

**HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW**

**REGULAR MEETING  
112 EAST STATE STREET**

**ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM**

**MARCH 8, 2006**

**2:00 P.M.**

**MINUTES**

**Members Present:**

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

**Members Absent:**

**Ned Gay (Excused)  
Gene Hutchinson (Excused)  
John Mitchell (Excused)**

**HDBR/MPC Staff Present:**

**Harmit Bedi, Deputy Executive Director  
Beth Reiter, Preservation Officer  
Sarah Ward, Preservation Specialist  
Janine Person, Administrative Assistant**

**RE: CALL TO ORDER**

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

**RE: ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Mrs. Reiter** introduced Janine Person as the new Historic District Board of Review Administrative Assistant. Mrs. Reiter also stated that Christy Adams would be doing the Board of Zoning Appeals. Mrs. Reiter then introduced Ms. Ellen Harris as the third member of the Metropolitan Planning Commission Historic Preservation Department who will be handling the County Preservation program.

**RE: SIGN POSTING**

**RE: CONSENT AGENDA**

**RE: Amended Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
HDBR 03-3027-2  
Bay & Abercorn Streets  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Jay Maupin for  
Sweet Pea Properties  
HDBR 06-3538-2  
509 ½ Blair Street  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder  
Gretchen Ogg  
HDBR 05-3539-2  
228 East Oglethorpe Avenue  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Sign Mart  
Bill Norton  
HDBR 06-3540-2  
250 C Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Sign Mart  
Bill Norton  
HDBR 06-3541-2  
254 C Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder  
Pete Callejas  
HDBR 06-3542-2  
15 Bull Street  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Joni Saxon-Guisti  
HDBR 06-3543-2  
6 East Liberty Street  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**HDBR ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Consent Agenda as submitted. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was passed. Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself from the petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay, HDBR 03-3027-2. Mr. Deering recused himself from the petition of Poticny Deering Felder, HDBR 05-3539-2 and HDBR 06-3542-2.**

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

RE: Amended Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
HDBR 05-3549-2/Ref. No. 01-2595-2  
Bay and Abercorn Streets  
Confirmation of previous approval  
There have been no changes.

Present for the petition was Patrick Shay.

Mrs. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:** The applicant is requesting an extension of a previous approval to build an 8-story hotel at the Southwest corner of Bay and Abercorn Streets. The extension time has expired, however, there are no changes in the context of the hotel. The applicant is deleting the PTAC systems under the windows and replacing with brick or cast stone panels depending on location. The windows are to be “Peerless” previously approved for the Hampton Inn and Suites at Oglethorpe and Martin Luther King Jr., Boulevard.

**FINDINGS:** February 13, 2002, the applicant received a conditional approval from the Historic District Board of Review.

March 13, 2002, the additional material requested to be submitted was approved.

April 9, 2003, a one-year extension was approved.

The Board of Appeals had previously granted a two-story variance for eight stories at this location. This was reaffirmed by the BOA on January 24, 2006.

**HDBR ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

RE: Amended Petition of Daniel Snyder  
HDBR 04-3294-2  
320 East Jones Street  
Alterations

Present for the petition was Dan Snyder

Mrs. Reiter gave the Staff report.

The applicant is requesting to amend a previously approved petition as follows:

1. Revise metal panels of the West elevation to be flush wood siding.
2. Revise Portland Cement Stucco to be Sto-Powerwall system. This will delete a number of control joints and is not an EIFS system.
3. Revise punched, opening windows from paired, stacked, awning windows to double-hung windows.
4. Revise window casings to be painted wood.

5. Revise masonry wall recess of the north elevation to be painted flush wood gate. Revise north half of the west wall to be painted flush wood.
6. Delete crawl space vents.
7. Add vents in pool equipment storage building.

**FINDINGS:** Refer to applicant's submittal for applicable standards. Proposed amendments comply with the standards.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Snyder** stated that the fence is a flush 5 ¼-inch board, tongue and groove fence. He said there was an error in the drawing and there is more fence than he planned in the elevation.

The flush wood siding was approved in the last presentation.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Deering** asked about the crawl space remaining in the east elevation.

**Mr. Snyder** stated that the crawl space was there before and is not functioning.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as amended. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

**RE: Amended Petition of Rudd Long  
HDBR 05-3348-2  
517 East Congress Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Rudd Long

Mrs. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:** The petitioner is requesting approval to amend the previous application for rehabilitation/additions to construct an 8-foot by 5-foot second floor addition on the rear of the building at 517 East Congress Street. The addition will be surfaced in smooth finish fiber cement board lap siding to match the previous approval. The petitioner is also proposing to install two, 2 feet by 4 feet glass block panels in an area not visible from the public right-of-way.

**FINDINGS:** The building is not historic and the addition will be minimally visible from Congress Lane.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

**RE: Amended Petition of Hansen Architects  
Erik E. Puljung  
HDBR 05-3402-2  
201 East York Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Patrick Phelps

Mrs. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:** The petitioner is requesting approval to amend a previously approved petition for renovations to 201 East York Street as follows:

1. Delete porch stairs on Abercorn Street side. Install 6/6 wood TDL single-glazed on either side of a central wood multi-paned TDL door on ground and parlor floor levels.
2. At third floor, extend rear addition to just shy of carriage house and recessed four feet to provide for uncovered porch. Previously approved railing to remain. A sand-finished stucco color to match existing brick is proposed.
3. At top floor, enclose two deck areas. The walls will be a sand-finish stucco, color to match existing brick.
4. There will be no changes to existing elevation on Abercorn Street side of carriage house. Two new windows will be introduced on the lane.

**FINDINGS:** The changes do not appear to have an adverse effect on the overall renovation.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

**RE: Amended Petition of L & W Development  
Company, LLC  
Walter Evans  
HDBR 05-3486-2  
462 – 470 Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Walter Evans and Haroun Hodayun.

Mrs. Reiter gave the Staff report with recommendations.

**NATURE OF AMENDED REQUEST:** The applicant is requesting to amend a previously approved petition to add four individual balconies at the middle two units facing Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard. The use of the space on the second floor has changed from office to residential. The proposed balconies will have a different expression from the balconies above to preserve the separation of the building base visually from the upper floors. The balconies vary in width and depth and are less deep than the previously approved balconies for the upper levels.

**FINDINGS:** The metal canopy and screen railing panels are similar to those previously approved for the upper balconies.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval

**HDBR ACTION:** Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

**RE: Continued Petition of Diversified Designs, P.C.  
Sean Roach  
HDBR 05-3490-2  
111 West Congress Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Jeff Kramer

Mrs. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:** The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations to the existing building at 111 West Congress Street. Alterations consist of new storefronts, a side stairway, a patio area and gate, and a sign and awnings on the existing building and existing concrete block addition.

**FINDINGS:** The commercial building at 111 West Congress Street is not a rated building within Savannah’s Historic District. The property is zoned B-C-1, Central Business, and although it was originally constructed ca. 1900, non-historic alterations and a fire have resulted in a loss of historic integrity. A one-story concrete block addition exists on the west side and is setback 34 feet 8-inches from Congress Street.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p><b>Storefront:</b> Glazing shall be not less than 55% and shall be transparent, extending from the sill or from an 18-24” base of contrasting material to the lintel. Storefront glazing in subdivided sashes shall be inset a minimum of 4” from the face of the building; however, continuously glazed storefronts may be flush with the face of the building. Entrances shall be recessed and centered within the storefront.</p>	<p>The storefront windows cover over 55% of the bottom floor and extending from a brick sill approximately 1’-8” from grade. The glazing is setback 3” from the face of the building but is continuously glazed due to the narrow size of the façade. The entrance is recessed and centered within the facade.</p> <p>The storefront windows on the existing concrete block addition cover over 55% of the façade, and are recessed 4.5” from the face of the facade over a brick sill and 1’-8” brick base.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>

<p>Storefronts shall be constructed of wood, cast iron, Carrera glass, aluminum, steel or copper as part of a glazed storefront system.</p>	<p>A steel framing system is proposed for the storefront to match the color of the existing windows.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p><b>Standard</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed</b></p>	<p><b>Comment</b></p>
<p><b>Utilities and refuse</b> Sec. 8-3030 (l)(15): HVAC units shall be screened from the public right-of-way.</p>	<p>The proposed condenser unit is located on the roof at the rear of the already existing structure and will not be visible from the public right-of-way</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p><b>Awnings</b> Sec. 8-3121 (B)(11)(a): within nonresidential zoning districts, in addition to the permitted principal use sign, one awning principal use sign shall be permitted for each entrance. Such sign shall not exceed a size of more than 1 SF of sign face per linear foot of awning. Individual letters or symbols not to exceed 6" shall be exempt from this provision.</p>	<p>The proposed awnings are located on both the primary building and the existing addition. They have an 8' clearance, extend 4' from the building face, and are 3.25' in height. The awning on the primary building is 16'-6" wide, canvas and is Sunbrella Forest Green or Logo Red. The awning on the existing addition is 13.75' wide, canvas and is Sunbrella Forest Green or Logo Red. Lettering on both awnings will be 6" in height located on the valance.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval upon verification of awning colors.</p>
<p><b>Sign</b> Sec. 8-3121 (B)(11): for each nonresidential use, one principal use sign shall be permitted. Such sign shall not exceed more than 1 SF of sign area per linear foot of frontage along street.</p>	<p>A 6 SF projecting sign is proposed on the primary façade, which has 20 linear feet along Congress Street. While the proposed sign is within the size limitations, currently, there is no tenant for this space and the materials and design of the sign have not been submitted.</p>	<p>Staff recommends resubmittal of the sign when design and materials has been determined.</p>
<p><b>Side Stair:</b></p>	<p>The proposed exterior stair and platform is located on the west elevation of the 2-story building. It begins almost at the street and extends above the one-story concrete block building at the rear.</p>	<p>Staff recommends elimination of this element. It spans almost the entire depth of the building disrupting the window and door alignment along the west elevation and creating a fire escape appearance along a main through street. A new entrance is indicated on the plans however no materials, colors, or design were submitted.</p>

<p><b>Patio:</b></p>	<p>An open basement level access is located below grade in front of the existing concrete block addition. The applicant wishes to cover the opening, which currently features some mature trees and a steel grate, with Trex (a synthetic flooring material) to create a patio/eating area for a potential restaurant.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval with the condition that the Trex material have a smooth finish and that the trees be preserved insitu.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Standard</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Comment</b></p>
<p><b>Gate/Fence:</b></p>	<p>An existing iron gate is located in front of the concrete block addition and a central gate is proposed to allow access onto the patio area. The simplified design matches the existing gate in design and materials.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval upon clarification of the awning colors and with the condition that:

1. A smooth finish Trex material be used for the patio flooring;
2. The trees be preserved insitu;
3. The projecting sign be resubmitted when a design and materials have been chosen;
4. Elimination of the side stair and entrance element.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** asked if there were any pictures of the previous building.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that it was not a historic building.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** agreed with staff regarding the elimination of the stairwell. He understood that they made the stairwell, extended it, and dropped it to add a landing to retain the arched windows on the ground level and felt it was an overpowering element on that side of the building.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Kramer** agreed with all of the staff recommendations. He said they have taken the stairs off the side per the recommendations, and put them inside the building.

**HDBR ACTION:** **Mr. Meyerhoff** made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as amended with the drawing of the interior stairwell as presented. **Ms. Fortson-Waring** seconded the motion with the conditions that the new drawings be submitted to the staff and it was passed unanimously.



**RE: Continued Petition of Ronald Erickson  
HDBR 05-3515-2  
314, 316 & 318 West Taylor Street  
New Construction – Part II**

Present for the petition was Ronald Erickson

Mrs. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:** The applicant is requesting Part II Design Detail approval for three townhouses located at 314, 316, and 318 West Taylor Street.

**FINDINGS:**

1. Part I Height and Mass were approved January 11, 2006.
2. Refer to applicant's written submittal and drawings for complete discussion of materials and Standards. The applicant revised the window lintel and sill material to be cast stone rather than stucco per previous discussion. The height of the wall remains at eight feet due to noise and security concerns. Both eight feet and nine feet have been previously approved on nearby Montgomery Street properties.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Deering** stated that the drawing was in brick, but the site plan indicates stucco and asked if that was an error on the site plan.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Erickson** stated that it was an error because it was stucco when he first planned it but then changed it to all brick.

**HDBR ACTION:** **Mr. Neely** made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition. **Ms. Seiler** seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

**RE: Continued Petition of R. K. Construction  
Development  
HDBR 06-3522-2  
318 West Broughton Street  
Sign**

Present for the petition was Ramsey Khalidi

Mrs. Ward gave the Staff report including recommendations.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:** The petitioner is requesting approval to install an illuminated projecting blade sign on the building at 318 West Broughton Street. The sign is for the retailer, American Apparel, who currently occupies the building.

1. **Size:** The sign is 13 feet tall and 1-foot-8 inches wide. It is 21.7 square feet and is 8 inches deep.

2. **Illumination:** The proposed sign will feature laser cut letters with backlit acrylic infill.
3. **Materials:** Folded aluminum sign with a baked on enamel finish.
4. **Colors:** Background – Benjamin Moore AC-26 “Ozark Shadows” Letters – backlit reversible black/white acrylic infill

**FINDINGS:** The building was constructed in 1891 and is a rated structure within Savannah’s Landmark Historic District. The property is zoned B-C-1, Central-business, and consists of two commercial storefronts within one large masonry structure. Sears Roebuck & Company maintained a projecting blade sign in the approximate location of the proposed sign in 1931. Neighboring buildings also featured projecting blade signs at this time and Broughton Street currently features a number of illuminated signs, serving as one of Savannah’s most commercial boulevards.

The following Broughton Street Sign District standards (Section 8-3119) apply:

1. **Principal Use Signs** (Sec. 8-3119 (2)(c)) One principal use sign shall be permitted for each business establishment. One such sign may be erected as a projecting sign. The copy area shall not exceed 40 percent of the display area of a principal use sign.

The standard is met. A projecting blade sign principal use sign is proposed to be located above the commercial storefront at the second and third stories. The text on the sign comprises 29 percent of the overall sign.

2. **Size, Height and Location** (Sec. 8-3119 (2)(c)) of projecting signs, for all principal uses occupying 125 or less linear feet of street frontage, “projecting” signs shall be permitted one-square-foot of display area per sign face per linear foot-of-frontage occupied by each principal use; provided, that a maximum sign area of 45 square feet shall be permitted per sign face for each projecting principal use sign allowed. The outer edge shall not extend more than 6 inches from the building to which it is attached. The height shall not extend above the parapet wall of the building, and the lowest point of the projecting sign shall not be less than 10 feet above the established grade.

The standard is met. The occupant of 318 West Broughton maintains approximately 32 linear feet of frontage for the American Apparel retail establishment. The sign face is 21.7 square feet. The outer edge projects 2 feet-4 inches from the face of the building and is 18 feet above the sidewalk. The sign is located below the parapet. There is a narrow space between window details, with which to locate the sign and staff would like to stress caution with the applicant not to cause harm to historic fabric on the exterior of the structure.

3. **Restricted Signs** (Sec. 8-3119 (2)(g)) signs placed upon a structure in any manner so as to disfigure or conceal any window opening, door or significant architectural feature or detail of any building.

There is a narrow space between window details, with which to locate the sign and it does not appear accurate in the elevations. Staff requests that the application proceed with caution and not cause damage to the brick window hoods.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he drove by this project on Broughton Street and noticed that this sign would be the only vertical sign on Broughton Street other than the Savannah College of Arts and Design (SCAD) Theatre. He stated he did not know if they were setting a precedent whether they wanted to live with it or not, and that it would be the only vertical sign with the letters being horizontal.

**Mr. Neely** stated that there were many historical signs and Mr. Meyerhoff added that there were but there are not any now.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Joe Sasseen** stated that he thinks the sign on Broughton Street would give it something new.

**HDBR ACTION:** Ms. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

**RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
HDBR 06-3523-2  
320 Montgomery Street  
New Construction**

Present for the petition was Patrick Shay

Mrs. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:** The applicant is requesting approval to demolish an existing non-historic concrete block building and approval of Part I Height and Mass for a proposed hotel located at 320 Montgomery Street within a four-story height zone in the Savannah National Historic Landmark District.

**FINDINGS:**

The five-story portion of the building has been reduced to four stories. This section is now 61 feet tall to the peak of the roof. The rest of the mass is approximately 53 feet tall with the exception of the Northeast and Southeast corners that are at 43 feet.

The height steps down 10 feet on Harris Street creating a 10-foot by 30-foot terrace at the fourth level adjacent to the two-story townhouse structure next door.

On Charlton Street, a similar terrace was created next to two new townhouses.

Storefront windows have been utilized on the Montgomery and Harris Streets elevations.

The entry has been recessed between bays topped with a pedimented parapet.

The applicant notes that the bay spacing is driven by the width of the hotel rooms, approximately 13 feet wide.

The parking garage entry is located on Harris Street and is 24 feet wide.

The dumpster is located on the Charlton Street side.

**COMMENTS:** The site is a challenging transitional site located between historic and modern residential and large-scale commercial uses. It is a site located in a ward that never had a square and lanes; and, hence the discipline of the Oglethorpe ward plan with its public and private faces. This site is all public face. Historically, the block was comprised of six lots, which were subsequently subdivided into a finer grained building pattern of many lots with structures facing all four street frontages. This fine-grained building pattern helped integrate the block into the overall building pattern of the historic district.

The Chadbourne Guidelines state that, “Today’s office buildings, hotels, retail centers and apartments seek larger footprints. The consequence is that assemblage, not subdivision is the rule and a spate of buildings has been built that ignores the 60-foot-module and are changing the scale of the city. At issue is not whether assemblage is allowed, but whether buildings can be made that are good neighbors – that conform to the scale of their predecessors. The guidelines seek to restore traditional massing to large scale developments...”

Therefore, in light of the Chadbourne guidelines, it should not be the width of a hotel room that drives the massing of the building, but rather how can that massing reflect the traditional subdivision of the Oglethorpe plan. Both the Montgomery Street and Harris Street elevations have a number of recesses and projections that follow the hotel room divisions rather than dimensions reflective of historic development patterns. In this case, it may be well to study eliminating the southern recess on the Montgomery Street elevation and the center recess on the Harris Street elevation to “calm” the exterior of the building and let the window openings make the rhythms. More windows might be introduced into the corner element on the Montgomery Street elevation to further define a rhythm of solids to voids.

The corner element of three masonry stories resting on a post with a recessed corner is incongruous and out of balance at this location. There is no corner entrance at this location.

On the Harris Street elevation the 24 feet wide garage opening creates a huge void which dwarfs the adjacent historic property, and establishes a major utilitarian feature within the meddle of the block.

The dumpster is located within a gated trash enclosure on the Charlton Street elevation across from the new row of condominiums. This is a problem of a site with three “public” faces. It would seem a better solution to place this on the non-public side. The question also arises regarding where the utilities will be placed.

Finally, regarding voids and the three “storefront” windows on the southern portion of the Montgomery Street elevation. These windows are a part of the mezzanine rooms here – what will be the appearance from the exterior of these windows and are PTAC systems installed at ground level? Perhaps spaces could be switched internally that would create more public uses for this corner, moving the three rooms elsewhere eliminating the mezzanine incorporating these windows.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends conditional approval of Height and Mass. It is a difficult site with many challenges. The revised plan has many positive changes that help the building transition to the surrounding residential buildings. Staff recommends that additional consideration be given to staff comments in preparing the Part II design submittal. Approval to demolish the existing structure.

**DISCUSSION:**

**Dr. Caplan** asked about the Montgomery Street elevation concerning doing away with the recess on the south end of the building.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that she suggested it be brought forward.

**Dr. Caplan** inquired about the balcony.

**Mrs. Reiter** answered that they would go away, that it was a possibility that it would encroach, and that it was important that the recess would not repeat on such a short rhythm.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that he was having trouble visualizing the symmetry.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that she suggested that the north end have additional windows.

**Dr. Caplan** asked about the width, mentioned the flat portion of building being considerably longer on the south end in comparison with the north end even with windows.

**PETITIONER:**

**Mr. Shay** introduced himself and his associate, Mr. Saad Al-Jassar, and stated that his clients were also in attendance. They have considered the recommendations of the Staff, and are generally very receptive to them. He stated that Mrs. Reiter has been nice enough to try to show the Board what some of the things might mean and he turned the discussion over to Mr. Al-Jassar for presentation.

**Mr. Jassar** restated that they had considered the comments of the staff and had invited the neighbors to address their comments and concerns. On the floor plan, they have leveled one portion of the building and moved the dumpster from Charlton Street to Harris Street. On the second floor of the mezzanine, the windows have been closed that are facing the residents in the back, and they have setback of about four feet with the landscaping. He added that the windows of the rooms have been opened on front of the mezzanine. The concern from the neighbors was the two terraces that would remain as a group and not as a terrace. In addition, the first level had added windows. Mr. Jassar agreed with Staff that the opening of the parking was big and would try to reduce it by adding a couple of arches instead of one arch.

**Mr. Deering** thanked the petitioners for reducing the scale, listening to the neighbors, and for the changes that were made to the building. He asked if they could put a pier in between the in and out lane of the garage entrance so that it will not appear too small.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if the movement of the trash dumpster to Harris Street was adjacent to the house next door and the relation of the dumpster to the house.

**Mr. Shay** stated that the dumpster would be hidden behind the screen where there is a recess in the building along with a considerable setback from the front façade of the building. He stated that he contacted all of the general managers of the hotels in the Historic District to ask them how they were managing their waste and found that every hotel had a different strategy. The concern of some of the neighbors was that the garbage trucks would be coming at 4:30 a.m. to empty the garbage. All of the managers insisted that the waste removal companies come at hours other than early hours so as not to disturb the hotel guests because this was a great concern. Most of the hotels in the area transport their garbage daily from the site by attendants and remove them to containers that are located away from the hotel.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if they did not ask for the dumpster to be placed on Charlton Street, then where did he recommend the dumpster be placed.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that the only non-public side is between the east, ten or fifteen feet.

**Dr. Caplan** stated he was concerned for the residents regarding the large parking garage entrance imposing upon them. He commended them for reducing the height so that it blends more with the structures adjacent to it. He stated that the residents are concerned about noise and other things, and that he wasn't necessarily concerned about the noise next to the hotel, but concerned about the residents next door and the effects of the dumpster in that particular location. He hoped that they would have a better solution.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he worked on that problem, that he had learned more about it, and that he intended on finding out more about it before he presented anything in design details.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if the tower feature was a part of the Height and Mass. She stated that the Chairman asked the Board to take a poll about the tower element, and only one person stated that they did not like it, and she wanted to know why they removed that element.

**Mr. Shay** responded that they have a certain program started that they looked at it and studied whether they could do the round element. He found that it lost most of its impact when it was shorter. They also lost hotel rooms and the room count by not being able to do the five-story form. They had to squeeze every possible hotel room in by going back to the rectangular tower. They could only get three rooms in the corner on four floors rather than two and it made a difference.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that one of the elements that she liked in the previous design was the Old Desoto charm. She felt that the element was refreshing and different and gave something that would distinguish it from another hotel.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he appreciated Ms. Seiler's comments toward his client, that the client liked the round element on the corner, and that he would encourage them to look at whether or not they can figure a way to add it.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Joe Saseen** felt that the first design was a much better design and if you take the building and staff suggestion to remove the indentations and make the building flush, the building across the street will look just like it. He added that there will be a mass of brick and windows without any design. The first view of Savannah will be that building and he felt that the people would not know the difference between the hotels and that they needed something different than another four-story building with a lot of windows.

**Mr. Owen Schuller** knew that it was a Height and Mass hearing, but stated he wanted to address some other important issues because his home would be devalued if this were approved. Mr. Schuller asked to approach the model to point out some things.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that it was a Height and Mass hearing and if there were specific objections to design details that it should be held until the next hearing. If there are items regarding the design that would affect the approval of Height and Mass it will be allowed.

**Mr. Schuller** asked if the four- or five-story height had anything to do with the elevation.

**Mr. Deering** referred to the Historic ordinance in defining the height regarding towers, parapet walls, gables, and elevator penthouses that can be above the five-story height.

**Mr. Schuller** stated that in previous discussions regarding the property that the building would be dropped down a couple of stories due to privacy issues. He stated that he had hoped that the drop would be expanded to consider the residents concerns.

**Mr. Clint Land** stated that he was the first resident at The Gardens on Jones and prior to February 1, for the last five years, was involved in the property management of development. Mr. Land stated that he has relinquished his property management duties. His primary residence would be approximately 30 feet from the dumpster location. He pointed out that he has relinquished his representation of 36 condominium owners and is speaking as an independent. He is vehemently opposed to the hotel, and is concerned that his front door is 30 feet from egress. He asked the Board to take his constructive comments to heart and look at the situation. He mentioned that some residents are part-time owners and that out of 36 residents, 12 units were owned by people out-of-state, and now the population consists of mostly full-time SCAD students whose parents own the units. The goal of the area is to become full-time and that the condominiums across the street were purchased as investments for people. Mr. Land stated that he bought it as an investment and turned it into his primary residence. He was pleased that the trash receptacle had been moved to the other side of the street and away from his door. The noise issue is a concern regarding the hotel, which he recognized had nothing to do with Height and Mass, but it was a major issue now, and he could not imagine what it would be like down the road.

**Mr. Steffen** took a moment to explain the Board's role. Because the height guidelines for this property are four and five stories, whether they like it or not it lends itself to development of structures of that height that tend to be hotels and commercial rather than residential. The role of the Board is to make sure that the building complies with the Historic guidelines. As to issues like the step-downs and other existing units, these items are within the Boards purview. Questions about hotels or another entity, parking, noise, ingress into the buildings are not in the Boards purview and they cannot make those decisions. The Board can be compassionate to residents when neighborhood changes by virtue of development, but their role is to ensure that what is developed complies with the Historic guidelines. Mr. Steffen acknowledged the fact that the petitioners have met the requests but that the items discussed are not within the Board's purview and they cannot decide what type of business goes in on the property.

\*Mr. Hutchinson arrived at approximately 3:05 p.m.

**Mr. Francis Hayes** commented as to its appropriateness of the tower in the context of Height and Mass. He felt that it was quite appropriate in the context of historic events that took place at the site along with the replication of the Desoto Belvedere. Mr. Hayes made reference to there not being any negative comments from the public about the tower and was surprised to see it eliminated. Regarding the Belvedere round tower, he felt there were economic factors and the difficulty of designing a round room, but city entrances are very important with respect to Height and Mass. The original boutique design of the hotel was Richardson 19<sup>th</sup> Century style and picked up the predominant influences in the neighborhood. He commented about the separation of the neighborhoods that are commercial on one side of Montgomery and residential on the other. He stated that the design might have been a little bit more expensive to build than the existing planned hotel, but that it was tasteful but not perfect. He differs that Montgomery Street is not a boulevard. In his opinion, history showed that Montgomery Street was in fact a major thoroughfare, an avenue, a boulevard that was lined with palm trees. A few of these palms remain clustered near The Gardens on Jones. The designs as they have evolved have gone from boutique to pedestrian. What was classy about the previous design has been eliminated. He objected to the Liberty parking garage as a design influence for Height

and Mass. He said it took 50 years to get rid of the first garage (Ellis Square) that everyone admitted was a mistake. Hopefully, there will be a redesign of this garage (Liberty Street) sooner than 50 years. The public perception of the garage was that the people were in favor of it, and the people were not in favor of it.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that they were not reviewing the garage at this moment.

**Mr. Hayes** stated that they were and referred to comments and references made in the record from the last meeting that Mr. Steffen suggested to Mr. Shay that his Height and Mass consideration should be governed by the abutting building and that it should reflect, and that it was recorded. He stated there should not be a rectangle, this is a perfect place to have the tower, and the earlier design had some positive features. After a private showing to the neighbors, the architect changed things dramatically. He felt that a fifth story should be put on so that the small number of rooms can grade down better than the current design shows. In reference to the trash area, the change was a positive response because it was not enclosed in the first instance, and the glazing provided on Charlton Street was not in the first presentation. The owners and architects have been willing to respond to neighborhood concerns, and now they are responding to what is perceived as the Board's concerns. The people that live there have to live with the mistakes and what is going to be the future. They don't need to reinforce the Height and Mass of the large building. This hotel is in the neighborhood setting. The other thing that was positive that we don't see reflected is the way that the top of the tower was circular and enclosed all of the mechanical systems. It was more of a Belvedere than this particular design.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that Mr. Hayes made some very important points about the history of the area, but now we are getting into things that were repetitive and off-point.

**Mr. Hayes** stated that he had one last comment. He respectfully disagreed with Ms. Seiler about economics not being a factor in Height and Mass. That may be a personal opinion, but on the other hand, the City, the State, and the development entities that promote Savannah, promote the economic elements. The development in the Historic District are providing taxes to the overall benefit of taxpayers and they are a factor in to what you charge for a piece of land and being able to get economic value from it. He stated that there is a relationship in that and that he may not agree with it, but it is a factor when somebody makes that kind of an argument.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Board is governed by Historic guidelines. The economic impact is for another day and another place.

**Mr. Paul Morgenthal** stated that his house was listed on Page 111 of the survey book and that according to the City Ordinance that makes the property a historic property. Mr. Morgenthal gave reference to Section 8-3030 stating that items under this section are classified as historic. He stated that he had heard nothing about the previous meeting last month, or a year ago when Mr. Thoman attempted to build a hotel here. He said one of the provisions in the Board Rules states that great weight should be accorded to the protection and preservation of historic structures whenever the Board is considering any plans for new construction. Here we have a plan where economic necessity rather than consideration for the Currietown Ward is pervasive. You can't have a hotel unless you have a lot of rooms so a month ago the petitioner presented a plan for 75 feet, taller than the monstrosity across the way from 311 West Harris Street and also the historic structure next to it at 309 which he and his wife owns. He felt that the Board needed to consider the Currietown Ward not looking north or south. He feels that there is no building in that ward that exceeds 30 feet in height. In previous meetings when Mr. Thoman presented a plan for a hotel, there was discussion about stepping down the height of the building away from 311 West Harris Street. So we have an attempt to do just that, a little terrace. There has been no forthright consideration by the owner or his architect to give any true weight in consideration



to the historic building that will be directly impacted by the construction of this additional monstrosity. The design calls for there to be no setback between the eastern border at 306 West Harris Street. All they have heard about is 320 Montgomery Street. There is no provision for any setback right next to 311 West Harris Street. There is proposed to be an opening for a subterranean parking garage, an archway is being considered, but there is nothing visually that it relates to. That's done because of the attention to it's all about economics here. Let's not be fooled, there is little consideration for aesthetics. There are several historic structures in that very ward. They are all listed in the book and you've got the book, and I will remind you that my constructions are on Page 111. It's proposed that this building is going to be constructed of stone, brick, and modern concrete; has little visual compatibility. Amongst all in the room, he felt that he was going to be the most affected should this plan go forward, and he learned today that he will get to have a garbage dump located next to his property. While they all hear it as being West Harris Street because of the monstrosity built to the north of my location, which is the Liberty Street parking garage, let's measure what that street has become. It's a lane, and yet we've got buses going in there now because of the parking garage and now we're going to have garbage trucks. That I call as being in total disregard of the primary role of this Board to protect and preserve historic structures. On the eastern face of this structure as you go along the boundary line of this proposed site there will be a pool and there is no setback between this proposed site. He agreed that the law doesn't require a setback just like the law says that there can be four stories. Although, the law only says a story is defined as a minimum of ten feet so we really don't know what the height of a story is in this town. This Board has an opportunity today to make it clear once and for all that it is interested by its actions in preserving and protecting historic sites. Along that eastern wall there is a 12-foot or 13-foot gap. He felt that he could plan on invasions from the criminal element, and the guests and patrons of the hotel coming onto his property at all times of the day and night.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Mr. Morganthal to direct his comments to Height and Mass and stated that he allowed quite a bit of latitude in making personal comments and they were not appreciated. He stated that he would not allow it from others present because they are there to deal with serious issues from serious people of good character, and he reiterated that comments be made toward Height and Mass.

**Mr. Morganthal** stated that his comments were stated directly toward Height and Mass because they don't have to do with economic gain. In earlier meetings there were discussions about setbacks he and wanted to know why a third of the building was not setback starting from the east going west toward Montgomery Street. He wanted to know why wasn't the third of the structure stepped down two stories next to the historic structure on west Harris Street coming up a third to a third story and then to a fourth closest to Montgomery Street. That is not being considered, yet this is what was a concern of this Board in previous meetings and from previous petitioners. He stated that the width of the proposed hotel to its height and its front façade on west Harris was no matter in compliance with the rules of the Board because it is not visually compatible to the contributing buildings along that street, i.e., 309 and 311 West Harris Street with the proposed hotel. What was intended to do was to use architectural features that were in no way related visually to what can be seen if you were to walk or drive along that pathway. There is nothing about the openness of the windows of this proposed hotel on west Harris besides what relates to the historic structures in the Currietown Ward. The type of windows being used were not reflected by any other structure in that ward. No attempts had been made regarding a meaningful transition between the historic structures in Currietown Ward with the proposed hotel. He stated that he would recommend that the Board consider continuing this matter for another design proposal and to consider its role in preserving historic structures that exist.

**Mr. Steffen** thanked Mr. Morganthal and reminded everyone that they were dealing with Height and Mass and the proposed demolition of what is on the site right now. He stated that there would be another time to deal with specific design elements.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if it was within the purview of the chairperson to instruct speakers to limit their time.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he was going to exercise his prerogative by allowing people to speak until they become repetitive. He stated that he was not going to limit speakers at this time because all of these things were important.

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** commended the design team for lowering the height of the building and he felt it important to get more development and more need for square footage on lots in the Landmark District and that it was appreciated the movement downward and closer to the integrity of Height and Mass. He would like the design team to consider one other item that affects Height and Mass regarding the first floor of the building being 18 feet high. He felt that this was extremely high compared to other first floor levels and it did affect Height and Mass. He felt that the first floor could be substantially lowered and it would help the compatibility with the structure on Harris and Charlton Streets.

**Mr. Mark Marshalok** stated that he felt that the current design was a step backwards. He felt that the first design had significant and better elements than now. He felt that it still did not address the earlier suggestions that the Board had made and that there was a need for appropriate Height and Mass transitions to the neighborhood structures.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Neely** stated that his biggest concern was the transition to the historic structures on Charlton and Harris Streets. He could see how it related the Height and Mass north and south to the taller structures. But If you go east on Charlton and Harris that was the biggest concern to him.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that there have been some very serious acknowledgements from the designers in listening to their comments and the design elements. He felt if Height and Mass were approved, the design elements would address and answer a lot of the questions. He felt that there would be ample opportunity when dealing with the design part to revisit some of the issues that Mrs. Reiter raised, some of the issues that the members of the community raised, and some of the things that Mr. Shay had been taking notes on. Mr. Steffen personally felt comfortable that the Staff's recommendations could be followed to grant this approval and let the design elements be addressed in detail as it progressed forward. He then asked Mr. Shay if the suggestions that he made corresponded with Mr. Shay's thinking on the project.

**Mr. Shay** stated that what he is hearing is that four stories is the limit but they also want for somehow to be consolatory toward the neighbors and they will try. It is not design by committee but design by consensus and so we try to meet everyone's expectations or at least try. By the end of the day they hope to present a piece of architecture that they are willing to hold up to the community and have their reputation judged for another 50 years. They welcome opportunities for approval of Height and Mass and take into consideration comments from Staff, the Board, and the neighbors and come back with something that is still a piece of architecture.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the two motions be separated because the demolition will be in an advisory capacity. Any time that they do a demolition that it should be a separate motion from the Height and Mass.

**Mrs. Reiter**, Ms. Fortson-Waring, and Mr. Deering stated that it is not a historic building.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that it is his recommendation that the demolition be a separate motion because demolitions are handled different.

**Mr. Fortson-Waring** made a comment on Page 8 of the ordinance regarding the compatibility factor that they should be mindful where it stated that greater weight should be given to the adjacent historic structures and then it talks about height and height shall be within the height limits. She stated that its almost contradictory because under the revised ordinance, the applicant's are permitted to build to the height that they are allowed within the Height map. However, for us to determine visual compatibility we must also give greater weight to the adjacent historic structure. We should really consider the comments from the neighbor and impress that upon the applicant.

**Mr. Neely** stated that if they approve the mass that they are approving the box.

**Mr. Deering** stated that they would be stuck with what they approve.

**Mr. Neely** stated that there would be significant concessions for stepping down, it works for what we approve. If they approve the Height and Mass that the petitioner will work with the box, and he may come back with something but perhaps he will not. In his view it is more of a concession or a transition.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** wondered whether or not they had tried to get a variance for the height and it was rejected. The Board can recommend one but that doesn't stop the petitioner from appealing and asked the petitioner if they decided not to appeal.

**Mr. Shay** stated that his understanding was when they come to the Board that they do not ask for a variance. They ask for a view on compatibility and it was very clear from the last meeting that it was felt that any type of height variance in this area was a threat and would be incompatible. Rather than go to the Zoning Board of Appeals and ask for something they knew was against their wishes, they worked within their wishes and will continue to try to do that. To address Mr. Neely's comment he stated that he could not sit in the meeting and say exactly what they are going to do, he did not know. They will not be coming back and saying at the next meeting that the Height and Mass was approved and you are stuck with it. Obviously, everything that they have done and presented they have tried to make it a reasonable negotiation. They can't do everything that everyone wants because there is not a consensus on what everyone wants. On those elements where there is a consensus they try hard to do this.

**Mr. Neely** recommended that there be a continuance because he would vote against the project due to the concern of Height and Mass and that he wanted to see more creative design in regard to Height and Mass.

**Dr. Caplan** agreed and requested a continuance instead of an approval of Height and Mass so that there would be no misunderstanding on what had been approved.

**Mr. Steffen** asked what the Board's feeling was on hearing both Height and Mass and design at the next meeting.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated that it is what would have to be to continue the item but that she felt comfortable approving the Height and Mass.

**Mr. Neely** asked if the petitioner wanted a continuance.

Mr. Shay was not sure because he did not know what the vote would be.

**HDBR ACTION:** Ms. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve Part I Height and Mass with consideration of comments recommended by Staff for the Part II petition. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion. Ms. Seiler, Dr. Johnson, Mr. Hutchinson, and Ms. Fortson-Waring voted for approval. Dr. Caplan, Mr. Deering, and Mr. Neely voted against approval. Mr. Meyerhoff recused.

**RE: Continued Petition of Josh McIntosh  
HDBR 06-3526-2  
519 – 521 East Gordon Street  
New Construction**

Present for the petition was Josh McIntosh and Christopher Dean, Architect.

Mrs. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:** The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part I and Part II, of a single-family residence and garage at 519-521 East Gordon Street. The two- and one-half story building will straddle the property lines and a minor recombination subdivision application should be filed and recorded prior to the release of a building permit. Currently, the lots are vacant.

**FINDINGS:** The property(s) is zoned RIP-A, Residential, Medium Density, and is located within Savannah’s Historic District in the Beach Institute Neighborhood. This area consists of modest sized 19<sup>th</sup> century wood frame structures. Historically, the property was referred to as 519-523 East Gordon Street and contained a two-story row house with three units (an additional unit existed on the vacant lot to the east at 525 East Gordon Street). The following standards from the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the Historic District (Section 8-3030) apply:

**Part I – Height and Mass**

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<b>Building Coverage:</b> RIP-A districts maintain a maximum building coverage of 75%.	Combined, the property is 5,100 SF. The proposed residence and garage are 2172 and 572 SF with 54% lot coverage.	The standard is met if the lots are recombined.
<b>Height:</b> 2 ½ stories.	2½ stories is proposed for the main residence.	The standard is met. A one-story building is to the east and a two-story building is to the west. Both 1- and 2-story residence line the street, with 3-story buildings at the west end of the block.
<b>Floor-to-Floor Height:</b> Historically, floor-to-floor heights in the Beach Institute Neighborhood are predominately lower than in the remainder of the historic district and as such lower floor-to-floor heights are permitted. (Normally, 11’ for	Foundation Height: 3’-4” First Floor: 10’-1” Second Floor: 9’-1”	The floor-to-floor heights are compatible with neighboring buildings.

<p>the first floor and 10' for each story above).</p>		
<p><b>Standard</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed</b></p>	<p><b>Comment</b></p>
<p><b>Rhythm of Structure on Streets:</b> The relationship of a structure to the open space between it and adjacent structures shall be visually compatible with the open spaces between contributing structures to which it is visually related.</p>	<p>The proposed structure has a 1'-6" setback on the west and a 19'-6" setback on the east, with an 8' side porch projection. Contributing buildings within the block face are mostly attached dwellings and historic Sanborn maps indicate an open space of 5' to 7' between row houses. Contributing buildings on the north side of Gordon St. are detached dwellings with 3' to 7' of open space between structures.</p>	<p>The 19'-6" side yard is not typical of the Beach Institute Neighborhood.</p>
<p><b>Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection:</b></p>	<p>A central entrance with a stoop porch with a side stair is proposed.</p>	<p>The entrance and porch projection are consistent with massing and projection of neighboring contributing structures.</p>
<p><b>Relationship of materials, texture and color:</b></p>	<p>The proposed building will feature lap siding. All of the contributing buildings in the vicinity are wood frame with clapboard siding.</p>	<p>The standard is met. Colors to be submitted to staff at a later date.</p>
<p><b>Roof Shapes:</b></p>	<p>Residence: A side gable with gabled dormers front Gordon Street with a hip extension on the rear.</p> <p>Garage: A side gable faces Gordon Lane.</p>	<p>The side gable is compatible with other buildings in the block face.</p> <p>The standard is met. Gordon Lane is comprised of one-story dwellings with side gable roofs.</p>
<p><b>Scale of a Building:</b> The mass of a structure and size of windows, door openings, porches column spacing, stairs, and additions shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.</p>	<p>The proposed residence is 30' wide at the street with an 8' wide side porch pushed back from the street elevation. The main building is 58' deep. Adjacent contributing structures are attached dwellings with 15' to 20' wide units and are 25' to 35' deep. Detached dwellings across the street are 20' to 25' wide and 40' to 60' deep.</p>	<p>The building is wider than most of the buildings within the block face. A 30' wide masonry residence is located on the north side of the street close to E. Broad. Historically, the lots on the south side of the street were only 60' deep, resulting in structures that were 30' deep with a rear porch. The proposed size of openings, porches, and column spacing is compatible with neighboring buildings.</p>

	<p>The proposed garage is 26' wide and 22' deep along Gordon Lane at the rear of the property. This lane is comprised of 1-story attached duplexes between 12' and 20' wide and 30' deep.</p>	<p>Although the proposed garage is wider than other buildings facing the lane, it is minimal for a 2-car garage and its depth is less than other buildings along the lane.</p>
--	---	--

**Part II – Design**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<p><b>Exterior walls:</b> On lots less than 60' wide the front façade shall form a continuous plane parallel to the street. Porches may project street ward of the plan.</p> <p>Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco. Smooth finish fiber cement siding may be used on new residential construction.</p>	<p>The front façade forms a continuous wall parallel to Gordon street with a 9'-4" wide porch projecting 5'-8" onto the sidewalk.</p> <p>Beaded Hardi-plank lap siding with a 7½" exposure is proposed. With Hardi-board trim and treated wood around windows.</p> <p>Continuous brick is proposed for the foundation. This is consistent with adjacent contributing structures.</p>	<p>The standard is met. The neighboring buildings have porches that project into the sidewalk the same distance.</p> <p>The standard is met. The applicant should use a smooth finish Hardi-Plank.</p>
<p><b>Windows:</b> Residential windows shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian. Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on new construction, provided that: the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8"; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding. "Snap-in" or between-the-glass muntins shall not be used. Windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad. The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically. All windows facing a street shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3.</p>	<p>Proposed windows are 2-over-2 (4-over-4 shown on drawings) simulated divided light, double pane glass, double-hung sash wood frame windows.</p> <p>Four-light, fixed square windows with the same specifications are proposed for the rear (south elevation).</p> <p>The building features rectangular window openings that align vertically.</p>	<p>Verify muntin width, profile, use of spacer bar between glass, and dimensions of lower sash. Staff recommends using a light pattern to simulate rectangular panes of glass instead of square panes as depicted in the 4-over-4 windows.</p> <p>The standard is met.</p>
<p><b>Doors:</b></p>	<p>Solid wood doors with a</p>	<p>Verify design.</p>

	transom above are proposed.	
<b>Shutters:</b> shall be hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening. The placement of the horizontal rail shall correspond to the location of the meeting rail of the window. Shutters shall be constructed of wood but other materials may be approved by the review board.	Operable shutters are proposed which fit the opening of the window. Wood vertical plank shutters are proposed.	The standard is met.
<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>Roofs:</b> Gable roof pitches shall be between 4:12 and 8:12 and shall be covered with standing seam metal, slate, tile or asphalt shingles.	<p>The proposed gable and hip roof has an 8:12 pitch and is covered in asphalt shingles.</p> <p>Dormers on the primary façade have 9:12 pitch gable roofs surfaced in asphalt shingle.</p>	<p>The standard is met. Staff recommends modifying the detail at the eave; it should be parallel with the face of the building and have a return.</p> <p>Staff recommends reducing the pitch of the roof and the depth of the dormer. Generally, a dormer window should be less than the size of the first floor window – indicating the hierarchy of the building façade. The height of the dormer and projection create a narrow tunnel effect.</p>
<b>Stairs, stoops, and side porches:</b> Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street. Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone or slate. Wood portico posts shall have cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave. Balusters shall be between upper and lower rails. Supported front porticos shall be constructed of wood. Stoop heights shall be visually comparable to other historic stoops.	<p>Front stoop: continuous brick base (matching the foundation material) with brick side stairs. Material for treads is not noted. 12" x 12" painted permacast columns with capitals and bases for the front stoop and side porch, which align with the architrave. The balustrade is comprised of 1" square wood pickets between an upper and lower rail.</p> <p>Side porch: brick pier foundation with infill. Wood stairs, extending west from the porch, and balustrade with shed roof surfaced in standing seam metal.</p>	Staff recommends reducing the depth of the architrave to allow the columns to extend outward. Although the proposed stoop height appears slightly higher than neighboring properties it does appear visually compatible.

**Lanes and Carriage Houses:**

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<b>Location:</b> Carriage houses, garages, and auxiliary structures must be located to the rear of the property. Overhead garage doors shall not be used on street fronts, adjacent to sidewalk, unless they are detailed to resemble gates.	The proposed garage is located at the rear of the property and is 26' wide by 22' deep.	The standard is met.
<b>Openings:</b> Not to exceed 12' in width.	The proposed two-car garage features two 9' wide garage door openings. No materials were indicated for doors.	Submit garage door information.
<b>Roofs:</b> Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapet.	A side gable roof is proposed. All of the buildings on the lane and the main residence feature a side gable roof.	The standard is met.
Standard	Proposed	Comment
<b>Utilities and Refuse:</b> Electrical vaults, meter boxes, and communications devices shall be located on secondary and rear facades and shall be minimally visible from view.		Verify location.
HVAC units shall be screened from the public right-of-way.	HVAC and condenser units will be screened by a 6'-4" stucco pier and wood louvered fence attached to the garage.	The standard is met.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval with final details to be approved by Staff including:

1. Restudy of dormer windows, verification of window details, door (exterior and garage) material and design, and smooth finish Hardi-plank siding.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Christopher Dean** stated in regard to the smooth-finished Hardi-Plank he agreed and felt that it was not a problem. Concerning the eaves of the structure in the last picture shown by Mrs. Ward, the eave had been amended to look exactly like the home directly behind this project and they did not propose a closed eave or a blunt-off end with the fascia and soffit because of the houses surrounding the project. Mr. Dean stated that the current proposal was comparable to the houses in the area.

**DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Deering** stated that the house that was shown was not a historic house but a reproduction house and asked if the house behind the petitioner's house was historic.



**Mr. Dean** stated that the other house was built recently.

**Mr. Deering** stated that they were only concerned with the historic homes.

**Mr. Dean** asked if the Mr. Deering agreed that the fascia, soffit, and the eave lends itself to the style of home.

**Mr. Deering** stated that Mr. Dean needed to have a plumb-cut eave and not the square-cut.

**Mr. Dean** asked if Mr. Deering was proposing a plumb-cut with a piece of crown, and a fascia.

**Mr. Deering** stated that it does not have to have crown molding because its not a fancy neighborhood but just a plumb-cut eave which is more indicative for the historic structures in that neighborhood.

**Mr. Dean** then asked with the suggestion being made would he need to have a return for the fascia and soffit.

**Mr. Deering** answered no and asked the petitioner to go look at some old houses.

**Mr. Dean** stated that he had and that is why he constructed the plans in that manner. He stated that he researched, had photos, and read books about it and that is why he planned it the way that he did. However, he will restudy the eaves, make the changes, and propose it back to Staff. Concerning the dormers, Mr. Dean stated he had made another drawing with a proposal of the first floor windows being six feet by two inches in height, the second floor windows being five feet by six inches, and the dormer windows are exactly five feet with the width being two feet eight inches, being 32 inches wide on all three windows.

**Mr. Deering** asked Mr. Dean if he would consider narrowing the windows in the dormers.

**Mr. Dean** stated that he could, but the issue that Mrs. Ward mentioned was the height creating the tunnel affect.

**Mr. Deering** stated that if the window with in the dormer were narrowed, it would be more successful.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that this was a situation where the eave line of the adjacent building was the same as the new building, and the ridgeline of the new building was the same as the adjacent building. Yet, the design as shown looked like a three-story building whereas the adjacent west existing building looked like a two-story building due to the same height and being in line with the other windows. By reducing the dormer and particularly the height of the dormer the house would look like a two-story building with dormers instead of looking like a three-story building as currently displayed.

**Mr. Tom Hoffman** stated that he had concerns about the roof slope drawing being an eight on twelve, and the roof slope of the adjacent house on the right is a four on twelve. He was concerned how the ridge and the soffits will match. He also stated that the Height and Mass model shows this difference concerning the roof slope.

**Mr. Deering** asked if there were photographs of the site and answered that it would just depend on the depth of the building itself and its hard to say from the photograph what the slope of the roof on the neighboring house could be.

**Mr. Hoffman** reiterated that it was one of his concerns that the drawings depict that the roofs are the exact same slope, and the Height and Mass show the roofs at the same slope. However, he feels that one roof is an eight on twelve and the other is a four on twelve. Also, that his house does have a closed soffit similar to the details that were being suggested and that the Historic Savannah Foundation did those designs for the detail. Concerning the setback, Mr. Hoffman stated that they had to maintain a five-foot setback with the house and gave reference to Section 8-3030 L3 dictated a five-foot setback in the Landmark District. He stated that this is just one item that would be better with a larger setback and these were his concerns.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Board approve the petition with conditions to modify the eave, the architrave and porch columns, the dormers be restudied to have less tall and narrower windows, that the types of doors and windows be submitted to staff, and that the proposed Hardi-Plank siding be smooth.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** felt that the changes would affect the character of the house to a point that the Review Board should see it along with the Preservation Officer.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated that it could go on the Consent Agenda and the item could always be moved.

**Mr. Deering** stated that if they were not happy with the changes than the item could be put in the Regular Agenda. He stated that this way the petitioner could proceed with the project.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that the motion did not state to go to the Consent Agenda but conceded that it would be fine if it was done.

**Mr. Deering amended the motion for the changes to be brought back to the Board.**

**Mr. Fortson-Waring** asked if they wouldn't be able to do anything until next month.

**Mr. Deering** stated that they could proceed with the design project but they wouldn't be able to build.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if the staff was comfortable with the setback.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that there was a misunderstanding by the neighbors about that section which was is in relation to the buildings facing a square.

**Mrs. Ward** stated that the average space between buildings is about five feet.

**Mr. Deering** stated that the chapter that Mr. Hoffman quoted was about Trust Lots.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated that the item is going to Staff and the second doesn't accept an amendment but that the second only approves the original motion.**

**Mr. Steffen** stated that they did not need to go further because they had a motion to approve the item with the amendments offered and the motion has been seconded. He stated that if there was no further discussion that the Board was ready to vote on the item.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if there were any amendments to the motion.

**Mr. Deering** answered that they were going to let the motion stand as it was first stated.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the amended petition, to modify the eave, the architrave and porch columns, the dormers restudied to have less tall and narrower windows, that the types of doors and windows be submitted to staff, and that the proposed Hardi-Plank be smooth. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

**RE: Continued Petition of Lee Meyer, A.I.A.  
HDBR 06-3530-2  
417 Jones Street  
Garage Door**

**Mr. Steffen** asked why was the petitioner asking for a continuance and stated that his understanding was that the petitioner wants the item continued so that they can come back and argue it again without any changes.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that it was continued and that they have a right to ask for a continuance

**Mr. Deering** stated that it had been continued from the last meeting and that they could still have it continued.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that they have a right to ask for a continuance and that the Board does not have to grant it, but that she had moved to grant the continuance and it was seconded.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he wanted to make it clear that they were not going to entertain the same issue with the same facts on a continuance.

**Mr. Deering** stated that they hadn't voted on the issues.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that they had a continuance and that they didn't know what it is going to look like when it's continued.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** again stated that the Board had not approved anything.

**HDBR ACTION:** Ms. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition to the April 12, 2006, meeting. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was passed. Mr. Steffen and Ms. Seiler voted against the continuance.

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay  
HDBR 06-3544-2  
27 Bull Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Patrick Shay

Mrs. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:** The applicant is requesting approval for a new fence and storefront and conceptual approval for exterior alterations and sign at 27 Bull Street. Alterations consist of:

1. Replacing the existing brick screen wall on the west, along Whitaker Street, with brick piers and metal fencing.

2. Replacing the existing drive-thru canopy for the bank.
3. Replacing the aluminum storefront entrance.

**FINDINGS:** This Classical Revival style building was constructed in 1912 and is a rated structure within Savannah's Landmark Historic District. The property is zoned B-C-1, Central Business, and is currently occupied by The Coastal Bank.

1. The existing 4-foot brick screen wall is not historic. The applicant is proposing to erect a new fence with 6-foot brick piers spaced 10 feet apart, separated by a 2.5-foot-tall brick wall topped by "ornamental metal fencing". The location (site plan) and colors were not submitted. The Historic District Standards (Sec. 8-3030 (l)(14)) state that: *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. Masonry copings shall be used with iron fencing.*

Staff recommends approval upon verification of material and color and location on property.

2. The existing canopy is not historic and was installed ca. 1983. It is approximately 13 feet tall 30 feet wide and extends 30 feet from the exterior building wall. The proposed canopy is 14 feet tall with a 21-foot-tall vertical side wall facing Whitaker Street featuring the logo and sign for "The Coastal Bank". The canopy is 37 feet wide and extends 28 feet from the west elevation. It has a 5-foot decorative frieze and cornice and is surfaced in stucco with a metal coping. The canopy appears heavy and out of scale for the type of structure that it is – a canopy. The vertical sign wall spans approximately 41 feet along the Whitaker Street elevation and features two piers with a massive curved stucco wall containing the sign for the bank. The plans indicate that the applicant intends to paint the existing stucco wall on the west elevation.

Staff recommends reducing the massing of the canopy and simplification of the frieze and cornice design which appear heavy for a canopy. Elimination of the vertical sign wall which is also massive and out of character for a drive-thru which should be simple and not a focal point of this Classical Revival style historic building. If the standards are met, a sign may be placed on the west elevation of the building, creating a similar effect. Submit/verify paint color and site plan.

3. The existing storefront is not historic and the proposed new entrance will be similar in design with two swing doors topped by a transom made of copper clad framing with clear glass. The Historic District Standards (Sec. 8-3030 (l)(5)) state that: *storefront glazing in subdivided sashes shall be inset a minimum of 4" from the face of the building; storefronts shall be constructed of wood, cast iron, Carrera glass, aluminum, steel or copper.*

Staff recommends approval upon verification that the storefront will be inset four inches.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Approval for the new privacy wall upon submittal of a site plan to staff and verification of color and material.
2. Continuance for the drive-thru canopy to restudy the mass and vertical sign wall.
3. Approval of the new storefront upon verification of four inch inset.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Shay** stated that the metal for the fence would be ferrous metal which will consist of iron, that it will be painted black (powder-coated), and that the bank would like to proceed with the item sooner than later, especially since the wall had been struck down. He stated that the problem was with the people waiting to go into the restaurant across the street sitting upon the fence and that is why they are installing an iron fence. The fence is not straddling the wall in the middle but was pushed all the way to the Whitaker Street side so that people cannot sit on the wall. He stated that the storefront that is there now is the same vintage of the drive-thru metal canopy and the aluminum storefront has shadow baffle panels so that the masonry opening is there but is recessed into the building approximately 18 inches. These items will be removed and the copper clad storefront will be recessed in the masonry opening approximately one-foot, but much more than four inches placing it back in the wall where it should be. He added that he had considered Staff's comments on the drive-thru canopy and that it is their preference to create something more modest, that they could consider placing the signage on the big blank stucco wall instead and that it would not be a problem.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Deering** stated that the Classical Revival building could handle a more substantial canopy, but it needed to be more in a Classical Revival vein and not the current plan.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he could discuss with the client regarding tearing off the cladding that is present and go back to something simple, keep the canopy the same size, and make the sign that identifies the building. He felt that the photograph obscures the sign currently existing on the building because it is behind the palm tree.

**Mr. Shay** asked if they could make a motion to approve the wall and the front door and he will seek a continuance on the remainder.

**HDBR ACTION:** **Mr. Deering** made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the replacement of storefront and fence, and continue the petition on the drive-thru canopy. **Ms. Seiler** seconded the motion and it was passed.

**RE:   Petition of Lynch Associates Design, Inc.  
      Rebecca Lynch  
      HDBR 06-3545-2  
      314 East Huntingdon Street  
      Alterations**

Present for the petition was Rebecca Lynch.

Mrs. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:** The applicant is requesting approval to remove a non-historic rear deck and stairs and replace with an enclosed wood porch with screening and wood slat railing. Ten-inch box columns and a double screen door will be used. The columns, handrails and trim will be painted Benjamin Moore White. The stairs, deck and railing will be stained Benjamin Moore dark walnut.

**FINDINGS:** Sections and elevations have been provided. The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Additions shall be located to the rear of the structure and sited such that it is clearly an appendage.	The porch addition is on the rear.	This standard is met.
Additions shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.	The addition is subordinate to the main structure and less deep than the previous deck.	This standard is met.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects  
Erik E. Puljung  
HDBR 06-3546-2  
20 East Macon Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Erik Puljung.

Mrs. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:** The applicant is requesting approval to replace the existing metal stair and add a fire escape on the rear of the building at 20 East Macon Street.

**FINDINGS:** 20 East Macon Street was constructed from 1855-1856 as part of a masonry row house containing four, four-story town homes. The building is a rated structure within Savannah’s Landmark Historic District and is in a RIP-A, Residential, Medium Density zoning district. Currently, the building contains four living units without a secondary means of egress for the upper units. The proposed alterations are trying to address this situation and are for fire safety.

1. The existing non-historic metal stair and platform will be replaced with a painted steel stair and platform. The stair will be similar to the existing stair and will be minimally visible from the lane due to the 6-foot 8-inch garden wall at the rear of the property. The proposed platform is 13 feet 7 inches wide by 8 feet 4 inches deep supported by 4 inch by 4 inch painted steel tube columns with IPE wood decking with a natural finish. The railing will be comprised of painted steel posts and pickets with caps. The steel will be painted gloss black.

2. A commercial fixed-escape fire ladder is proposed on the stair landing at the parlor level on the rear. It is a JOMY aluminum pop-out ladder and appears as a tube similar to a downspout when closed and will be painted Charleston green. It is located 8 inches from surface of the wall and is approximately 16 feet tall.
3. A steel exit balcony is proposed for the fourth floor with an integrated ladder. The balcony projects 2 feet from the building supported by steel brackets. The ladder is 20 inches wide and will be perpendicular to the exterior building wall. All of the steel will be painted gloss black.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff approval with the consideration that all work be painted the same color.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Erik Puljung** agreed with Staff that everything be painted the same color of gloss black.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they were removing the spiral staircase and the fire escape ladder also.

**Mr. Puljung** stated that they were not removing the spiral staircase because it is two doors down.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if that was a requirement by the Building Department for a secondary egress.

**Mr. Puljung** stated that with it being an existing condition that he was not positive if it was a requirement but the owner would be more comfortable with providing the ladder on the fourth floor for the tenants.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated his concern for a landing on the sloped roof. If something else is planned, it should be brought back to the Review Board.

**HDBR ACTION:** Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects  
Patrick Phelps  
HDBR 06-3548-2  
215 East York Street (115 East York Street)  
Fence**

Present for the petition was Patrick Phelps.

Mrs. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:** The applicant is requesting approval to construct a three feet by four-inch masonry and terra-cotta fence and a surface parking lot west of the building at 115 East York Street. The Savannah College of Art and Design is the owner of the property and are undergoing an adaptive reuse of the old hospital building for the school.

**FINDINGS:** The building at 115 East York Street was constructed in 1906 for the United States Marine Hospital and is a rated structure within Savannah’s Landmark Historic District. This “fireproof” building represents an early example and one of the largest Italian Renaissance style structures within the district. This style was generally incorporated into landmark structures within urban areas during the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and is defined by its large overhanging bracketed eaves, tile roof, belt courses, arch openings, and stucco veneer. Originally designed in a symmetrical cross plan, the building featured porches on all sides with street yards on both the east and west elevations. In 1923, several three-story additions were constructed on the east elevation facing Abercorn Street.

Although the address indicates that the primary entrance faces York Street, the Drayton Street elevation maintains a dominant presence. The façade was originally a porch, which was later enclosed to provide additional space for the growing needs of the United States Marines following WWI and WWII and is within a flat roof in front of a series of gable roofs. The symmetrical three-story façade features a three bay-arched loggia, which is set back approximately 70 feet from Drayton Street, creating a landscaped entrance setting. A central sidewalk and flagpole flanked by four mature palmetto trees extend from the façade to Drayton Street. This is a standard design feature in most military landmark buildings and is a defining feature of this property.

**Surface Parking:**

The west elevation serves as a prominent building façade and the proposed surface parking area detracts from the centralized entrance into the structure. Although the main entrance is located along York Street, the recessed façade and central sidewalk entrance create a unique urban landscape setting which has become a contributing element of the property. The applicant is proposing to relocate the flagpole, still aligning with the center of the façade and appears to be retaining the palmetto trees. The existing landscape element serves as a street yard and should not be compromised unless all other alternatives have been exhausted. Parking is a secondary utilitarian use for the building and should not become a focal point of the prominent façade along Drayton Street. In the vicinity, several other buildings have entrances along Drayton Street, including the Chatham County Courthouse, and the Standard Oil Building. The property is in a BC-1, Central Business, and as such, the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance (Sec. 8-3090 (b)) states that within the BC-1 zoning district, all uses are exempt from providing off-street parking. Staff recommends that other alternatives for parking be examined including satellite facilities.

**Fence:**

The proposed fence is comprised of 3 feet-4 inches tall CMU piers surfaced in stucco separated by stucco and terra cotta barrel tile. The piers are between 1 foot-4 inches and 2 feet wide between 4 feet wide panels of CMU surfaced in stucco topped by five layers of stacked tile and topped by a 4-inch cast concrete cap. The stucco material will match the existing building in color. The fence will define the surface parking area with a continuous portion along Drayton Street and a continuing east along York Street and York Lane with openings to allow a vehicular traffic to pass through.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends continuance pending board discussion on all other possible parking alternatives, including satellite parking. If the surface lot is deemed compatible by the Board, staff recommends that the number of spaces be reduced by half and that the central sidewalk and entrance from Drayton Street be maintained. Staff is not opposed to the fence; however, the central walkway from Drayton Street to the building should be maintained with an opening on the west elevation if the parking element is approved.



**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Dr. Caplan** asked if they had jurisdiction whether or not there will be parking in that open space and, do they have any jurisdiction over what they may or may not do with the trees. He stated that it appeared that it was the Board's responsibility to make sure that the fence was right because it's a structure, but wanted to know if they had the authority to say whether or not parking can be place as planned or does someone else have the authority.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that if this is a landscaped feature typical of marine hospitals, at a certain point in time that Staff has a necessity to point that out.

**Mrs. Ward** stated they would be applying concrete in the grass front street yard and that the Board wouldn't allow that to happen on a trust block. She said they were correct in stating that the Board could not prevent removal of the trees.

**Mr. Deering** stated that it was altering the historic character of the property.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that she remembered when they had this discussion with the Mansion and the parking lot regarding the landscaping, and that she felt that it was within their purview.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they were going to continue the item and stated that they had jurisdiction over the wall.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated that the applicant has not requested a continuance.

**Mr. Steffen** inquired as to the characteristics of the buildings of this period.

**Mrs. Ward** stated that in doing research on military hospitals that it was typical that a central flagpole showing the U.S. military presence be placed in a landscaped courtyard.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that this is a community that has a particular affection for its military and military sites that have not been well preserved in the past, and that if the property has a military historical significance that the Board needs to know in every way possible.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** added that another significant historical feature of the building was that Vice-President Hubert Humphrey's father practiced medicine in this.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that the U.S. Public Health Service maintained a series of hospitals in different parts of the country including Savannah, New Orleans, Baltimore, Staten Island, and New York. He clarified that the hospital was considered a marine hospital because they took care of the Coast Guard and the Merchant Marines, and not the United States Marine. He also stated that the public health service is only a military facility in times of war and the rest of the time, it is a civilian facility.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Patrick Phelps** stated that because the building had emotional ties he felt that it has significance to Downtown Savannah. He agreed with Staff's recommendation on creating a central opening along Drayton Street by a break in the fence along with a front door entrance on Drayton Street. He stated that he would also make a modification to the fence. He stated that the 14 spaces that they are proposing in the front area is not parking for the entire site. The primary concern of the parking is for quick deliveries, staff parking, and for accessible parking. On the site there is some parking located along York Lane on the south end of the property. He

stated that they want to take the additional parking and put it behind the fence which is a zoning requirement. The buffer can consist of fencing or landscaping.

**Mr. Deering** suggested creating a sidewalk to park across that consisted of a different material where the current sidewalk is, and to consider using a grass-paved product. He stated that the landscaping of the building is one remaining characteristic.

**Mr. Phelps** stated that they had proposed brick pavers for that area. He stated that he was concerned with maintenance of grass-pavers.

**Mr. Deering** stated that it doesn't always work, but the same product was used at Daffin Park during its first phase and it seems to be working.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that if they are proposing a visual barrier between the sidewalk and the property that it really does need to be higher than three or four feet.

**Mr. Phelps** stated that the intent of keeping the wall low was to keep it from overpowering the base of the building.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that at his height that he could see over a 4- or 5-foot wall to see the building, and it would hide the cars, but the 3-foot by 4-foot height may hide only the bumper.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that she loves the plan, but was concerned about the height of the wall and the pedestrians that would gather by the fence. She stated with York Street being on the bus route that it would be a nuisance because it will become a nice place for everyone to sit. She stated that if the height were raised it would detract from sitting on the fence.

**Mr. Phelps** stated that he did not wish to ask for a continuance.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Cassie DeLuckie (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated that the ARC felt that green spaces in the Landmark District are very rare and they strongly discouraged the Board from approving parking on the site. She stated that the Drayton Street façade is important to the character of the structure and should continue to play a vital role in the landscaped entrance to the building.

**HDBR ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion, seconded by Ms. Fortson-Waring and amended by Ms. Fortson-Waring that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition for a masonry fence and parking area, paved in a grass paved product; also, amended by Mr. Meyerhoff for a four-foot fence. The motion failed.

Mr. Hutchinson recused himself.

Mr. Neely made a motion, seconded by Mr. Deering that the petition be continued to April 12, 2006. The motion passed. Mr. Hutchinson recused himself.

RE: Petition of Gonzalez Architects  
Jose Gonzalez  
HDBR 06-3550-2  
304 East Bryan Street  
Alterations

Present for the petition was Jose Gonzalez.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following report.

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

**FINDINGS:** The site is zoned R-B-C, Residential-Business-Commercial, and adjoins a R-I-P-A, Residential-Institutional-Professional-Amended zone in Warren Ward. An existing one-story historic building at the corner of Bryan and Lincoln is also to be renovated.

The development has a footprint of over 11,000 square feet and therefore meets the definition of large-scale development. The Chadbourne guidelines state, "Today's office buildings, hotels, retail centers and apartment houses seek larger footprints. The consequence is that assemblage, not subdivision is the rule and a spate of buildings has been built that ignores the 60-foot-module and are changing the scale of the city. At issue is not whether assemblage is allowed, but whether buildings can be made that are good neighbors...the guidelines seek to restore traditional massing to large scale developments."

Staff met with the applicant on-site prior to the submittal and urged that the design provide access to Bryan Street and respect the residential character of Warren Ward.

The following standards apply: The construction of a new structure...in the Historic District, visible from a public street or lane shall be generally of such form, proportion, mass, configuration, structure, material, texture, color and location on a lot as will be compatible with...nearby structures designated as historic.

Parking is proposed for the ground floor level spanning the majority of the building. Staff believes that this design creates a dead zone at street level. Alternatives such as automated parking, parking on the rear of the structure or on the roof might be explored so that there can be pedestrian interaction at street level. There are no pedestrian entrances at street level along

Bryan Street for nearly 166 linear feet. This is not in compliance with the Historic District Ordinance standard, which states, "primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street."

The established setback in this ward is a "0" lot line with encroaching stoops. The proposed structure is setback approximately five to ten feet with stoops entirely on private property. In addition, a wide stair running in an East-West direction provides access to one segment along Bryan Street. This is not typical of the building typology anywhere in Savannah. The stoops should follow the traditional pattern for the ward. Also the stoop function is not clear since it appears that the units are accessed by elevator from the lane side. Since the building lot coverage in the R-B-C zoning district is 50 percent, a building lot coverage variance will be required for this building. However, the front setbacks should reflect traditional setbacks and stoop placement in the neighborhood before the variance is calculated.

Many window openings in the stucco portion appear square and not in a 3:5 proportion. Since the windows do not reflect what is going on inside the building (they are along a corridor) a three bay window rhythm should be explored to better fit the neighborhood.

The submitted model does not reflect the drawings in the area adjacent to the existing historic building on the site.

With regard to the future Part II design submittal, large cornices and rusticated bases are not typical of this neighborhood. Simplified brick facades are more appropriate. The renovation plans for the existing building should be submitted with the Part II design submittal.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends receipt of comments from the Board and public and continue for corrections and revisions.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that he wanted to create something that would work for both the garage and the hotel guests. He stated that Bryan Street needed to be smaller in scale in keeping with the surrounding residences. He stated that Ms. Reiter pointed out that there was not an entrance from the street. He stated that entrances to the units have elevated stoops. He stated that the house to the right of the property has windows, penetrations, but no entrance at ground level. He stated that all of the parking was completely contained within the structure so that the neighbors won't have to see the parking lot and the cars underneath. Regarding the allowed 50% lot coverage he stated because of the parking garage across Bryan Street they have turned the project inward. He stated that they are restoring the existing historic building which has 1400 square feet. He stated that if it was not there, he would be allowed to build up four floors or approximately 4200 square feet. The entire courtyard area which will contain the pool is 3600 square feet. The approach completely conceals the parking to the property immediately to the north and it allows the rooms to look at the garden plaza which is elevated and conceals the parking. He stated that in regard to the rhythm and scale along the street, he felt that even though they are facing a parking lot in the future, the approach would be an attractive façade on Bryan Street with a lot of variety and interest. In terms of scale, the current building that is almost completed, and the height of the building that is being proposed, the height is the same as the height of the building to the right.. The actual roofline is between 36 and 38 feet for the home next door and the proposed project is at approximately the same height.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she liked the proposed plans, but was concerned that there was not a door on the bottom floor.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that there was an entrance and the public could enter and move freely underneath and enter the hotel.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if the elevator would go all the way down to the bottom floor and if the petitioner would want the public to come in the front to get to the elevator.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that there would be two entrances on the property including one on Lincoln Street.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if the public would be able to go out on the end balconies, if they were accessible, and if they would be sold as City views..

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that the balconies on the end have a nice view of the square.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that he would like to see the parking garage come down and Warren Square be restored to single-family residences. He stated that he felt that the petitioner stayed true to what is happening in the neighborhood, that they varied the architecture so that it doesn't look like a big flat building, and that he disagreed about two significant houses on the square, on the west side, with entrances on the first floor. He stated that as far as the setback off the street, considering what you have to look at across the street, he welcomes the trees and bushes in the landscaping. He felt that the petitioner is going in the right direction.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that Ms. Reiter had suggested they pull the sidewalk out where the area is on-street so that it would create a welcoming sidewalk. He stated that it was beyond their scope in terms of their site, but they would like to continue to entertain that as well as what Dr. Caplan was suggesting.

**Mr. Deering** stated that Staff was right in that the ordinance states that, "There must be an entrance at ground level every 60 feet. He stated that the floor-to-floor heights don't meet the ordinance although he welcomes it being a smaller four-story building. He felt that the floor height should vary so that it follows the traditional historical building pattern in the neighborhood.. He stated that in his opinion the façade represented "Disneyesque" fake townhouses. He stated that the proportions were bad. There was a brick Georgian center building in a clapboard neighborhood, and the stucco townhouse on the right had a high stoop but did not have an entrance door in the traditional Savannah townhouse manner. The door in the brick building to the right did not have a high stoop or a door at all. The one with the "Charlestonsque" porch did not have an entrance to it.. He reiterated Mr. Meyerhoff's point that the openings in the garage would not create a lovely streetscape. He stated that the inside of the garages would be seen on both sides of the street, the setbacks on the sidewalk were incongruous with the ward, and he felt that it was incompatible with the clapboard houses around Warren Square.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the corner building was going to be renovated to be the blacksmith shop that it was.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that he is going to restore the façade and the original openings.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if it was going to be rental space.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that it would be meeting space for the hotel and would have a connection to the garage.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he was curious whether the Board could approve part of a project and have the second part submitted at a later date for approval.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he concurred in part with what Mr. Deering had stated regarding the setback along Bryan Street. He stated that it doesn't do justice to all of the buildings and the examples that are around the square currently. He stated the singular stair with the non-visible entrance, on the side rather than on the front, and the unsymmetrical proportion that it created made it appear disjointed.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that he wanted the Board to keep in mind that the zoning is different than further up the street. He stated that it was a commercial zoning.. He stated in terms of the scale that Mr. Deering pointed out, he had no objections to varying the height and that he didn't apply the commercial standards which were much higher in terms of the stories because he felt it wasn't appropriate façade. He mentioned that the Board recently had approved something similar three blocks up from Price Street. He stated that it had an extremely uniform façade and that was extremely simple in terms of its massing. He felt that it was more appropriate to have a more varied textural image along Brian Street.

**Mr. Deering** stated that the ward was what needed to be looked at, not the commercial zone which started at Lincoln Street. He stated that the ward itself was very residential and had clapboard.. He stated that the project design was not part of that and that it was not visually compatible with the rest of the ward.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that there are brick structures in the ward, and that this project is part of a complex. He stated that he could work in a variety of different ways in terms of how it might be treated in its ultimate form, but what is more important to him is that it is understood what is being presented to the neighbors in terms of mass and how it is articulated along Bryan Street. He stated that he has taken the elements that he felt important and whether it has a “Disneyesque” treatment is not relevant today.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that in the next block west, there was a FBI building that was built before there was a review board. He stated that it is a plain brick building, however, the building has two wings at Bryan Street and the center portion of the building is setback at least ten feet. He stated that the proposed project had no breathing room. He stated that there were setbacks and projections without any symmetry and with the stairwell there is a straight line going across the front. He stated that it was one big mass.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that the Board approved the condominiums that are going in on State Street and that it’s one block down and one street over. She stated that you can’t get any closer to the street than those.

**Mr. Deering** stated that it is a typical setback pattern for the district.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that Ms. Reiter stated that in that particular area there is a zero setback and now he is hearing from the Board members that it should be setback and he is delighted to do what is necessary, but the conflict is difficult for him to figure out.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that in the next block west where in what was called the Castle building, there was a row of houses called Castle Row and that it was a whole block of row houses. She stated that it might be good to look for pictures of that row.

**Mr. Deering** asked if the building was stucco or brick.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that the lack of symmetry was disturbing.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that it was done on purpose so if the Board wants a more symmetrical approach that it could be done.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that Mr. Deering’s points were well-taken about some of the aspects of the residences in that neighborhood, and when it came to detail and design, that he could look at some of the houses and incorporate some of the designs. She stated that considering the number of hotels that have been approved lately that were yet again brick, she felt that Mr. Gonzalez’s project was refreshing and she applauded him on the project.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that the Board had approved a house that had a small setback two blocks down, because the house next door had a small setback on it.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he may not have made himself clear on the setback. He stated that he didn’t mind that there was some setback to have some relief, but that it was typical in Savannah to have the setback at the same level. He stated that the setbacks were one part without a setback, one setback at five feet, one setback at three feet, and one at four feet. He stated that there is too much variation in the setbacks.

**Mr. Neely** asked if the setback issue was a Part I or Part II decision.

**Mr. Deering** stated that it is part of the mass, that it’s like shrink-wrapping a part of the building.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that Mr. Gonzalez asked for guidance and stated his appreciation in the way that Mr. Gonzalez asked for it. He stated that in the last retreat they had wrestled with the idea of what height and mass was and what it wasn't, and that the Board came to a consensus that it really means "shrink-wrapping" the building. He stated that in the Height and Mass considerations that the Board is talking about setbacks, where the windows are placed, and that it could be part of the reason that Mr. Gonzalez is getting conflicting advice. He stated that this was the Board's first crack at this item and that it was a pretty ambitious project, and that some of the thoughts may be developing as the Board discusses it. He stated that maybe the Board can give Mr. Gonzalez enough guidance to be able to move forward and come back with something that is acceptable to the majority of the Board.

**Mr. Gonzalez** asked if he could ask questions that would help in the process. He stated that they had discussed symmetry as one component and asked if he was correct in the interpretation that the Board would like a definable rhythm in terms of the façade.

**Mr. Deering** stated that it did not bother him personally that buildings in the district are right on the sidewalk, but that the Board might feel that there should be a setback.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he had a concern with the double stair in the center, the single stair going sideways, and the rhythm.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that they did not create a rhythm on purpose because they felt that the variation would be more interesting than a more rhythmic approach. He stated that if the Board did not agree with it than it was alright. He stated that he designs for the Board, the clients, and the community and that he wanted to understand where the Board was so that he could try to respond as much as possible to everyone's comments. He stated that the last thing was in regard to treatment of materials and he felt that it was important even though it wasn't a mass issue. He stated that it was important to him in terms of how it ultimately ties to the existing structure because it is operationally one, and that there is rustication typically in that area and in that neighborhood.

**Mr. Deering** asked if he meant that it was scored stucco.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that rustication is anything that embellishes a base in a more detailed fashion. He stated that it could be a running bond which is what is traditional around the area, whether it's done in tabby or stucco. He stated that he could continue along that line because it allows them to unify the project. He stated that he did not believe that they should use clapboard siding on the project. He stated that a combination of brick and stucco would certainly be an appropriate approach. He stated that in regard to the "Disneyesque" trim he stated that he did not want it to be barren.

**Mr. Deering** stated that it is not just the trim and that he was not talking about, but that it was the proportion of the window openings and that he is trying to create a townhouse look and not all of them look like townhouses, but rather building fronts with no real purpose.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that he would request a continuance.

**HDBR ACTION:** Ms. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition to the April 12, 2006, meeting. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

RE: Petition of Robin Screen  
HDBR 06-3555-2  
528 East Jones Street

**Addition**

Present for the petition was Robin Screen

Mrs. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:** The applicant is seeking after-the-fact approval for an addition to the rear of 528 East Jones Street.

**FINDINGS:** The Following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
An historic structure...visible from a public street or lane...shall only be...altered in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior architectural features of the historic structure....Exterior architectural features shall include but not be limited to the architectural style, scale, general design and general arrangement of the exterior structure, including the kind and texture of the building material, the type and style of all roofs, windows, and doors.	The applicant has built a second story addition supported by pressure treated wood posts. The applicant states he was repairing a deck and extended it to match a lower deck and enclosed it.	No second story deck ever received approval from the Board of Review. A one-story lower deck was approved in the past.  The addition as designed is incompatible in design with the historic house and does not meet the standard..
Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction, provided, however, that the windows meet the following standards: the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8 inch; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash (rail) shall be wider than the meeting and top rails...	Aluminum or vinyl windows have been used.	The windows do not meet the standard.
Snap-in or between-the-glass muntins shall not be used.	Snap-in or between-the-glass muntins have been used.	The windows do not meet the standard.
In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.	Vinyl or aluminum windows have been used.	The windows do not meet the standard.
Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.	Vinyl siding has been used.	The wall covering does not meet the standard.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends denial of addition and removal of addition within 30 days of receipt of decision.



**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the petitioner had a building permit.

**Mrs. Reiter** answered that the petitioner did not have a building permit. The construction was done by the owner. The petitioner is not the owner, but was asked by the owner to straighten the matter out.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Screen** stated that he was an acquaintance of the homeowner and that he came to represent the owner who just had back surgery. He agreed that it looked bad, that he didn't agree with what was done, and that he also didn't agree with punishing him for thinking that he could build it. He stated that everyone was not into construction and that the homeowner placed the vinyl siding on his home because another home had vinyl siding. The homeowner made the changes without any prior knowledge of the system.

**Mr. Steffen** stated to the petitioner that he would not hear the matter without the homeowner being present.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated there is a constant demand to obtain more enforcement with regard to people building without a permit. Here is a project without a building permit, nor approval from the Board.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Board could only do something about the Review Board portion. He felt that the homeowner should remove the building and he asked the Board to give a 30-day time frame to resubmit drawings. The owner needs to reexamine how he can architecturally remedy the problem.

**Mr. Screen** agreed that it was a good idea and stated that the homeowner recently retired from the Fire Department and that the home was the homeowner's dream home and that he just wanted to help him out the best way that he could.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they had any construction documents to build.

**Mr. Screen** stated that he was brought into the situation and that he had no knowledge of what was done, but was only asked to help a friend out.

**HDBR ACTION: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion to deny the petition. Mr. Deering seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**Mrs. Reiter** asked the Board if they were going to establish a time for when the building needed to be taken down.

**Mr. Steffen stated that the request was to ask for Staff's recommendation for removal of addition within 30 days be included in the prior recommendations. He asked for a reconsideration. Ms. Fortson-Waring moved to reconsider the motion and Mr. Deering seconded the motion. The motion passed.**

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the proper motion would be to continue this item.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that the Board voted to deny the item and that Staff recommended denial, but that the discussion was whether they should continue it and he felt that it was not

appropriate. He stated that the City's ordinance was broken by not obtaining a building permit and he moved for the petition to be denied.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that it could not be denied because it was in deliberation and that no one mentioned the thirty days.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he did not mentioned the thirty days because the thirty days is a continuance.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the thirty days was to tear down the structure within the thirty days and the motion that was made was for denial.

**Mrs. Ward** stated that a firefighter should understand about a building permit, wires, and electrical systems.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he felt that was the purview was of the Building Department and not the Historic Review Board. If the petitioner has built something that doesn't have a building permit then the Building Department will make him tear it down.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that the Board can tell them to remove it and then it will be enforced.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** asked if they should have another motion to continue it to next month, for the petitioner to bring plans, at which time they can either reject or approve the plans. If they don't and the motion stands, then they will have to tear it down.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Meyerhoff restated the motion to deny and the owner has 30 days to remove the project. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion. The motion passed with Mrs. Fortson-Waring and Mr. Neely casting nay votes.

#### RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Tom Kale & Cindy Glick  
HDBR 06-3535-2  
316 East Jones Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: Approved**
2. Petition of Charlie & Peg Lehosit  
HDBR 06-3536(S)-2  
211 West Gordon Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: Approved**
3. Petition of Thoa Kim Tran  
HDBR 06-3537(S)-2  
8 East Broughton Street  
Door Alteration  
**STAFF DECISION: Approved**

4. Petition of W. Park Callahan  
HDBR 06-3551(S)-2  
112 West Jones Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: Approved**
5. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
Jim Morehouse  
HDBR 06-3552(S)-2  
337 Bull Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: Approved**
6. Petition of Commercial Design Construction  
HDBR 06-3553(S)-2  
405 East Jones Street  
Color/Shutters  
**STAFF DECISION: Approved**
7. Petition of William Lovett  
HDBR 06-3554(S)-2  
115 East Jones Street  
Shutters  
**STAFF DECISION: Approved**

**RE: OTHER BUSINESS**

1. **WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**
2. **Mrs. Reiter said the Board could send one person to the Georgia Alliance Preservation Commission Spring Training. She asked if anyone was interested to contact her. Mrs. Reiter was asked to contact Mr. Hutchinson.**

**RE: MINUTES**

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes — January 11, 2006
2. Distribution of Regular Meeting Minutes — February 8, 2006

**HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the minutes of January 11, 2006, as submitted. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer