units in line.

Ms. Fortson-Waring stated the Board would be redesigning his project.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated they were not redesigning the project but just making a suggestion of breaking up the Tattnall Street facade.

Mr. McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated Mr. Stuebe's remarks concerning the variances were made on behalf of the Downtown Neighborhood Association.

HDRB DECISION: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve Part I Height and Mass, with the reduction of the lot coverage on Building 3 to 75 percent. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was passed.

**RE: Petition of Richard Guerard
H-06-3709-2
342 Drayton Street
Rehabilitation/ Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Richard Guerard.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

Mr. Deering recused himself.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for the renovation and additional stories for the shell of the historic former service station, located on the southeast corner of Charlton and Drayton Streets.

FINDINGS:

Significance of the Building: 342 Drayton Street was first surveyed in 1996-1998 by the National Park Service using SCAD Historic Preservation students. It was found to be significant and contributing to the National Historic Landmark District by the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office and the National Park Service, and recognized by a nationally known architectural historian as well. Based on these findings it was recommended by MPC and approved by City Council to be added to the Historic Buildings list. This significance has since been reaffirmed in writing by the National Park Service and the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office and has been the subject of a SCAD Master's thesis.

Site History: Lafayette Ward and Square were laid out in 1837; however, development was slow until the jail was removed in 1846. The Andrew Low House was built on the southwest Trust lot in 1849. On the lot adjacent to 342 Drayton Street, the Battersby Hartridge House was built in 1852. Both of these structures are exceptional examples of Greek Revival townhouses in Savannah's Landmark District. On the Abercorn Street end of the block was another three-story residence. In 1888, the Drayton Street end was still vacant land. In 1898, a small one-story shed occupied the center of the lot.

In 1902, the Abercorn Street corner residence was demolished and replaced by the Cathedral School. The first use on the Drayton Street lot was an auto service station which extended the depth of the lot along Drayton Street, with the remainder of the lot to the east being vacant. In 1927, the present service station was built and auto service uses continued until it was sold in 1985.

Thus, this tything block's development pattern has historically consisted of three building sites. The first development on the 342 Drayton lot was auto-related and that use remained consistent until 1985. Drayton Street in the 20th century became commercially and automobile oriented. In

the vicinity of 342 Drayton were other filling stations, the former YMCA building, and 300 Drayton (Chatham Motor, Smith and Kelly Building).

The Development Standards of the Historic District Ordinance direct that the exterior features of historic structures should be preserved. The features of 342 Drayton Street include the four walls of the one story auto-related structure and the porte cochere with its tile roof and lighted eaves.

The proposed scheme is to adaptively reuse the remaining shell of the station and its porte cochere for residential use. Parking for 17 cars is proposed for the ground floor level, and condominium units are proposed on the floors above. The existing one story walls of the service station are about 23 feet tall to the top of the parapet. It is proposed to insert a mezzanine on the interior of the original building.

The following standards and visual compatibility factors apply in considering Part I Height and Mass. New construction and existing buildings which are materially altered shall be visually compatible with structures, squares, and places to which they are visually related. Visual Compatibility Factors shall be considered in determining the visual compatibility of such a building, provided they comply with the specific design standards as set forth in this subsection. Greater weight shall be given to adjacent historic structures.

Standard	Proposed	Comment
The Historic District standards state that additions should be clearly differentiated from the historic building.	It is proposed to retain the remaining first floor walls in their entirety with the porte cochere. The new walls appear to be recessed one foot from the outer face of the existing walls.	The new stories are differentiated by being a different material than the original building. This material format is also found on the Lafayette.
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.	No changes are proposed for the existing footprint of the building.	
Dwelling Unit Type	A residential condo adaptive reuse is proposed.	There are apartment buildings within Lafayette Ward including the Henrietta Apartments 307-311 Abercorn, 3 stories; 340 Abercorn Street, 3 stories; 205 East Charlton Street, 3 stories; and 321 Abercorn, a 4-story apartment building which is also an adaptive reuse of the Southern Bell Telephone building constructed in two phases 1928 and 1948.
Street Elevation Type	The existing building has a commercial form with shop front windows.	The proposed use retains these windows.
Entrances	Entrances to be located on existing ground floor. A lobby entrance is proposed at the existing porte cochere. The garage enters and exits on the lane.	The entrance is in its existing location.
Building Height: Visual Compatibility Factor: "New construction or additions to existing structures shall be within the height limits as shown on the historic district height	The historic height map indicates a four story maximum for this site. The existing building has an unusual feature of a 23 foot first story. This is being retained and a mezzanine is proposed which	There is precedent for taller structures in this ward (Lafayette and the Cathedral). A height comparison was submitted. Four stories is allowed on this site.

map.”	is allowed by the ordinance. The overall height is 60 feet. This is lower than the Lafayette, one block north on Drayton Street. The adjacent Hartridge house is approximately 36 feet tall and the EMC Engineering building across Drayton is approximately 42 feet tall.	
Proportion of Openings rhythm of solids to voids	There are existing storefront openings on Charlton and Drayton Street. The windows in the new floors above and rectangular and vertically aligned.	Staff recommends approval.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	This is an existing building that was oriented to Drayton Street.	There has been no change in orientation on the site.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	Three foot projecting balconies are proposed on three sides of the building supported by braces that tie into the parapet. The porte cochere is being retained and restored.	The portico is a significant feature of this building. The balconies are similar to those on the DeRenne a few blocks north. Staff recommends approval.
Roof	The roof is proposed as flat behind a parapet.	Staff recommends approval.
Scale	The first floor height is existing. The punched openings above reflect the type of windows in the EMC building across the street and help to break down the mass within the façade.	Staff recommends approval.

Part II Design Standards

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Walls	Brick walls by Carolina Ceramics over the original stucco building. Piers emphasize the division of the bays.	Final brick selection to be made with staff from sample board.
Windows and doors	Anderson Windows Narrowline Permashield Double Hung windows. Doors 15 light balcony doors by Anderson Frenchwood. Shutters: Atlantic Manchester.	Staff recommends approval.
Roof Shape	Flat behind a parapet. The Spanish tile roof of the portico will be repaired and retained. The lights of the portico will be repaired.	Staff recommends approval.
Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches	Wrought iron hand rails are proposed for the balcony railing	Staff recommends approval.
Color	Iron and shutters: Sherwin Williams Tricorn Black 6258; Trim Sherwin Williams Pure White SW7005. Stucco and brick color to be submitted to staff.	Staff recommends that a sample panel be erected on site prior to final brick, mortar and stucco color selection.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval as submitted.

STAFF REPORT: (Verbatim)

The applicant is requesting approval for the renovation and additional stories for the shell of a historic former service station located on the southeast corner of Charlton and Drayton Streets. 342 Drayton Street was first surveyed in 1996 to 1998 by the National Park Service, using SCAD Historic Preservation students. It was found to be significant and contributing to the National Historic Landmark District by the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office, and the National Park Service, and recognized by a nationally known architectural historian as well. Based on these findings, it was recommended by MPC and approved by City Council to be added to the Historic Buildings list. Significance has since been reaffirmed in writing by the National Park Service and the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office, and has been the subject of a SCAD masters thesis.

The development Standards of the Historic District Ordinance direct that the exterior features of historic structures should be preserved. The features of 342 Drayton Street include the four walls of the one-story auto-related structure, and the porte cochere with its tile roof and lighted eave.

The proposed scheme is to adaptively reuse the remaining shell of the station and its porte cochere for residential use. Parking for 17 cars is proposed on the ground floor level, and condominium units are proposed for the floors above. The existing one-story walls of the service station are about 23 feet tall to the top of the parapet. It is, therefore, proposed to insert a mezzanine on the rear portion of the interior of the building. In calculating that, we are also using the covered area of the porte cochere in the calculations.

The Historic District Standards state that additions should be clearly differentiated from Historic buildings, so it is proposed that the new stories be brick as opposed to the stucco of the original building. This material format is also found nearby on the Lafayette Apartments.

There are no setbacks are required in the R-I-P-A zone, and no changes are proposed to the existing footprint of the existing building. The dwelling unit type is a residential condo adaptive reuse. There are apartment buildings within Lafayette Ward including the Henrietta, 340 Abercorn Street, and 205 East Charlton. There is a four-story apartment building which is also an adaptive reuse of the Southern Bell Telephone Building; the Lafayette.

The existing building has a commercial form with shop front windows. These are going to be retained, and the way the walls are arranged on the interior, you will not be able to see the auto parking on the inside. The entrance will be in its existing location facing Drayton Street, and the porte cochere is open, not enclosed.

The Historic Height Map indicates a four-story maximum for this site. The building does have an unusual feature of a 23-foot first story. As I said before, this is being retained with a mezzanine proposed, which is allowed by the ordinance. There are some taller buildings in the ward. The Lafayette has already been mentioned, and the Cathedral. There is a height comparison, which was submitted, and I have a larger one if you need it – larger than the small one that was in the packets.

There has been no change in the orientation of the building on the site, and the existing openings have been retained with glass installed. The portico is a significant feature of the building, and it is proposed to restore the portico.

The brick walls are by Carolina Ceramics, and again, Staff would recommend that final selection be made in the field from a panel that is erected on-site. The windows are Anderson Windows narrowline Permashield double-hung windows. The doors on the balcony are 15-light doors, also by Anderson. The shutters are by Atlantic. The roof shape is flat behind a parapet, and the Spanish tile roof of the portico and the lights will be repaired on the portico. Wrought iron handrails are proposed for the balcony railing, and the colors – the iron and shutters will be black, the trim will be white, and the stucco and brick color will be submitted in a panel format on the site.

Staff does recommend approval of the renovation as submitted and, also want to reiterate what was in your packet that City Council, whatever way this goes today, does want a final decision from the Board.

Mr. Steffen: Questions for staff?

Mr. Meyerhoff: According to the Building Code, when you have an enclosed garage you have to have a certain amount of open ventilation through louvers or windows to disperse the monoxide gas. These elevations do not show anything as far as having openings for that. Whatever motion we make, if the building department requires that, and it does, these elevations need to come back to the Review Board to see how the client has handled that.

Mr. Steffen: Mr. Meyerhoff how does that fit within our purview?

Mr. Meyerhoff: What?

Mr. Steffen: How would that fit within our purview. I am not sure I understand how that fits within our purview.

Mr. Meyerhoff: It fits this way. If he is going to get a building permit, he is going to have to have some natural ventilation. And what I'm saying is, if he is directed that he has to do that, that these drawings, if we approve them today, should return to the Preservation Officer to see how that is handled.

Mr. Steffen: Ms. Reiter what is your view on that question?

Ms. Reiter: If it includes having louvers or something that is visible from the public right-of-way, then he is correct.

Mr. Steffen: Where I think we are getting into trouble is we are presuming that something is in violation of the building code, which we are not purview to nor do we make decisions on. So we make our decisions based on what our knowledge is, and if they come back and say something needs to be changed, then they would come back to us for an amendment. I think that would be the proper procedure. What I don't want to do is let's not try to be experts at more than we are experts at which is not much.

Mr. Meyerhoff: I just wanted to make that observation.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: Beth, I have a concern about the faux retail first level. Aren't we trying to encourage true retail first levels?

Ms. Reiter: I believe the rooms of the first level are being used as rooms for the condominium – spa, exercise rooms - there is no retail connected with this building.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: But it's all just parking.

Ms. Reiter: No, there are other functions on the ground level, if you look at the plans.

Mr. Steffen: Are there any other questions for Staff? O.K., can we hear from the petitioner?

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Dr. Caplan: Joe

Mr. Steffen: Yes Sir:

Dr. Caplan: I'd like to take a little bit of issue with what you said. Mr. Meyerhoff's comments are very appropriate, and for this reason. I understand what you said, which is also correct. But unfortunately, what often happens is, that they are going to say alright you are going to have to have to do it, and it doesn't come back to us. We'll never see it until somebody makes a complaint because the elevations are not the way they were presented. It is very appropriate to be very careful as Mr. Meyerhoff suggests, and ask us if there are any variances, that they be brought back to us to see it.

Mr. Steffen: Thank you. Mr. Guerard.

Mr. Guerard: Good afternoon. My name is Richard Guerard. Any questions? Do you want...

Mr. Steffen: You're here to answer our questions unless you have something you wanted to add right now to what Ms. Reiter said.

Mr. Guerard: We feel that the building meets the Ordinances of the City of Savannah and the Historic Design Standards. I'll answer one question - there is an indoor lap pool and a spa down there.

Mr. Steffen: Any questions for the petitioner?

Mr. Neely: It is not related directly to design, but I am just curious, how you are dealing with structural issues? We were told at a prior meeting on that building that the structure of those walls were questionable.

Mr. Guerard: I wasn't privy to those conversations. I wasn't here at the meeting. That was back whenever the previous owner owned the building, and I can't speak for whoever they hired or whatever they did.

Mr. Neely: So you are comfortable you could structurally add three floors on top of those walls.

Mr. Guerard: The existing building won't be carrying the load.

Mr. Steffen: Questions for the petitioner? Any comments from members of the public?

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Michael Brown: Hi, I'm Michael Brown and a member of the public. I am concerned about this project. This project violates every single subsection A through K of Section 8-3029 Pages 5,6,7 of the Chadborne guidelines entitled Development Standards Visual Compatibility. The guidelines are there to protect the integrity of the Historic District, and you as guardians of the District should always put the integrity first and foremost. The only reason to ever consider

this project would be for the financial gain of the petitioner. If that is the consideration, then let me give you an alternative. On February 20, 2006, the City had asked to have a private consultant, Urban Partners of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, give an opinion on the value of this building, and they came back with a proposal which I have, and I would be glad to give you copies, that four -2800 units, townhouse units at two levels, which would just be a little bit above the existing line would make great economic sense even at the purchase price. I personally hired ...and I have no interest in this property whatsoever, other than I think it denigrates the Landmark District. I hired Stephen Hamm, a licensed MAI appraiser to give me an appraisal, and he concurred with the Findings of the independent consultant, Urban Planners out of Philadelphia, that in fact, it can be an economically viable project and still fit within the guidelines of visual compatibility. I'll give you the summary of his results. I changed it because I understand the purchase price was larger than it was originally. This is from an MAI, this isn't from me. The bottom line is, and I won't bore you with all the details, but the bottom line is that with 4 – 2800-square-foot compatible two-story townhouses with parking that are compatible with the District, produce 1.8 million dollars profit and the reason...

Mr. Steffen: Mr. Brown I want to stop you and ask you to go...first of all the economic viability of the project is of absolutely no consequence before this Board...

Mr. Brown: That's my point...

Mr. Steffen: and you know that.

Mr. Brown: That's my point...

Mr. Steffen: I understand it's your point, but you ran right past the thing that was on point, which was the question of whether or not this is in fulfillment with our guidelines. You put a piece of paper up there with a number of sections – I can't even read it from here

Mr. Brown: Oh it is actually in the Chadborne Guidelines on pages 5,6, and 7. I'm sure you've got it right in front of you.

Mr. Steffen: I do but what I am asking is what exactly were you referring to when you said its in violation of the whole page. I don't know what you were talking about.

Mr. Brown: O.K., if you read A through K, and you look at the proposal, you will see that in area A through K, every single one of those guidelines are violated by the proposal that is in front of you today. If you read them it is simple. My question is that if four compatible units can yield a handsome profit and maintain the spirit and integrity of the District, why would you ever consider allowing somebody to cram and force 20 units in to the same footprint? When a building is properly restored with quality materials, and this is in reference to the period of the building, obsolescence becomes obsolete. The concept of a building having a predetermined life span disappears in the notion of old is reconfigured. I would just like to leave this with you. There is no reason for you to allow this to violate all the guidelines that are here, and build something, even on an economic basis, but to me that would be the only reason that you would approve something like this because of economic viability and I can prove beyond a reasonable doubt that it is economically viable. The building that meet all the integrity, meet all the guidelines and probably would be available for historic tax credits. This is obviously a very historic building.

Mr. Steffen: Mr. Brown I'm going to ask you a question and you're certainly not obligated to answer my question from me or an other member of this Board, but based on what you're saying, I was with you in City Council meeting when this was heard about eight or nine months ago, and you told City Council at that time that you knew of people that wanted to purchase this

property and to be in compliance, and yet, we are now nine or ten months later and none of that has happened.

Mr. Brown: No, somebody purchased the building. They just don't want to be in compliance.

Mr. Steffen: Somebody got in there first. O.K.

Mr. Brown: They just paid more money. And I imagine the assumption is that they figured they could cram 20 units in and be successful because they knew the Review Board would more than likely approve it.

Mr. Steffen: I just wanted to know where you are coming from. Is there something else you want to add?

Mr. Brown: David McCullough the author said, "Landmark buildings are part of our life, they were not just buildings. They were aged and add navigation to our daily life, they were who we were in time."

Ms. Fortson-Waring: Mr. Brown did you read the minutes..., I know apparently you were there, but did you see what the City Council has asked of us. I appreciate your economic example, but clearly regardless of what we do, that presentation is better suited for City Council.

Mr. Brown: My point is that the only conceivable reason that I would think that this Board would even consider something that is so obviously in contradiction to the guidelines, would be for some financial reason. It certainly wasn't for an aesthetic reason. It certainly doesn't comply with anything in the guidelines. It certainly doesn't fit in anything in the neighborhood. So that is the reason I used an example. Even if you used that financial as a guideline which I know you can't and I don't expect you to, there is an alternative that still makes 1.8 million dollars. So I don't understand why you would even consider this petition.

Mr. Meyerhoff: Could you be, as an example, be more specific?

Mr. Steffen: I have already advised him to do that and he doesn't seem to want to do that. Our staff, Mr. Brown I'm talking right now.

Mr. Brown: I'd be more than happy to read it to you.

Mr. Steffen: I know I have already asked him once to give us examples.

Mr. Brown: O.K. The best way to do it is to pick up your guidelines and I am sure that they are right there in front of you.

Mr. Steffen: Mr. Brown that is not an answer. Our staff has already told us they believe it is in compliance, and by throwing the guidelines in our face that doesn't answer the question. If you've got a specific reason you believe it is not in compliance I think you should tell us.

Mr. Brown: The height of the proposed structure should be visibly compatible with the adjacent structure. Well, there is nothing except for the Lafayette that is compatible, and the Lafayette is on a three or four times the size lot size as this. So, I don't think that is compatible. The building next to it is three stories, so that's A and I'd be glad to go all the way through K.

Dr. Caplan: So is that within the height map?

Mr. Brown: I'm sorry?

Dr. Caplan: Is it within the height map recommendations?

Mr. Brown: I don't know if it is within the height map but it is sure not visibly compatible. Is that contradictory?

Dr. Caplan: They are entitled by the height map to build whatever height.

Mr. Brown: With the exception that it is not visually compatible. If you read the guidelines, they are very clear. They say you can go five stories assuming it is visually compatible. This obviously isn't visually compatible.

Dr. Caplan: We have gone back and forth on this, Mr. Brown, and apparently it was decided that the height map says it can be four stories and we worked hard on that ...

Mr. Brown: Why would they have pages 5,6 and 7 the guidelines for visual compatibility?

Dr. Caplan: Well, this also was done about ten years prior to the provisions of the height map, too. So, we are stuck in a hard place here because if the height map says it can be that, they are entitled to do that unless for some reason you want to make a big deal out of it.

Mr. Brown: Unless, unless Dr. Caplan, it is not visually compatible A through K and it is not.

Dr. Caplan: As I said Mr. Brown, we've gone back and forth through that and apparently the City Attorney gave us the opinion, if I'm correct, that if it says it can be four stories it can be four stories. I mean we don't know what to do.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: We've been through this before and to reiterate what Dr. Caplan said. Unfortunately, the way the new ordinance is written, we have no control, and the visual compatibility factor does not come into play when someone is within the height map restrictions. I know I have looked at the page, and we've been through this on other projects, and that is something that we have challenged this Board, five of us are rotating off for the next Board to really bring together. It's inconsistent, it is inconsistent, and it's a change that used to exist. But we absolutely, I mean it says shall, and they are allowed to build up to the number of floors, and there are no guidelines as to how high the floors have to be.

Mr. Brown: Well, actually that is a very good point that you said the word shall and not will, and I think that you have the control, and that's why you as guardians of the integrity of the District...

Dr. Caplan and Ms. Fortson-Waring: We don't have control.

Mr. Brown: You don't have control? So, that means that whatever the height line says, everything can be built.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: Absolutely, until it is changed. Until the ordinance is changed.

Mr. Steffen: We have asked the City and the City staff for clarification.

Dr. Caplan: If we look at it, we say that the floors are 23 feet high, then we can say its got to come down, but you can still have four floors.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: Right. This is something we sent, we have charged to the City Manager and City Attorney.

Mr. Brown: So, basically the future of the Landmark District is in jeopardy because of your interpretation.

Dr. Caplan: It is not our interpretation, it is the City manager's interpretation, or the City Attorney's.

Mr. Steffen: Let's hear from some other members of the public.

Mr. Walter Hartridge: I am Walter Hartridge. I am a lawyer. I am married to the owner of the immediately adjacent property, Cornelia M. Hartridge, 119 East Charlton Street. And I also, as a lawyer represent Mr. and Mrs. Clark Dryden who own 108 and 112 East Jones Street immediately across the lane from this proposed project. I certainly agree with the observations just made by members of this Board about shall, and the height restrictions, and I will refer to that very briefly.

I am not here, Mr. Chairman, to throw things into your face but I think we need to get on track about a couple of things. First of all, this application is not timely. This is your ordinance, I put it up here, I don't mean to be presumptuous, but this is the way lawyers work. It says, "Such application and supplementary information must be filed no later than 20 days prior to any meeting of the Board at which such application is to be heard." This application, although it is not date stamped, I'm informed by the Staff, was filed on Friday, December 8th. That indeed is when Mrs. Reiter's recommendation was put together, although it bears the date December 13th which is today's date of course. So, what you had was a submission in handwriting by Mr. Guerard on last Friday, and attached to that he submitted basic cut down plans. O.K., so procedurally, it is flawed. I just like to call that to your attention to start with before I get to really the dead rock issue that is before you, and I am glad that members of this Board said what you did about what the height ordinance says, and shall being mandatory because I have that to go to.

Alright, now, the next thing that we've got going is this. The Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance provides, I'm not going to take a lot of time I know you've got a lot of work today. O.K., Visual Compatibility Factors Height New Construction or additions to existing structures shall be within the height limits as shown on the Historic District Height Map, and that is four stories. I think we are all in agreement on that. Indeed the Staff has agreed on that, in three previous iterations of this business which were rejected because it was five stories high. It's still five stories high.

Now, as to height – this is the key -- the height map attached ...incorporated therein. There is an exception provided however, a mezzanine is defined as an intermediate level between the floor and ceiling of a story. It shall not count as a story provided its aggregate floor area is not more than one third of the area of the room or space in which it is located. Now, I won't belabor the shall...you all know that. Some of you pointed that out. Now, you had submitted to you in your packet this deal, which is the mezzanine floor. I would like now to hand up to you, if I might ask Staff to pass it out, calculations. While that is being done, I heard Ms. Reiter say that the mezzanine concept included the canopy in the calculation or the porte cochere – the area of the porte cochere is included in the calculation. Now, you'll understand, and you have in your packet, of course, you have the side cuts of this building, which you can clearly see is five stories high if you just look at the cross cuts. I might add also for the record that there are two windows depicted what we submit as a common wall of my wife's house which she wouldn't consent, to that may not be before you, but there are two windows that look into our living room and dining room. That's a design feature which is not desirable.

Now, the calculation which I have handed you, was prepared by a draftsman who is here today, under my supervision and in my direct sight. You can clearly see without belaboring the point, that if you look down to the floor below which is parking where the cars are, and you look down

over here where it is x'd out, everything else here, this and this, is called mezzanine. We could only scale it from the cut down drawings that were submitted in the file here. We don't have any larger plans, but when you scale it out in inches and its all in proportion, you have a total of 59.8 square inches in this area. And clearly a third of that is 19.7, but yet, the area with the floors is 37.1. Clearly, this does not meet the definition of a mezzanine under the ordinance which is defined as an intermediate level between the floor and ceiling of a story; it shall not count as a story provided that its aggregate floor area is not more than one-third of the area of the room or space in which it is included. You've got the plans. I do not want to belabor the point, I do not see how conceivably the mezzanine could be included in that. That would defy logic. You all are bound by this ordinance as you have already said. I won't belabor that. It just doesn't meet the test.

Now, in addition to that, there are a lot of other disabilities here in what was submitted. First of all, there are no dimensions on the plan. No adjacent building plan. No size provided for the openings. The detail of the storefront system is not handled. It doesn't provide detail information. The materials were only generally dealt with. There is no site plan. No location for mechanical equipment, including the dread air conditioners that we were talking about. And certainly it is not visually compatible. You did get, I believe, this document in your packet. This structure - it's observed in the Staff Recommendation that the Cathedral is there. Well, of course it's there. That's not apposite. Neither is the Lafayette. The apposite structures are the house I happen to live in, which Ms. Reiter once said was one of the finest examples of freestanding neoclassical architecture in Savannah, on which Historic Savannah Foundation holds an historic easement I might add, and the property restored and purchased by Mr. Dryden and his wife at very great expense behind it would be dwarfed by this. To me, it is inconceivable, what we've got here candidly, I know what City Council said. I've been through all of this from day one. Lived next door to it for 25 years. You can't drive a square peg into a round hole. You've got to deny this petition as a matter of law it doesn't meet the ordinance.

Now Historic Savannah wants to make a statement through its Executive Director, and I think Mr. Dryden would like to make a statement.

Mr. Steffen: Mr. Hartridge, let me ask you one quick question. Alright. I'm going to let you sit down and hear from the others first.

Mr. Hartridge: Right. Thank you.

Mr. Mark McDonald: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. My name is Mark McDonald. I am the executive Director of Historic Savannah Foundation. And, we would first of all like to commend and thank everyone who worked so hard to preserve this building on the corner of Drayton and Charlton, and commend the petitioner for making an effort to find a way that he could economically reuse the building, and to save the façade. In the final analysis, we are here to oppose this application here today, however, because we don't think that it is compatible with the buildings in the ward, but primarily it is not compatible with the very building to which it is being added. If this is a significant building as Ms. Reiter pointed out, and I think she's made her case well, what's being proposed today is not compatible with what is there today. And I think that design review standards are important. The height of proposed structures shall be visually compatible with adjacent structures. This building is not visually compatible from a height standard from what's there today. We're really just mixing two separate buildings. These are two different building types altogether. You've got a commercial gas station, we're grafting on to it a condominium style building or an apartment style building. It is visually incompatible with the very building to which it is being added.

The proportion of openings within the facility: Look at the window openings. Large, commercial, retail window openings. What's being added to it are a bay rhythm that look like our apartment buildings that I have already referenced. They are incompatible. They may be compatible with the Lafayette, but they are not compatible with the building that they are added to. And, they are certainly not compatible with the National Historic Landmark District, Andrew Low building across the street, or the Battersby House that Mr. Hartridge raised we do have a preservation easement on. It is a highly significant building in the city, and will be dwarfed by this building in scale.

The rhythm of solids to voids: Standard D. The rhythm of solids to voids are incompatible with the building to which it is being added to.

The relationship of materials, textures, and colors. Yes, we try to differentiate it. But it is not compatible, the materials, brick are not compatible with the stucco that we have here. The details are not compatible.

And finally, the scale of the building. The size of this addition – we look at these routinely – you do it all the time. We've always said, I've heard Review Board members say, we don't want the addition to dwarf the original structure. This is a significant building. Why are we going to allow the addition to be twice the size of the original building? And I think the answer is clear. We're trying so hard to save this building, that we are destroying the building. We are destroying its significance and integrity by trying to save it. Andres Duany the architect and planner, always talks about and he criticizes sometimes, preservationists for not thinking about the exchange value of what's happening in our built environment. You might oppose the demolition of a historic building, we really should look at what is going to go back in its place. And here, to me the exchange value is clear. What we are gaining in saving this building, were losing far more in allowing it to be added to because were destroying the truly significant buildings in this ward. We're destroying the scale of those. Frankly, we're just hurting the Landmark District. The Landmark District is listed as a National Historic Landmark District, the largest in the country, because of the Oglethorpe Plan the way it is subdivided into a system of wards divided into Trust Lots and Tithing Lots. This building doesn't fit the context of this, and the addition just obliterates it and we would just ask you to deny it. Thank you.

Mr. Steffen: Mr. McDonald, may I ask you a question?

Mr. McDonald: Yes.

Mr. Steffen: On behalf of Historic Savannah, if this Board were to deny this petition today, are you at all concerned about this building being demolished by neglect?

Mr. McDonald: Oh, absolutely. We have been concerned about it for years.

Mr. Steffen: Cause I know this has been on, this issue has been going on for about a year now.

Mr. McDonald: It's been going on for a year, but the neglect of this building has been going on for almost ten years I would say. I remember when the roof caved in and when it was removed, so yes, we are very concerned about that. We are aware of what City Council has said. Procedurally, I don't know how City Council can order this building to be demolished. The only thing that can order this building to be demolished is a petition by the owner of the building, which has to come before you, and you have the right to deny that. So unless the Council finds that somehow this building is in fact...

Mr. Steffen: They have already overruled us on that.

Mr. McDonald: Well, but if this petitioner now, this petitioner has not withdrawn that...this petitioner has an application before you to save the building, not to demolish it.

Mr. Steffen: Let me ask one other question. Mr. McDonald, on behalf of Historic Savannah are you aware of any other effort to preserve the façade of this building that is on-going?

Mr. McDonald: I am not aware of any, no I'm not. I haven't seen any development proposals. I have heard things but have not seen any real plans. And, of course, as we all know we need to see the real plans before we can make any judgment on them.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: Isn't it true though when this building first came up here Historic Savannah did not consider this a building that should have been saved?

Mr. McDonald: It is true that we had a lot of disagreement on our committee. I think that in the final analysis we voted to ask Council to save the building, to do all that they could to save the building, but at our committee meeting yesterday, after looking at his development proposal, we just felt on balance, and I know this is a hard position that all or you are in, this building, what we are doing to this building in order to save it is injurious to the ward that it is located in. And it is injurious to the building itself. And that's what we determined and what we are here to communicate to you today. Thank you all for the job that you do and I'm sorry you have to make this decision.

Mr. Steffen: Any other member of the public wish to come forward.

Ms. Cynthia Hunter: Hi, my name is Cynthia Hunter. First off, I don't know what City Council has asked you to do. Could you please briefly describe that, maybe? No?

Ms. Fortson-Waring: It really is quite a few pages and actually, I was going to suggest that we get into Board discussion so you might find that out later on when we get into the discussions.

Ms. Hunter: O.K., then I guess I would like to start with Page 18 of the Ordinance, 12. Additions B. Additions that are equal to or exceed the size of the existing structure shall be treated as new construction. I have been here for three years, been coming to the Review Board quite consistently for the past two, and I haven't seen a project like this that I can relate back to. So, I interpret that as this should be viewed and reviewed by Staff and the Board as new construction. Thus, potentially being continued to January and either doing a Part I and Part II analysis in January, or doing a Part I and another month doing Part II. So, I guess that was my first point and question. If there is another that could be used as an example for first point. I'm not getting any comment on that one.

Mr. Steffen: We'll try to get to that in the discussion. We normally don't answer questions. We just hear your comments.

Ms. Hunter: I guess my second point is I wrote a lot of my comments down in a letter, hoping that I would not have to stand up here and read them all to you, but I didn't get here in time so I'm just going to pass these out if I could, and read a few brief points that I had made in the letter.

Mr. Steffen: That's fine.

Ms. Hunter: Towards the end of the first page – the building is located within an area that consists of historic row houses. While the proposed design presented just by itself, the brick portion, I feel might be compatible as a new structure for the site alone. I don't think that its location kind of placed on top of this historic building is appropriate. The building and all

buildings proposed in the District need to be compatible with themselves first and foremost, and then evaluated in accordance with the surrounding context. I don't believe that the proposal is visually compatible with itself – that is the original commercial building that we see on the site today.

The structure was originally a one-story building, and while it was quite tall for a one-story building, it still is just one-story. The height map does allow the four stories and we got into that, and according to countless discussions, the owner is granted this right. However, the ordinance states, and this gets into my other points, in Section K, Development Standards 1, that in considering exterior alterations to historic structures, which this is, in the Historic District, that the original design of the building may be considered. Again, not shall, but may. It also states that the items to be considered are architectural style, scale, general design, and arrangement of the exterior of the structure to include building materials, roof type and style, windows, and doors. The addition of the three stories plus the mezzanine creates an extremely disproportional height and mass of the building when compared to the original height and mass of the existing structure. The original proportions of the existing building are far more horizontal than the vertical mass as proposed. The style of the proposed building or addition is not congruent with the style of the original building. The plus/minus 40-foot-high brick addition, the drawings that I had were really small. I couldn't tell exactly what the foot height was, but it was about 40 feet I believe, reads very much as an apartment building just set on top of the original walls of the 20th century commercial structure. Again, residential windows don't share the same proportion as the commercial storefronts and wide openings of the original mass. I do not believe the use of shutters is appropriate with this original commercial building. The proposed use is not in harmony with the original building. I know use isn't in your area, but many mixed use buildings in the Historic District are unified in design, style, and materials.

The proposed materials are not sensitive to the original smooth stucco walls. The proposed brick pilasters appear to bear on the original stucco walls, creating what I think is a utilitarian look for the proposed purpose for the original structure. The original structure should be the foreground of the design and not represented as the foundation for a new condominium complex. I'll spare you from going through all those again. I agree with what Michael Brown and Mark McDonald said in reference to the visual compatibility points, and just to reiterate that, and if you would finish reading the rest of the letter before and after what I've just read to you.

Mr. Claude Dryden: My name is Claude Dryden. My wife and I own the adjacent properties. I'd like to say just briefly that we agree with all of the folks who have been up before that we don't believe this building fits in this neighborhood of which we own two of the adjacent properties, 108 and 112 East Jones Street that we've owned now going on ten years. I'd like to say that we have spent many dollars in repairing and restoring the buildings that we own, and have been to your group before with some additions and changes that we wanted to make, and in some of them we've been denied and asked to go back to the drawing board because we were told that our proposals were not in keeping and didn't fit with the surrounding areas. We would like to ask you to consider the same thing in that this building does not fit with the surrounding properties, and would ask that you send this gentleman back to the drawing board that could come up with something that would be more appropriate with our surrounding areas. Thank you.

Mr. Bill Steube: I'm Bill Steube of the Downtown Neighborhood Association. I'd like to submit that this building does read as a five-story building in a four-story zone as is shown by this elevation. One, two, three, four, five stories. And it is very clear. Also, the style of the building the design is visually incompatible with itself. With the base structure the Greek Revival vocabulary of the six over six windows, shuttered windows, pilasters, parapet, and brick façade is not at all visually compatible with the original gas station structure. In fact, there are punched six over six windows with shutters in the original stucco façade, all of which are totally visually

incompatible. I would submit, I don't know if you all are familiar with Preservation Magazine which is put out by the National Trust. I think if this structure got built, we would be subject to the YIKES award, which the National Trust puts out every month showing how incompatible buildings are married together, and this would be, I think, perhaps the first distinctive building in Savannah with a YIKES award. Thank you.

Ms. Kathy Ledvina: Hi, my name is Kathy Ledvina. I'm a member of the public. First, I just want to reiterate everything, actually, that everybody else has said. Thank you Mr. Hartridge for explaining the mezzanine to me. I did not understand how an over 5,000-square-foot could not be counted as a story. I do want to go over the plans, and again, the plans that were submitted and received by the public really are not detailed plans. I don't even know the dimensions of this building feet-wise because again they are not show in here. The two things that I am concerned with in addition to what everybody else said, were the bases of the pilasters sitting on top of the parapet wall. It's absolutely ridiculous to think that a parapet wall could hold up pilaster/columns for this building. Also, these corners right here are extremely weak because the recessed balconies are on all four sides. It really just takes away from the massing, which might be a good think. Six over six Georgian windows with shutters certainly don't relate to the shop front window pattern, and that they are added to a historic building which compromises the historic building even more, is just,..it goes against everything the Secretary of Interior Standards believes. A 40-foot-high, Georgian-inspired condominium, residential condominium building is essentially being plopped down on this Spanish eclectic one-story gas station, and it really obliterates the historic structure which is what we are concerned about saving. The addition should be readily distinguishable from older work, just like the Secretary of Interior Standards state. However, the new work should be harmonious with the old in size, scale, proportion, materials, color, and character to insure that the character and the form of our National Historic resource is not changed to an unacceptable design. And I believe that this rendering and design does exactly that. Thank you.

Mr. Hartridge: You know the fact that you've got, and it's been said, I've said it. I didn't make a blow-up but I did advert to this the – you know, transverse cut of the building shows its five stories as Mr. Stuebe said. This is a five-story building, by its own submission if we were in a legal situation it would be subject to a motion to dismiss once you got past the timeliness issue. This is a five-story building. And the only ...this is after three previous iterations to this Staff, which ya'll don't have. Iteration one, a member of your Board prepared, Mr. Deering. Iteration two, I think his firm had that one. Iteration three, which is some rolled out drawings, all withdrawn, and this is iteration four, submitted as I said in an untimely fashion on December 8th and approved on that date. Staff is shaking her head but that's my recollection of what occurred.

Mr. Steffen: Mr. Hartridge I don't even need to go there.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: Point of order.

Mr. Steffen: If you are making a new point then that's fine.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: He had an opportunity to speak. We are not allowing the public to speak twice. We've been there. I'd like to ask some questions of the petitioner so we could move forward please.

Mr. Hartridge: I thought I was asked to come back up by the Chair.

Mr. Steffen: Sorry, let's go ahead and get the petitioner back up. Thank you Mr. Hartridge, I appreciate that.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: To Mr. Hartridge's point, he talked about the open space and the mezzanine, and if you could tell us what your definition of the open space is as it pertains to the mezzanine definition that is in the Comprehensive Zoning.

Mr. Guerard: This area right here and this area right here doesn't count towards the mezzanine because that's a life safety feature as far as stairwells go. Those stairwells go up and down no matter what.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: So what is your calculation?

Mr. Guerard: 0.33 percent of the total coverage of the whole building.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: And do you have those numbers of what that would be?

Mr. Guerard: I don't have them with me. Whatever they are is what they are.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: Do you know is the mezzanine is one-third of that per...

Mr. Guerard: I'm the one who brought the ordinance up. I know exactly what it is.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: O.K. So it is your position that you are in compliance with the Ordinance that being no more than one-third of the open space.

Mr. Guerard: I have no problem with agreeing to that.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: O.K., it's on the record. That's all I have.

Mr. Guerard: Excluding the life safety features.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: That was my only question.

Mr. Guerard: Can I say one thing though?

Mr. Meyerhoff: I have several questions. When this project first came up and you were not involved, we heard that the existing walls were on the verge of collapsing. We had a structural engineer tell us that in a hurricane they would blow over, and I believe I heard you say today that you are going to build three stories or four stories, however you want to look at it, above these existing, on these existing walls?

Mr. Guerard: No sir, I did not say that. I said the exact opposite. I said those walls would not support the structure.

Mr. Meyerhoff: So you are going to demolish three...

Mr. Guerard: No sir. I'm not going to touch the walls. We'll come back and repoint them and strengthen them. All they are going to be is a façade. They will not be load bearing.

Mr. Meyerhoff: And do you show us anywhere in these drawings how that is going to take place? I see...

Mr. Guerard: I think that is a structural issue. I'm not sure that is a part of the approval process.

Mr. Meyerhoff: It is a part of the issue because, I mean, I see the existing walls on traverse building sections, Sheet A-10, show the existing walls and trusses laying on top of them. And you're telling me that those walls will be removed but I don't see any existing walls....

Mr. Guerard: No, no, no, I did not say any walls were be removed. I did not say any walls were being removed. I did not say any walls were being removed. Those walls are staying.

Mr. Meyerhoff: Those walls are staying?

Mr. Guerard: Yes Sir, they certainly are. And as far as the previous owner of the property and what his structural engineer said or what anybody on his behalf said or what he said, A) it isn't any of my business, nor do I stand behind anything he said.

Mr. Meyerhoff: Let me move on to the next point. These drawings show no dimensions or have a site plan. On Drayton Street is the porte cochere, which I am assuming, but nothing states it one way or the other, that you will retain this in its current condition or whatever. But what are you going to do with that, all that concrete that's there that was the drive into what was the service station at one time. Is that going to become parking? Are you going to remove it? Are you going to landscape it? There is no site plan to tell us what you are going to do there.

Mr. Guerard: There will be three parking spaces and you would drive under the porte cochere. At one time we did have a plan that showed outside parking and how it was done, but I do not know where it is, at this point in time. The bottom line is Mr. Meyerhoff, I don't really have an answer to that but we are going to put three parking spaces and drive cars underneath it and we're going to landscape outside and shade it from Drayton as far as make it more aesthetically pleasing than the concrete mass that it is right now. We worked very diligently on these plans, and everybody here loves to bash them, but two or three months ago everybody wants to save the world and save the building. I spent about \$58,000 having these things done by redrawing them and redrawing them and redrawing them. I'm just trying to save the building, and as far as the front part goes...

Mr. Meyerhoff: That's not the point. We are here, the Board, to either approve or deny your request, and we have a set of drawings here that are incomplete.

Mr. Steffen: Mr. Meyerhoff, let me interrupt you for a second. I want to ask him a question that may answer you question. O.K.? If you would give me a chance to do that. Mr. Guerard, if we were to treat this as a new construction petition since the majority of it is new construction, and we were to entertain approval of this project based on height and mass, and asked you to come back in a month and present us further design details, including things that Mr. Meyerhoff is asking you about, would you be willing to do that? You don't have to answer my question because you did not know I was going to ask you that.

Mr. Guerard: I don't think that is an option Mr. Steffen. I mean not on my behalf. I don't really care one way or the other...

Mr. Steffen: I'm asking on your behalf. Don't begin to guess on what Council is going to do we'll worry about that. I want to know on your behalf.

Mr. Guerard: I am willing to...I either want no, and then we're going to go tear it down. Or I want yes, but come show us how you're structurally building it, show me the parking spaces and show me the tree. Because that doesn't have anything to do with the structure, but I don't want to wait a month and then come back and get bashed again and now we've bought some more time.

Mr. Steffen: Mr. Meyerhoff, does that help answer your question a little bit.

(TAPE ENDS)

Mr. Steffen: That's what I asked him, that's exactly what I just asked him.

Mr. Meyerhoff: What I'm getting to is, that I don't think that we can make a cogent decision, beside of what Council has done, on this submittal.

Ms. Seiler: That is why Joe has proposed, that would have worked...

Mr. Steffen: Before we even discuss it, I wanted to find out whether the petitioner would agree with it O.K.? So, we can discuss it here in just a minute. I'm not going to cut you off on discussion section. I want to finish with the petitioner right now. Are there any other questions for the petitioner? Now I have a couple of questions I want to ask the Staff.

Dr. Caplan: I've got a lot of comments I want to make.

Mr. Steffen: O.K., we're going to get a chance for all the comments, I promise you. Any other questions for the petitioner? O.K.

Dr. Caplan: I'll ask a question. Did you say you would tear this down if...

Mr. Guerard: I was told by the City of Savannah that if it was disapproved today, that they would mandate I tear it down. It wasn't by decision.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: That's irrelevant.

Mr. Steffen: Let me ask Mr. Guerard, I think...

Mr. Guerard: Pardon me?

Dr. Caplan: I say that's inappropriate, not on your part.

Mr. Guerard: No, I'm caught in the middle here, I am not the bad guy everybody's bashing today.

Dr. Caplan: We're caught in the middle too, that's the problem here.

Mr. Guerard: I understand, we all are.

Mr. Steffen: Ms. Reiter let me ask you a few questions. Mr. Hartridge raised the question about late submittal. Does Staff have anything to say about that?

Ms. Reiter: The submittal came in on the due date. It was under another architect. It was posted, then it was subsequently changed by the owner. So, the drawings were changed. We often give people – it is an administrative date that's in here – we often give people another week once they've made their petition and gotten their petition in which was in on time, another week to get more drawings in if its not complete so we don't bring you an incomplete set.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: And we accept drawings on the day of.

Mr. Steffen: That's all I need to know because the issue Mr. Hartridge raised was the first time we've heard that and I wanted to get the full answer. Mr. Hartridge I appreciate you bringing

that to our attention. Let's go ahead and open it up for Board discussion at this point, unless anybody else has any other question to ask the petitioner?

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Dr. Caplan: You were going to, just as a point of information, Gwendolyn or somebody was going to talk about this you were going to discuss for the public the City Council papers that we had.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: Right, I wanted us to be clear, and before we get into that in terms of Board discussion, I voted in the majority not to demolish this building, O.K. And of course it went to City Council and City Council decided to send it back to us and they decided to keep this façade, and for us to determine whether or not the project with the façade met the guidelines in the Ordinance. In my opinion, it's not visually compatible. It's not visually compatible as to proportion of openings, voids in the front. In terms of height, I think that it is properly a four-story building, however, we didn't get a clear answer as to whether or not what the open space is and whether or not the mezzanine represents a third of the open space. I think that is a valid point, but in my opinion, they get the four stories, but I personally would deny the petition based on visual compatibility because this is the one time when we can apply visual compatibility because you know we were changed with determining that the original historic structure should be built upon and I think we ought to send it back to City Council and say no, it doesn't work.

Dr. Caplan: Excuse me for interrupting. Let's just forget about that part. I am still trying to get an interpretation of what, from you or Joe, of what City Council said because I read that document, a good part of it, it was a very formidable document. I can't recall anywhere in that document where it says that if we don't approve it they are going to tear this building down.

Mr. Steffen: No, No let me clarify – Dr. Caplan, I think I can get you a better answer than that. My clear understanding is that Council is very frustrated with this issue. They have had it for 10 or 11 months now. They have had it with a lot of promises from a lot of people that they were going to step up and save this structure. A lot of those promises didn't come to reality until this gentleman came forward. And I think City Council has basically said this is the last chance to save this façade. If you all don't find a way to save it at this meeting, that they are going to direct that it be torn down as a public safety hazard. That's my understanding of what Council believes that they are going to do. We don't need to debate whether Council is right or wrong. They have the ultimate authority to do that, so we have to work within that authority. We have to decide as a Board whether we think it is better to save the façade under this program, and I've suggested one way we can do that with approving height and mass and then making them come back for details, or, we can deny this petition with, I think the very strong assurance that that façade is coming down and something completely new will go on that site.

Dr. Caplan: Which puts us between a rock and a hard place.

Mr. Steffen: It is, but again, in slight defense of City Council, they have had this for 11 months and a lot of promises have been made to them, and a lot of promises haven't been kept to them, and this keeps coming back to them and they are not Historic Review Board people. They have other business to do. And so, I think they've grown frustrated with it, rightly or wrongly, and it is back in our lap today. This is the last we are going to see it unless we have this person come back for details.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: I don't believe that. I think ...

Mr. Steffen: I'm giving you my interpretation of it Gwen. I'm not disagreeing with you, I'm saying that's what I hear.

Mr. Meyerhoff: Whatever City Council has decided is beyond what we as a Review Board are going to do today. And if they threaten us by saying that they will allow the building to be torn down if we don't vote for it, well, then the onus is on them. But we as members of this Review Board know what we are seeing here. We are seeing a shell of a building being "retained" and altered appreciably in its elevation, and then a five-story building slipped inside these walls that is totally incompatible and totally not complete in its submission to us. I can't see personally, as a member of the Review Board, that I can vote for this. No matter what City Council intends to do.

Dr. Caplan: First of all, I would like to thank Mr. Guerard. A big thanks for making an attempt to save this building. And, I would like to thank the comments from the public because I think their comments have been very good. I think Mr. Guerard, if you really want to save this building, that we find a way of making this acceptable to the Review Board and to the public. And Mr. Steffen has suggested a way of doing that. This is not an addition to a building. This is really new construction. I think that if we recognize the fact, and there is tremendous frustration on my part and confusion also, is this a mezzanine or is this a five-story building? Clearly if you look at the east elevations and the south elevations it's a five-story building. That's right, you have five sets of windows. Your cross section shows it as five stories. So, you can see how the public can interpret this as a five-story building. I mention the fact that we say you can have four floors, but we can take exception to the height of those floors. And if that first floor is 23 feet, then we can certainly take exception to that and say you can't have 23 feet, you can have 15 feet, which would do away with your mezzanine. There are a lot of ifs, ands, and buts on this and a lot of frustration. I don't think there is any doubt in anybody's mind that this may not pass this Board. I would hate to see this building torn down. What I would like for you to do is say alright I'm a good citizen. I'm working hard to preserve this building. Let's do it the right way. Let's bring it up and make it Part I and Part II and let's break it up and say, O.K. We're going to make this visually compatible. Were going to cut down on the height of the building and we are going to make the neighbor's and the Board happy. That's just how I feel about it. I won't be here to see this come to fruition, but I think you have to understand that there is a huge amount of frustration over this project. I would love to see this building saved. There were some of you who spoke to demolish this building who are now talking about wanting it to be visually compatible and they've kind of switched sides on this. I would hope that we could come up with some sort of solution because right now it's a no win situation, and I'm afraid this is going to be turned down, and I hate for it to be turned and have this building demolished.

Mr. Steffen: Ms. Seiler, do you want to make a motion?

Ms. Seiler: Yes, I would. I go back to Mr. Steffen's original point to the petitioner in feeling that this is in the nature, Mr. Guerard, of new construction, and therefore, I would like to ask the Board to consider that we consider this new construction and move that we approve Height and Mass on this, and require the petitioner to come back next month for details. Therefore, possibly saving this building when it comes back to City Council, when it goes to City Council.

Dr. Caplan: I don't think you can do that. I think it has to come back. You can't say we can approve Height and Mass, you can't change the petition. He has to come back with a new petition.

Mr. Steffen: No we can, we can..I am going to suggest that we can. We can do exactly that because it is before us and we have many times had someone come to us on one thing and tell them that it is really something else and treat it as something else. And, if we make that determination that we are treating this as a new petition because it involves a substantially new

structure, and treat today's hearing as a Height and Mass hearing because it was noticed, that we can do that, and then require him to come back for design details and make substantial changes to the design, that will address some of the concerns that have been raised. It isn't going to address every concern, I understand that. But, I, the motion that is on the floor at least has an opportunity of saving it, and before we go any further with this let's remember – I don't think it's right to take City Council's position in the nature of a threat. Only in the sense that we have to remember that they have the ultimate authority on these things. We are not an independent Board operating in the middle of the City. We are answerable, eventually, to City Council because they have the right to review our decisions. So, what they think and say...

Ms. Fortson-Waring: There is a motion that hasn't been seconded.

Mr. Steffen: Is there a second to the motion? (none)

Mr. Mitchell: Well, there was still a little discussion on it.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: No, you have to have a second and then discussion.

Mr. Steffen: Would anyone like to second the motion.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: I'd like to make a motion then.

Mr. Neely: Or could I suggest that he might consider a continuance at this point?

Ms. Fortson-Waring: Not without a second, no he has already said what he wanted and we are belaboring the point.

Mr. Neely: May I suggest that you ask, given all the discussion, he might want a continuance because he may know that this is going to be turned down.

Dr. Caplan: Or he might want a resubmittal. With a....

Ms. Fortson-Waring: He wanted a yes or no vote.

Mr. Meyerhoff: That's right.

Dr. Caplan: Well, let's ask him again.

(Audience laughs)

Ms. Fortson-Waring: Give him his vote.

Mr. Meyerhoff: No, no.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: No.

Dr. Caplan: I don't think we can tell him, that as the previous motion said, that O.K., we're going to consider this on one basis different from the basis on we recommended.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: Well, that motion did not fly. There was no second. I'd like to make a motion.

Dr. Caplan: Well, I know that, I'd like for him to be able to speak to what we just said, would you like to continue.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: No, I don't think that he, no, point of order. I would like to make a motion.

Mr. Steffen: Gwen make a motion and we can discuss it if you want to make a motion.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: Thank you. I move that we deny the petition H-06-3669-2, I'm sorry, H-06-3709-2, because it is not visually compatible with the guidelines or the Ordinance of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review.

Mr. Steffen: Is there a second to that motion?

Dr. Caplan: I'll second the motion.

Mr. Steffen: It's been moved and seconded that this be denied. Is there any further discussion?

Ms. Fortson-Waring: Now would be the time to discuss what you wanted to discuss.

Mr. Meyerhoff: Let me again make one more observation. We are not saving this building. That's a one-story building. What we are doing is saving the perimeter walls and the porte cochere and slipping a five-story building inside it. That's what we have been presented with.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: And may I also say if we deny the petition, he has to come back and submit a new petition, which is what you all wanted to do with this round about motion that was...

Mr. Steffen: No, it ain't going to happen.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: Or, he can go to City Council

Mr. Steffen: Because there isn't going to be a building to talk about.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: Maybe or maybe not.

Mr. Steffen: Not maybe or maybe not.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: Well, I think you are out of order, Chair. If you want to take part in the discussion you need to step down. That's Robert's Rules.

Mr. Steffen: I understand Robert's Rules, Gwen you don't need to lecture me. So, I am going to continue participating in the discussion because I think this is an unusual matter.

Mr. Guerard: Can I ask a question?

Mr. Gay: Have we come to the conclusion that he cannot ask for a continuation?

Mr. Guerard: No, we have already voted.

Mr. Steffen: There is a motion on the floor. We're still discussing it.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: He said he would but he wanted a yes or no vote.

Mr. Guerard: I thought you already voted to deny it.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: We haven't voted yet.

Mr. Steffen: Mr. Guerard there is a motion and a second on the floor. Until we actually vote on it, if you wish to request us a continuance, then we can entertain that motion.

Mr. Guerard: No, thank you.

Mr. Steffen: Yes Sir, I understand your position. I'm not sure the rest of the Boar does.

Mr. Guerard: To be perfectly honest with you, I'm not trying to save worlds. It's cheaper for me to build once it's torn down. Its economically...I mean I'm trying to save it. It's the best I can do.

Mr. Steffen: Yes Sir.

Mr. Meyerhoff: There is a motion on the floor.

Mr. Steffen: There is a motion on the floor is there any further discussion. Have I made clear to you all that this structure is coming down?

Ms. Fortson-Waring: No, I think that's out of order.

(Audience laughs)

Mr. Steffen: Gwen, Gwen, I make questions of order. You are not...

Ms. Fortson- Waring: No, I think that we can say when it is out of order. You can check Robert's Rules. We can have a point of order.

Dr. Caplan: I don't care what Robert's Rules of Order are, I would like to save this building, and I would like to give the gentleman an opportunity, if he will, to bring us something.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: Well then, I think you need to go to City Council when he goes back to City Council and tell them what we did and what we tried to do.

Dr. Caplan: I think we tell City Council what we are trying to do and he agrees that he's going to try to make another effort, I think we are home free.

Mr. Guerard: Can I say one more thing?

Mr. Steffen: I'm going to allow that.

Mr. Guerard: This is not a five-story building.

Mr. Steffen: Mr. Guerard don't address that because that's not even a part of that. I can guarantee it.

(Several people speak at once)

Mr. Meyerhoff: There is a motion on the floor that has been seconded.

Ms. Fortson-Waring: You'd have to call for the question.

Mr. Meyerhoff: What?

Ms. Fortson-Waring: You'd have to call for the question.

Mr. Steffen: Is everybody done? O.K., go ahead and allow a vote on this, all those in favor of denial of this petition indicate by saying, no let's indicate by raising hands on this one. All those in favor of denial; one, two, three, four, five. All those opposed. I'm going to vote. It's five to four. It's denied. Thank you!

Mr. Guerard: Can I ask you what the specific reason for the record for why it was denied?

Ms. Fortson-Waring: It is not visually compatible according to the Ordinance.

Mr. Guerard: O.K., according to the ordinance. Thank you!

Mr. Hartridge: The chair votes in this matter?

Mr. Steffen: I am voting in this matter, yes Sir.

Mr. Hartridge: Even though it is not required?

Mr. Steffen: Ever though it is not required for me to vote, Yes Sir.

Mr. Hartridge: I read you loud and clear.

Mr. Steffen: Yes Sir.

HDRB DECISION: Ms. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the petition because it is not visually compatible with the guidelines of the Ordinance of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and it passed. Mr. Neely, Dr. Johnson, and Mr. Meyerhoff were in favor of denial. Mr. Mitchell, Ms. Seiler, Mr. Steffen, and Mr. Gay were opposed.

Ms. Fortson-Waring left at approximately __ p.m.

**RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-06-3710-2
305 – 311 Tattnall Street
Demolition/New Construction, Part I Height and
Mass of Four- and Five-Story Office Building**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval of Demolition. Approval of Part I Height and Mass.**

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay and Mr. Julius Bennett.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish two non-rated one-story commercial structures and erect a four- to five-story office building.

FINDINGS:

The Zoning Administrator has found that no lot coverage variances are required for this site.

Pulaski Ward was laid out in the 1840’s. The western Trust and Tithing Lots were truncated by Tattnall Street. Using the 1916 Sanborn Map book, residences were the major use along Liberty, Tattnall, and Harris Streets. One exception was a theatre, located mid-block on the South side of Liberty Street between Tattnall and Barnard Streets. This building later became a skating rink.

Along Tattnall Street there were approximately 10 lots with two- to four-story duplex residences facing Tattnall. The average lot coverage in 1916 along this block was 68 percent and a similar lot coverage was found (69 percent) on Harris between Tattnall and Barnard Streets.

In 1916, west of Jefferson, the fabric was made up of residences interspersed with more intense uses such as livery stables, veterinaries, boarding houses an Episcopal orphanage and an undertaker.

By the 1950’s, the stable uses had been converted to auto-related uses which gradually eroded the fabric along Montgomery Street and crept into Pulaski Ward along Tattnall Street.

Substantive changes from previous submittal:

1. The floor-to-floor heights have been reduced from 15’-12’-12’-12’-12’ to 13’-12’-11’-11’-11’.
2. The cornice has been simplified and lowered.
3. The direction of the undulating roof has been changed. The curved balcony has been made straight.
4. The South side elevation has been articulated as two masses.
5. The elevator penthouse has been placed on the five story mass.
6. The segmental windows have been straightened.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.		A 7’-6” walkway has been provided on the South side.
Dwelling Unit Type	NA	
Street Elevation Type	Commercial style with base, shaft and top	There is one other large commercial structure on Pulaski Square, the former Jewish Education Alliance building, later the Salvation Army. Located on a Trust Lot it has a smaller scale than the proposed building, however, the tripartite division of the proposed building helps to mitigate the size of the proposed

		structure on Tattnall.
Entrances	A central recessed covered court is provided on Tattnall Street 36.50 feet wide.	Several other apartment buildings in Pulaski Ward use a feature of a recessed central entry.
Building Height:	The lot straddles two height zones. Five stories are allowed nearer Liberty Street and four south of Liberty Lane. The overall height is 61 feet to the top of the cornice of the five story portion and 50' +/- to the top of the 4 story portion.	There is a step down and the building is not readily visible down Harris Street.
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development	The building has been divided into three legible sections that are reminiscent of the historic lot pattern widths. There is a base, middle, top relationship.	These standards have been met.
Proportion of Structure's Front Facade	The stepping down of the sections helps to define three distinct parts each taller than it is wide.	
Proportion of Openings	Vertical windows are grouped in pairs on the five story portion. The fenestration is varied slightly on the four story portion.	By carrying the fenestration the building is further segmented.
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	Each section of the building repeats a three bay rhythm.	This appears compatible with nearby rhythms of solids to voids.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	There is no lane. The building combines several lots however this recombined lot is developed in the third dimension as three elements.	
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	The main entrance faces Tattnall Street and is recessed within an open covered court which helps break down the mass of the building. There are recessed porches at the second third and fourth levels. The fifth level features a wave shaped roof that has been reoriented and it is doubtful this will be perceived from the right-of-way.	
Scale	The scale along the walkway has been reduced by breaking up the south elevation. There is pedestrian interaction along the streetscape on Tattnall and the walkway.	

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval to demolish two non-rated one-story commercial buildings.

Approval of Part I Height and Mass.

Comments regarding Part II Design

- The tapered posts on the porch appear too large for the context.
- There should be depth from the face of the building to the window plane.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay stated he received a phone message from Leo Beckman who has an office immediately adjacent to the property in favor of the project. Mr. Shay said that he had subdivided the mass of the south wall into two segments to be better proportioned considering the size of the adjacent building. The model had been revised, and the entire building was brought down to be below the cornice height of the City parking garage next door.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Gary Arthur (Bee Hive Foundation) stated his office and his residence were across the street from the project, and they were grateful for the floor-to-floor height reductions, the elimination of the heavy cornice, and that the curved balconies have been made straight. He said they still found that its direction had been shifted, that the roof really has no meaning or relation to the context of the rest of the design and certainly not to the architecture of the surrounding Historic District. They were convinced the expanse of Jefferson Street, between the large City parking garage, with the mass of this new office complex on the other side of the street, would become a forbidding canyon, and it continues the gigantic mass of the parking garage. He said Mr. Shay referred to the connector tying the two principle brick masses; the four-story part to the five-story part. They agree with the intention that the center portion of the building be expressed as a connector tying together the principle brick masses. It was a good way to break down the massing of the building, but, it was a connector they believed historically would not have been taller than one of the buildings being connected. He displayed some rough sketches to illustrate his point. One that was correct with a shorter connector. A second sketch was correct with a four- and five-story building next to each other, with shorter connectors. A final sketch of the four-story elevation displayed a connector that was too tall. He thought the design did not feel right, that the connector should be just that, a connector; a recessed hyphen with balconies and glass, lighter and smaller as compared to the solid mass of the two masonry components. He felt the top story of the connector needed to be eliminated to correct the anomaly.

Ms. Dolly Chisholm (Bee Hive Foundation) stated she was a downtown resident and wanted to add to what Mr. Arthur said about the connector. She said she wanted to talk about it regarding the legal concept. The drawings that were provided show Liberty Lane and the entrance in the middle of the proposed building. The height map showed where the four stories go, and the five-story section, and stated there was a discrepancy between what was allowed on the height map and what was being proposed. She showed a copy of a map of Chatham County with the properties and lane, using the northern boundary, the five stories would only be on one-half. She felt there was a significant amount that was encroaching on the four-story side.

Mr. Michael Brown (Developer) stated the Board knew his feelings on compatibility, but he wanted to take Dr. Caplan's side on this project. He felt Savannah was able to maintain the largest Historic District in the United States, with the largest collection of visually compatible buildings. The three largest most obvious exceptions were the Hyatt Hilton, Desoto Hilton, and Drayton Towers. Drayton Towers was built in 1952, before the formation of the Historic Review Board. The Hyatt and Desoto were approved by the Review Board. The extreme valuable Historic District asset generates 6.4 million people visited, which generated 1.4 billion dollars into the community in 2005. He felt the only reason for the figures was the balance of the visually compatible buildings and the guidelines imposed on them. He stated this month's agenda had four petitions that requested the Board's permission to violate the viable guidelines that Dr. Caplan drew attention to. He said it was easy to think it's just another story or another ten percent additional lot coverage, or let's use cheaper building materials. The four become 48 exceptions over a course of a year. If you look back there have been 240 exceptions in the past five years. If you take that and extrapolate it out for another five years, you could have 480 non-compatible structures over the next five years. He felt the Landmark District was too fragile to sustain 240 or 480 inappropriate buildings that violate the guidelines, the quality of life, and the economics of the city. He asked if the petitioner could pay the price for the land and build within the guidelines in this project; probably not. Then why would he risk overpaying for the land if it requires degrading the Historic District and violating the guidelines. The obvious reason was historically the Review Board usually approved the petition with minimal risk. He asked the Board to visualize the building next to their home's property line and asked if they would find it visually compatible with their neighborhood, would it affect their quality of life, their property value; yes, it would. If the Board was not sure the building was compatible or if they did not know, he asked them to abstain their vote. He asked the Board to not put Savannah's quality of life and economics at risk for any purpose. He stated following the advice of Nancy Reagan and say no.

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated the Architectural Review Committee prepared the same comments as Ms. Chisholm and Mr. Arthur, and they agreed with what was said. They would like to commend the petitioner for the connector and the setback because it created a more traditional bay rhythm.

Mr. Shay stated the goal was visually compatibility, and that was what the building looked like down at the side where it would be seen. He said he understood Mr. Arthur's diagrams, and what they submitted were documents of true elevations, but the reason for the model and other types of things so the building could be seen as it would actually be perceived on the ground. What they have done was everything they could to follow the letter and the spirit of the guidelines, present to the Board a building that has a subdivided mass and works very hard, and to retain the size and scale of the buildings on it when the lot was originally divided. He stated they did not do the building, the building was there, although it was not as important as other surrounding historic structures when considering context. He thought it was fair to point out it existed. He agreed with Mr. Brown's speech about the need to preserve the historic integrity, but it was also important to point out the buildings there now were not doing anything at all to contribute to the quality of the downtown environment through history, purpose, or economic function.

Mr. Steffen asked Mr. Shay wanted to address the issue Ms. Chisholm raised about the height map question.

Mr. Shay said he did not know where the line was. At the last meeting it was stated it could be interpreted as being anywhere within the lane. What Ms. Chisholm presented was a tax map, and he could tell the Board from a painful experience that if you rely on tax maps to be geographically correct, you could get hurt. It was a land survey and it did show that one of the buildings was aligned approximately with where they made the transition in the mass. When it

was brought up at the last meeting, it did not seem to be an issue because the five-story portion that was straddling the line was recessed back further from the front façade, and it was very difficult to perceive from the main Tattnall Street side.

Mr. Gay asked the purpose of the thing in the middle of the building that can't really be seen. He asked if it served a purpose.

Mr. Shay said it did. One of the architectural features of the design was the top floor had an outdoor terrace on the side so that it would not be as disturbing on the side-to-side. They made it slope from front-to-back. There was a restaurant that had interest in locating on the top, and they want to have something more contemporary. He asked the Board to consider in dividing the building into three parts with the massing, they would like the difference to be reflected in the roof massing as well.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Gay stated if Ms. Chisholm was correct, then it was not in compliance right now. They could not approve something that was not approvable.

Mr. Deering stated unless they made a finding-of-fact that the Board knew that the portion of the five-story connector was on the four-story height zone side of the line, then Mr. Shay would have to get a variance based on that.

Mr. Shay said or a finding-of-fact to the exact location of the line.

Mr. Mitchell stated the Board faced these issues often it has become a blame game. What is or is not a story, what floor heights are. He said it was only because of the economic issue of making more money.

Mr. Neely asked what would it do to the design of the top floor if Mr. Shay moved the section of the fifth floor back to the proper line based on the height map.

Mr. Shay stated he did not know if they had not done it. He asked if someone could show him where the exact line was within a document he could rely on, they would attempt to comply. He could not just eliminate the entire middle segment of the fifth floor because of the minimum square footage necessary to sustain a restaurant.

Mr. Deering thanked Mr. Shay for the changes, and said it was an improved building. He said the Tattnall Street side of the fifth floor connector was set back far enough from a pedestrian point-of view that it could not be perceived close to the building. If someone was far away they would perceive it. On the Jefferson Street side the fifth level connector section was too close to the street and could be pulled back, but that was where the core was. If the height map was printed at a huge scale they might be able to tell where the line was, but he did not know if there was anything written that states where the line was. The line was in the lane but where does it actually occur.

(There ensued a discussion regarding the location of the line drawing, the four-story and five-story zone, and how it related to the placement of the buildings.)

Dr. Caplan stated he always admired the way Mr. Shay stepped down the buildings and being careful about the adjacent neighbors. He did not want the Board to be in a position of doing something that was wrong, but he liked the building.

Mr. Shay said if there was a determination that part of their building with habitable space encroaches on the boundary, then they would go to the Zoning Board of Appeals and ask for relief, or depending on what his client tells him, they will work on it architecturally.

Dr. Caplan agreed, but said in order to satisfy everyone, it would be the thing to do.

HDRB DECISION: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for Part I, Height and Mass. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed. Mr. Gay and Ms. Seiler voted in favor of the motion. Dr. Caplan, Mr. Deering, and Mr. Mitchell were opposed. Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-06-3711-2
217 West Liberty Street
Demolition/New Construction**

Reconsideration at the January 10, 2007, meeting

Mr. Steffen asked the Board if they would take an item under Other Business out of order while Mr. Shay was still present. He said the Board at a previous meeting made a decision, and it was brought to his attention they had lost the quorum prior to making the decision. It was very likely to be legally challenged and the process had begun. It was his recommendation to the Board to take it or not, that the Board vote to reconsider the matter at the January 10, 2007, meeting. The Board could not officially reconsider today because they have not had notice of it.

Mr. Deering stated if you start the meeting with a quorum you don't have to finish with a quorum.

Mr. Steffen stated you do once you lose the quorum. As long as nobody raises the issue you can go on forever, but someone had raised the issue. If you lose the quorum prior to taking the vote, then the vote can be nullified, and that was law. If nobody challenges it, then no problem, but in this case someone was going to challenge it and it was his desire for the Board to make legally supportable decisions. It was his recommendation to the Board to make a legally supportable decision, that they vote to reconsider the matter, bring it back to the January meeting, and allow it to be reconsidered and re-voted on.

Mr. Mitchell asked if they needed a motion.

Mr. Steffen stated he did.

Mr. Deering asked why the Board was doing it now when other people had sat there for several hours.

Mr. Steffen stated because they would lose the quorum and the matter would be pushed off past the point of them being able to do anything about it, because people were leaving. He was asking the Board to do that. He was just asking for it to be continued and that it did not have to be discussed.

Dr. Caplan stated something had been bothering him for a while, and Mr. Meyerhoff was well-intended by recusing himself, but he had not monetary interest in this and nothing to gain. Mr. Meyerhoff did not have to recuse himself by the guidelines.

Mr. Steffen stated with all due respect he thought it was good to recuse yourself when you have even the appearance of having a conflict; it was good for any of them.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he recused himself because his name was on the drawing, and people could take it as whatever his opinion was.

Dr. Caplan stated it would make people vote against it.

Mr. Steffen stated they had a motion and a second that the matter be taken up for reconsideration on January 10, 2007.

HDRB DECISION: Mr. Mitchell made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Review Board reconsider Petition H-06-3711-2, until January 10, 2007. Ms Seiler seconded the motion and it passed. Mr. Deering was opposed and Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

RE: Petition of Atlantic Neon
Barbara Ferguson
H-06-3721-2
321 West Bay Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends a continuance for revisions.

There was no one present for the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for two principal use fascia signs on the building at 321 West Bay Street as follows:

Sign 1: -Located on the canopy over the main entrance
-Text: "Hilton" to be 4 3/8" tall and 1'-7 7/8" wide
"Garden Inn" to be 6" tall and 4' wide
-Non-illuminated aluminum sign with red vinyl text mounted to wall.

Sign 2: -Located on rear of hotel on parapet above the sixth floor.
-Text: "Hilton" 1'-9" tall and 7'-10" long
"Garden Inn" 30" tall and 19'-1.5" long
Overall square footage of 46.69
-Illuminated channel letters made of 2283 red lexan, and the retainers will be constructed of red jewelite.

FINDINGS:

The Garden Hotel at 321 West Bay Street is not a historic building and does not contribute to the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. The business is changing its name to the Hilton Garden Inn. The building maintains approximately 180 linear feet along Bay Street and 90 linear feet along Montgomery Street. The following standard from the Historic Sign District Ordinance (Section 8-3121) apply:

(B)(11)(a) Within nonresidential zoning districts, in addition to the permitted principal use sign, one canopy or awning principal use sign shall be permitted for

each entrance providing public access. Such sign shall not exceed a size of more than one square foot of sign face per linear foot of canopy or awning, or a maximum of 20 square feet, whichever is lesser; provided, however, that the aggregate total principal use sign area for the subject use is not exceeded along that street frontage...Individual letters or symbols not to exceed six inches indicating use, address, or an exit or entrance...shall be exempt from this provision.

Sign 1: The standard is met. The business is allowed 47 square feet of signage. However, according to the ordinance and the City's Zoning Administrator, only one sign is permitted per street frontage. Projecting principal use signs currently exist on the Bay and Montgomery Street elevations. The sign has been reduced to features individual letters 6" tall or less to meet the standards.

(B)(11) Principal Use Signs. For each nonresidential use, one principal use sign shall be permitted. Such sign shall not exceed a size of more than one square foot of sign area per linear foot of frontage along a given street or shall meet the following size requirements whichever is the most restrictive: 40 square feet provided that...each use...shall be allowed 1 additional square foot of sign area per each 2 linear feet of building frontage greater than 75 feet along the street which the sign is oriented.

Sign 2: The standard is met. The illuminated sign on the lane façade is 46.69 square feet. This was reduced from the previously submitted sign that was 70 square feet.

(B)(3) Lighted Signs. Lighted signs of an enclosed lamp or neon...are permitted within the non-residential zoning districts. Such signs shall be in scale and harmony with the surrounding structures and open spaces. The use of reversed silhouette or "cut-out" letters is encouraged to reduce glare where back lighting is applied.

Staff recommends approval. Similar internally illuminated channel letter signs are present in the district on non-historic facades.

HDRB DECISION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as amended. Mr. Neely seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Jerry Polk
 H-06-3722-2
 530 East Liberty Street
 New Construction / Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Jerry Polk.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of a wood open walled shed with sheet tin roof located in the lot adjacent to Polk's Market. The lot is currently used for the display of plants under a trellis structure. The size of the proposed plan is 22' wide by 27 feet deep. The height is less than the existing produce market adjacent. The wood will be stained gray. The structure is for the display of plants.

FINDINGS:

The structure is compatible with the produce market adjacent to it.

HDRB DECISION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed. Dr. Johnson opposed the motion.

**RE: Petition of Cogdell & Mendrala Architects
Daniel Brown
H-06-3727-2
116 East Oglethorpe Avenue
New Construction of Carriage House; Door
Replacement**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Daniel Brown.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for new construction, Part I and II, of a two-story brick carriage house at the rear of the property at 116 East Oglethorpe Avenue. The applicant is also requesting approval to install a new door opening on the existing carriage house.

FINDINGS:

The historic residence and carriage house at 116 East Oglethorpe Avenue were constructed in 1869 and is a rated structure within Savannah's National Historic Landmark District. The property is zoned RIP-A (residential, medium density).

1. A new garage opening is proposed on the existing historic carriage house. Currently, the building maintains a central carriage entrance with arched wooden double doors. Two window openings have been enclosed to the east of the entrance, and the electric panels and utilities are located to the west. The applicant is requesting approval to install an arched wooden double carriage door east of the central entrance. The opening will match the existing opening and contain a 8-foot-1-inch wide by 7-foot-9-inch tall wooden door painted Sherwin Williams, Porcelain (SW0053). The following standards apply:

(l)(14): Lanes and Carriage Houses:

- a. In existing carriage houses, original entries shall not be enlarged
- d. Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.

The standards are met.

2. New Construction of the carriage house:

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: New carriage houses may provide up to a 4' setback to allow a turning radius into the garage on a narrow lane. Carriage houses must be located to the rear of the property.	The carriage house is site at the rear of the property at the 0' lot line on the lane.	Staff recommends approval. This is consistent with neighboring carriage houses.
Street Elevation Type	Two-story brick carriage house with apartment.	Staff recommends approval. This is a common building type in the historic district.
Building Height: Secondary structures, which front a lane, shall be no taller than two stores.	A two-story carriage house with an overall height is proposed 22'-8". Neighboring carriage houses are 21.5' and 25' tall.	Staff recommends approval.
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade	The carriage house is 27'-2.5" wide by 22'-8" tall. The proportions are similar to neighboring carriage houses.	Staff recommends approval.
Proportion of Openings	A three bay rhythm with two garage door openings is proposed. Neighboring carriage houses feature similar patterns.	Staff recommends approval.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	No open space will remain between carriage houses at the lane. This building pattern can be found throughout the historic district.	Staff recommends approval.

The following Part II Design Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Windows: Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian [and]...shall be constructed of wood or wood clad. Double glazed windows are permitted on...new construction provided that...the muntin be no wider than 7/8"; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding. Windows shall be rectangular and shall have a	Marvin Wood Ultimate Double-hung windows are proposed that are 3'-2" wide by 5'-1" tall along the lane with ¾" muntins. A bay window is proposed on the second floor of the carriage house facing the interior of the parcel to match the oriel window on the main residence. This element will be minimally visible from Oglethorpe Street	Staff recommends approval. These windows have been previously approved in the district and have proven to meet the standards. The widows should be inset no less than 3" from the face of the building. Staff recommends an oriel base be incorporated into the bay to meet the standards. The petitioner and board agreed that the bay window would not be visible from the public right-of-way

<p>vertical to horizontal ratio or not less than 5:3. Sashes shall be inset not less than 3” from the façade of a masonry building.</p> <p>Bay windows shall extend to the ground unless they are oriel, beveled, or are supported by brackets.</p>		
<p>Doors: Garage openings shall not exceed 12’ in width.</p>	<p>9’ wide by 8’ tall garage door openings are proposed. Wood overhead garage doors are proposed that simulate carriage style doors.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Roof Shape: Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapet.</p>	<p>A flat roof behind a stepped brick parapet is proposed.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>HVAC:</p>	<p>HVAC units will be located on the roof behind the parapet and will not be visible from the public right-of-way.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Materials</p>	<p>Cherokee brick manufactured by Ole Savannah is proposed.</p> <p>A standing seam metal roof, painted rustic red is proposed for the bay window.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p>Color</p>	<p>Bay window frame to be Sherwin Williams Porcelain (SW0053). The surrounding window panel and garage doors to be Sherwin Williams Curio Gray (SW0024).</p>	<p>Staff approval.</p>

Mr. Deering asked what did Staff mean regarding the bay window..

Ms. Ward requested that they put some sort of base underneath so that it does not just cantileaver.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it was not visible from any street.

Ms. Ward stated it was facing the interior lot and was not sure if there was a garden wall.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Daniel Brown stated they could change the bay to an Oriel.

Mr. Deering stated they had done a great job and their submittal package was great. He disagreed with Staff regarding the Oriel window because the Oriel window in front of the house was historic and a unique feature to the building. Carriage houses didn't usually have fancy Oriel windows, and keeping a simple bay window was the best thing to do.

Mr. Brown restated it was not visible from the street, and there was an eight-foot brick wall behind it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cynthia Hunter stated the balcony was visible from the public right-of-way, and she had not seen it before. She thought it was odd and thought there should be a balcony at the end of the courtyard rather than between the two structures.

HDRB DECISION: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder
Ivy Stroud
H-06-3729-2
208 East Hall Street
Stoop

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

Present for the petition was Mr. John Deering.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for a rehabilitation of the front stoop on the residence at 208 East Hall Street as follows:

1. Remove the existing stucco veneer on the stoop base.
2. Replace stucco balustrade on stoop roof with HB&G PVC balustrade and railing.
3. Remove stucco newel, handrail and baluster from stoop and replace with HB&G PVC balustrade and railing. The handrail on the stairs will be iron, painted.
4. Replace porch trim and columns with wood brackets and wood chamfered columns.

FINDINGS:

The historic residence at 208 East Hall Street was constructed in 1881 (modified in 1888) and is a rated structure within Savannah's National Historic Landmark District. The existing stoop is a modification of the original design. Historical photographs reveal that the porch stoop and window treatments were much more Victorian in design, with an iron balustrade, wood columns and decorative brackets and trim work and not the pierced stucco design that exists presently. The porch posts, stairs and roof structure are to remain and the proposed alterations will adhere to the existing footprint. The following standards from the Historic District ordinance (Section 8-3030) apply:

(l)(11) Balconies, stairs, stoops, porticos, and side porches.

Standard	Proposed	Comment
c. Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street...	The existing stucco base will remain. The residence is surfaced in stucco.	The standard is met.
d. Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone or slate. The historic review board may approve other materials upon a showing by the applicant that the product is visually compatible with historic building materials and has performed satisfactorily in the local climate.	The existing masonry stairs to remain.	The standard is met.
e. Wood portico posts shall have cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave.	Four inch square wood chamfered columns are proposed with an acanthus-empire decorative capital and stepped base upon a paneled pier.	The standard is met.
f. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between balusters shall not exceed four inches. For one and two family dwellings the height of the railing shall not exceed 36".	<p>A decorative cast iron railing is proposed for the staircase to be painted. The detail indicates that the railing is 1'-1.5" tall. Reclaimed antique iron newel posts will connect the balustrade.</p> <p>An HB&G, pvc composite balustrade system, with top and bottom railing at no greater than 2'-10" tall is proposed on the base of the portico and above with HB&G paneled piers.</p>	<p>Verify paint color and height of railing.</p> <p>Staff recommends that the balustrade be constructed of wood. Synthetic materials are not appropriate on historic structures.</p>
g. Supported front porticos shall be constructed of wood unless the proposed material matches other façade details on the same building, such as terra cotta or wrought iron.	The existing porch base and roof structure will remain and will be surfaced in wood detailing reminiscent of historic photographs of the building.	Staff recommends approval with the elimination of the HB&G elements.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. John Deering stated they would like the Board to consider the composite material that had been used on a number of structures. Once it was painted you could not tell it was not wood and stated he had a sample.

Ms. Seiler asked if it was from a longevity standpoint.

Mr. Deering said it was, and agreed with Staff on Historic Structures. If you put the wood up and have to buy some really expensive wood that would be prohibitive, but you want it to last.

(Tape Ends.)

HDRB DECISION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the condition that the paint colors be submitted to Staff for final approval. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Ciphers Design Co.
307 - 311 East Huntingdon Street
H-06-3732-2
New Construction, Part I Height and Mass of a
Four-story Condominium Building**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval of Part I Height and Mass.

Present for the petition was Sarah Kepple.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of Part I Height and Mass for a three-and-one-half-story, six-unit condominium.

FINDINGS:

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.	5'-2" and 5'-4" side yard setbacks are proposed.	The setback standards are met.
Dwelling Unit Type	Condominium units are proposed. The building has been designed to resemble other structures in this block face.	There are several large Victorian duplexes on the street.
Street Elevation Type	A raised stoop format has been proposed.	There are other large raised stoop structures on this street.
Entrances	The main entries face Huntingdon Street.	The entrance standards have been met.
Building Height:	The overall historic heights to the eave line in this block vary from 24'-4" to 38'-7". The ground floor is 8 feet; second floor is 11 feet and third floor is 10 feet.	At 35'-8" the proposed structure is compatible with other historic structures in this block. The floor-to-floor heights have been met.
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development	NA	
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade	The proportion of height to width in the proposed structure is comparable to other historic structures in this block.	A comparison was provided.
Proportion of Openings	Rectangular windows are proposed.	The openings appear in the range of proportions of

		openings on other historic houses in the block.
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	The proposed building is essentially a six bay rhythm with an off center bay tower.	This block has a number of towers and rhythm of solids to voids. The proposed structure appears visually compatible with the other historic structures.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	The width of the mass and the side yard setbacks are consistent with other structures in this block face.	
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	Front and side porches are provided. The stoop is on private property.	The porches and stoops are consistent with other historic structures on the same block face.
Walls of Continuity	Punched openings are provided in the ground floor consistent with the ground floors of other historic structures in this block face.	
Scale	The scale of elements within the façade is consistent with the other larger Victorian structures within this block face.	

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of Part I Height and Mass.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Meyerhoff said they had given a nice collection of surrounding building pictures with each having a lot going on with turrets, bays, porches, etc. He was wondering, on their particular project, it wasn't a little bit much at the roofline, and he was particularly disturbed that the gable roof that ran east and west does not extend all the way to the eastern end of the building. He thought it would simplify all that was going on at the top of the roof level, and asked if they had considered it.

Ms. Kepple stated they had, and they decided it was more important to distinguish the porches with a lower roof. The floor plan on Page A2.0, the side porch was what ended the top gable. The roof plan was on Page A2.5, so the single large gable across the top was stopped where they threw out the lower pitched roof of the porch.

Mr. Meyerhoff said he saw the lower roof, but was wondering if the gable could be extended on the back.

Ms. Kepple said to get the size, they would have to make the side porch smaller if they wanted it to extend.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the side porch goes back one-third a part of the way. He was wondering what they were going to do where the building was that was called Garden Level Number One, as far as the roofline there.

Ms. Kepple stated they had a roof plan on Page on A2.5. She said the back two bays had pitch roofs on them, and one pitch would wrap around the side.

Mr. Deering thought they had done a great job with it, but the central main portion of the structure had the gable, and the part that looked peculiar from this elevation was 16 to 18 feet back.

Ms. Kepple said if they looked at the side elevation being discussed, it was a three-foot screen. You could see how the porch had a lower roof but you could still see the main gable. She thought it was the best solution for the shape.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated from the side elevation it looked more complex.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Hunter Kline representing Dorothy McCoy owner of 315 East Huntingdon. He said Ms. McCoy’s first concern with the plans was the parking lot and any future structures that might be needed in or around the parking lot for trash receptacles, in addition to the Height and Mass of the building and any other additional structures that might be needed for it. As far as height in the plans, it was stated as three-story, but was actually four finished floors. On the model and the street on the south side of Huntingdon, the building was higher and inconsistent with the sightline to the south side. If it was on the north side of the street and facing north, it would fit in much better. Facing the south side of the street it was inconsistent with the height of the other structures that were already there, and it was not visually compatible with existing structures.

HDRB DECISION: Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby the petition. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects
Erik Puljung
H-06-3733-2
212 Houston Street
New Construction, Part I Height and Mass, of a
Four-Story Condominium Building**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval of Part I Height and Mass.**

Present for the petition was Mr. Erik Puljung.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part I Height and Mass, of a four-story multi-family dwelling.

FINDINGS:

The vacant parcel at 212 Houston Street is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density). The following Part I Height and Mass Standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.	The building fronts directly onto Houston Street and	The standard is met.

	Oglethorpe Lane. A 8' setback is proposed on the east property line and a 4' setback on the south.	
Building Lot Coverage: maximum 75% in RIP-A	The lot is 60.5' by 45' (2722.5 SF) and the building footprint is 2034 SF for a lot coverage of 74.7%	The standard is met.
Dwelling Unit Type	Multi-family dwelling.	Staff recommends approval. Multi-family dwellings are present in Crawford Ward.
Street Elevation Type	Four-story wood frame dwelling on a raised masonry foundation, with a central high stoop.	Staff recommends approval. A four-story building with a central raised stoop is located on the northeast Trust Lot on Crawford Square.
Entrances	A central high stoop entrance is proposed with three doorways. A central entry within the base of the stoop is also proposed.	Staff recommends approval with restudy of the basement level entry during Part II. Historic buildings within the ward feature both low stoops with side entrances and high stoops with central and side entrances.
Building Height: Four-stories	The proposed building is four-stories with an overall height of 45'-8". Neighboring properties are 29' to 43' tall with the nearby four-story building at 44' tall.	Staff recommends approval.
Floor-to-floor heights: Exterior expression of raised basement between 6.5' and 9.5'; First floor 11' minimum; Each story above 10' minimum.	The raised foundation is 9'-4.75"; Second floor above is approximately 11'; the Third floor is approximately 11'; and the Fourth floor is 10'.	Staff recommends reducing the third floor height by one foot to the minimum standard to reduce the overall height as the building appears very tall proportionately.
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade	The front façade is 41' wide and 45'-8" tall broken into four stories with wood clapboard over a raised foundation.	The lack of horizontal elements in the façade configuration creates a more vertical effect on the building façade. Reducing the floor-to-floor heights and possibly strengthening the number of openings that span the width of the building or adding shutters would help break up the strong verticality.
Proportion of Openings	Openings have a 3:6 horizontal to vertical ratio on the 2 nd and 3 rd floors with smaller openings on the fourth	Staff recommends approval. The proportion of openings is consistent with historic buildings in the district.

	floor.	
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	A four bay rhythm is used on the front façade and the side elevation facing the lane.	While most historic buildings within the ward are comprised of three-bays, two and four bay rhythms exist. The four-story building on Crawford Square maintains a five-bay rhythm, which creates a horizontal pattern on the façade.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	Approximately 6' of open space will be created between this building and the adjacent structure.	Staff recommends approval.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	The front stoop will not encroach on the right-of-way. This is consistent with neighboring buildings. The lane facing elevation features a two-story verandah over garage entrances.	Staff recommends approval. Side porches are common within the historic district on buildings of this size, although usually facing a garden and not the lane.
Walls of Continuity	6' tall privacy walls and gates are proposed at Houston Street and along the lane.	Staff recommends approval.
Scale	Four-story buildings of similar or greater width and depth are present in the ward.	Staff recommends approval with the condition that addition more horizontal elements be explored to bring the building into scale with other historic structures on north-south streets not on Trust Lots.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the condition that the floor-to-floor heights not exceed the minimum and that more horizontal elements (possibly shutters or an additional bay) be explored. Restudy the basement level entrance during the Part II submittal.

Dr. Caplan stated it would be Part II with shutters and they were interested in the height.

Ms. Ward answered right. She said they may be meeting the standard, but there may be a little wiggle room in there.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Puljung stated he would look at shutters and windows in the design phase.

Mr. Puljung said on the height perspective they had an eight-foot ceiling on the garden level, and a 16-inch floor system, which was an engineered wood. They had ten-foot ceilings on the parlor level, second floor was ten feet, and then they go to nine feet. He said he did have the roof rafters sitting on the ceiling joist, which adds more height and lifts the cornice higher from the ground.

Mr. Deering stated it looked better in the exterior elevation if it sat up higher.

Mr. Puljung answered right. He needed to make sure that he could get clearance between the top of the window and the cornice line. It had to work out proportionately as well.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if they were intending that the balustrades on the stairs and porches be wood, or wrought iron.

Mr. Puljung stated at this time they would be wood.

Mr. Deering asked if they would consider a hip-roof on the side veranda.

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Review Board does hereby approve the petition for Part I Height and Mass as submitted. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Albert Faragalli
H-06-3734-2
308 East Hall Street
Demolition/New Construction of a Carriage
House, Part I and Part II**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Albert Faragalli.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for demolition of a one-story accessory building and new construction, Part I and II, of a two-story wood frame carriage house at the rear of the property at 308 East Hall Street.

FINDINGS:

The historic residence at 308 East Hall Street was constructed in 1891, and is a rated structure within Savannah’s National Landmark Historic District. The property is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density).

Demolition:

The accessory building at the rear of the property at 308 East Hall Street is not listed as a rated structure within Savannah’s National Landmark Historic District. The simple one-story wood frame building is clad in wood lap siding, maintains a low-pitched shed roof, and appears to be constructed on a slab foundation. The structure lacks a fenestration pattern on the lane elevation, characteristic of a typical Savannah carriage houses. The building does not appear to be original to the main residence and does not appear on the 1916 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. The structure is depicted on the 1955 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (revised through 1973), and as such may be 50 years of age. However, the building does not appear to possess any known historical significance or distinguishable architectural characteristics that would make it worthy of preservation.

New Construction:

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
----------	----------	---------

Setbacks: New carriage houses may provide up to a 4' setback to allow a turning radius into the garage on a narrow lane. Carriage houses must be located to the rear of the property.	The carriage house is sited at the rear of the property and is 5' from the rear property line.	Staff recommends approval with the condition that the carriage house be setback no more than 4' from the lane to meet the standards.
Building Lot Coverage: RIP-A maximum 75%	The proposed coverage will be 72%.	The standard is met.
Street Elevation Type	Two-story wood frame carriage house with bonus room above. The form of	Staff recommends approval. This is a common building type in the historic district.
Building Height: Secondary structures which front a lane shall be no taller than two stores.	A two-story carriage house with an overall height is proposed 22'-8". Neighboring garages are one-story in height.	Staff recommends approval.
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade	The carriage house is 29' wide by 22'-8" tall broken up by window and door openings.	Staff recommends approval.
Proportion of Openings	A three bay rhythm with two garage door openings is proposed.	Staff recommends approval.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	The carriage house is setback 1'-4" from the west side lot line, creating open space between the neighboring accessory building (currently there is no open space). An 18' side yard is proposed to the east for additional parking off the lane with a new fence beyond. A side stair is located with the yard to provide access to the second floor. The projecting entrance beyond the stair is a form taken to echo the main residence	Staff recommends approval.

The following Part II Design Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Windows: Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian [and]...shall be constructed of wood or wood clad. Double glazed windows are permitted on...new construction provided that...the muntin be no	Weather-shield HR 175 windows are proposed with 7/8" muntins, true divided lights with insulated glass. Windows maintain a 3:5.5 ratio of width to height. Shutters are depicted on the drawings.	Staff recommends approval. These windows have been previously approved in the district and have proven to meet the standards. Verify shutter material. Shutters should be operable and sized to fit the window opening when closed.

<p>wider than 7/8"; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding. Windows shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio or not less than 5:3.</p>		
<p>Doors: Garage openings shall not exceed 12' in width.</p>	<p>9' wide by 7.5' tall garage door openings are proposed. Overhead garage doors are proposed that simulate carriage style doors.</p>	<p>Verify material and manufacturer.</p>
<p>Roof Shape: Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapet.</p>	<p>A hip roof surfaced in asphalt shingles is proposed to match the main residence.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p>HVAC and utilities:</p>	<p>HVAC units will be located within the interior of the lot. The carriage house will be metered off the main residence. Trash enclosures will be screened beneath the side stair.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Fences and Garden Walls: Walls and fences facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building.</p>	<p>A 4' tall wood fence and gate are proposed to the east of the carriage house, approximately 33' from the rear property line.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval with the condition that the fence be painted to match the building.</p>
<p>Materials</p>	<p>The building will be clad in wood lap siding to match the main residence with wood surrounds and corner boards on a slab foundation. Stair treads and risers with a 3' tall wood railing is proposed.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p>Color</p>	<p>The carriage house will be painted to match the main residence as follows: Body: Sherwin Williams Classical White (#2829) Trim: Sherwin Williams Alabaster (#7008) Windows: Sherwin Williams Rock Wood Dark Green (#2816)</p>	<p>Staff approval.</p>

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Faragalli stated he did not have any problems with complying, ;and would submit the garage doors to Staff for approval.

HDRB DECISION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the condition that the fence be painted to match the primary residence, and the garage door and shutter material be submitted to Staff for final approval. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Petition of Alan Silver
H-06-3735-2
14 Price Street
Rehabilitation/Addition

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Alan Silver.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of a 591-square-foot addition to the rear of 14 Price Street.

FINDINGS:

The total lot coverage after the addition will be 47 percent. The lot Coverage standard is met.

The overall height will be equal to the existing residence. The addition is located at the rear of the existing structure and is distinguishable by material from the main structure. Because of the configuration of 14 Price Street, which is sited so that its side elevation fronts the main street, the appearance of the addition from the street is that it is subordinate in mass to the main structure.

The intent of the addition is that it appears to be an infilled porch. The lower level of the north side is a columned breezeway. There is minimal loss of original fabric and this occurs on the rear side where it is not visible from a public right-of-way.

The siding is smooth face Hardi-Plank, painted white. The brick removed from the end wall will be reused in the piers.

The windows are 6/6 Norco simulated divided light, previously approved on the applicant's infill House at 518 East Bryan Street.

HDRB DECISION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products, Inc.
Jeff Bradtmiller
H-06-3715(S)-2
111 West Congress Street

Color/Awning

STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products, Inc.
Jeff Bradtmiller
H-06-3716(S)-2
105 Whitaker Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

3. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products, Inc.
Jeff Bradtmiller
H-06-3717(S)-2
111 West Congress Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

4. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products, Inc.
Jeff Bradtmiller
H-06-3718(S)-2
215 West River Street
Color/Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

5. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products, Inc.
Jeff Bradtmiller
H-06-3719(S)-2
3 West Jones Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products, Inc.
Jeff Bradtmiller
H-06-3720(S)-2
41 Drayton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

7. Lulu's Chocolate Bar, LLC
Janine Finn
42 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Color change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

8. Cowart Coleman Group
225 Abercorn Street
Window and Door Replacement
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

RE: MINUTES

Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – November 8, 2006

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Review Board does hereby approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Neely seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: OTHER BUSINESS

RE: NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT AND ELECTION

Mr. Steffen asked what was the report on the nominating committee.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that the existing officers would continue.

Mr. Steffen stated the Chair and the Vice-Chair would remain the same.

RE: WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

RE: INFORMATION ITEMS

2007 Historic Preservation Department Calendar

RE: ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp