

**HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW**

**REGULAR MEETING  
112 EAST STATE STREET**

**ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM**

**OCTOBER 11, 2006**

**2:00 P.M.**

**MINUTES**

**HDRB Members Present:**

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

**HDRB Members Not Present:**

**Eric Meyerhoff**

**HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:**

**Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner  
Janine N. Person, Administrative Assistant**

**RE: CALL TO ORDER**

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

**RE: REFLECTION**

**RE: SIGN POSTING**

**RE: CONTINUED AGENDA**

**RE: Continued Petition of Steve Day  
H-06-3562-2  
20 East Taylor Street  
Front Stair and Stoop**

**Continued to November 8, 2006**

**RE: Continued Petition of Mark Curry  
H-06-3677-2  
541, 543, & 545 East Congress Street  
New Construction/Roof**

**Continued to November 8, 2006**

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

Continued to November 8, 2006

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Fortson Waring made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review approved the Continued Agenda items as presented. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

RE: Amended Petition of Hansen Architects  
Patrick Phelps  
H-06-3548-2  
115 East York Street  
Addition of Ramp Entrance

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Poticny, Deering, Felder Architects  
Keith Howington  
H-06-3690-2  
417 East Charlton Street  
Rehabilitation/Existing Window

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Coastal Heritage Society  
H-06-3692-2  
Brian White  
303 Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard  
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review approve the Consent Agenda items as presented. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

RE: Amended Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay  
Architects  
Jennifer Faulkinberry for Lindsay, Pope,  
Brayfield & Associates  
H-06-3549-2 (Reference H-01-2595-2)  
Abercorn and Bay Streets  
New Construction of a Hotel – Request for  
Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends partial approval, denial of stucco, and reconsideration of other details.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF AMENDED REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval of changes to the approved plans as follows:

1. Revise exterior materials as follows:
  - Exterior Insulation and Finish Systems (EIFS) in lieu of cast stone (Arriscraft) on floors three through eight
  - EIFS cornice in lieu of cast stone cornice
  - EIFS lintels and sills in lieu of cast stone
  - Copper colored pre-finished metal in lieu of real copper on the tower roof
  - Canvas awnings in lieu of glass at entrances

**FINDINGS:**

The Historic District standards state that commercial exterior walls shall be finished in brick, concrete formed or assembled as stone, precast concrete panels with finish to simulate stucco texture, polished stone, and glazed brick or tile where similar historic examples exist along the same block front. The Historic District Review Board may approve other materials upon a showing by the applicant that the product is visually compatible with historic building materials and has performed satisfactorily in the local climate.

The predominant historic materials used in this block are granite and brick. EIFS or even true stucco is visually incompatible on a major eight-story building in the Landmark Historic District.

The applicant needs to clarify if the window lintels and sills are proposed to be EIFS or Arriscraft brick. EIFS or stucco is inappropriate for windows and sills on a masonry building.

The applicant may wish to consider the alternative of retaining brick to match the other brick on the building in the second bay from Abercorn on Bay Street on the first through third levels. This would provide more emphasis on the cast block surrounds of the four entry bays. A sample of Arriscraft block should be provided.

Regarding the entry awning: The glass awning is a much more elegant, permanent, and interesting feature on this major building than a canvas awning.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Denial of the use of stucco or EIFS as a wall, cornice, and window sill/lintel material, with consideration of an alternative to use brick at the first through third floors on the Bay Street side to balance the three-story element further to the west, and on the first and second floors on Abercorn Street between the entry and the tower. Retain the cast block four-bay entry portion on Bay Street, and cast block at the entry on Abercorn Street. Provide a sample of the proposed block.

Approval of the alternative metal roof on the tower.

Reconsideration of changing the awnings from glass to canvas.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if they had a sample of the EIFS. He said he was familiar with stucco and Dryvit but he was not familiar with EIFS.

**Ms. Ward** stated it was a synthetic stucco material but she did not have a sample.

**Mr. Steffen** stated since one of the Board's purposes is educational, he suggested the public be made aware of what it stood for, and suggested Mr. Shay explain what it was.

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

**Mr. Patrick Shay** passed around a brick where one side was a smooth Arriscraft cast stone, and said it was like stone in every property except it was more durable and did not spall as much. He said the other sides were rusticated that were also available for the finish of the stones. He stated that the Board had seen samples of the material before, and it was proposed for the lintels and sills. He displayed a drawing that was approved before that had grills for PTAC units, and in order to improve the appearance of the building, the developer had received previous permission to remove the PTAC units and do recessed panels of brick. The larger size stones were two feet by one-foot, and they are proposed for all of the material up to the cornice level. The cornices, sills, and lintels would be constructed of the same material. He said EIFS stood for Exterior Insulation and Finish System, which was invented in Germany about 30 years ago, where insulation was applied to the outside of the building. The coating that goes on the outside is very similar to stucco except for being water-based; it is acrylic or latex-based. It is plastic mixed into the same matrix as you have in stucco, which comes in a sand-finished, a rougher sand texture, or any other sand textures. They were frequently used on buildings in the Downtown area. He brought an example from the Garden Inn where they used cast stone for the stones at the base and cornice, and used the bricks for the stringcourse and cornice. The items that were high above eye level were where the transition was made to the EIFS material that was in the same color. He said if you go down and look at it, you could probably read the difference. He showed a photo of the same building closer to street level, because he designed the large surrounds made of cast stone that the Board had, but it proved not to be possible. The Board granted permission to allow the change back to EIFS, and to the cast stone product. Although there was a difference in texture, the difference in the actual appearance of the material is subtle. He said there was no intent to use EIFS for the sills or lintels on the project, but the cast stone bricks would be substituted for the large pieces of the cast stone.

**Mr. Neely** asked if Mr. Shay could address the durability of EIFS over time, and did he know of examples of buildings in Savannah that had been around 30 years ago.

**Mr. Shay** stated it was invented in Germany about 30 years ago. He said it really did not become popular as a building material here until probably 15 or 20 years ago.

**Mr. Neely** asked if Mr. Shay if he could think of any that were in Savannah from the early days that were 15 or 20 years old.

**Mr. Shay** stated he knew there were some. The EIFS material was durable, but they don't like to use it and don't propose using it where people could put their hands on it or where it could be bumped. If you accidentally bumped a car or hand truck with some cargo on it, you could dent the EIFS material and it could be seen from the outside. That was why they like to use it only on the upper floors because it was not subject to that kind of wear and tear.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if it was some type of foam.

**Mr. Shay** stated the original product was invented to go over top of Styrofoam, and that it was not used that way all of the time now because the outside coating was about one-eighth of an inch thick. It feels like old-fashioned hard-coat stucco, but it sheds water at a much more dependable rate, so that water does not pass through it like cement stucco.

**Mr. Neely** stated the 100 Bull Street building at Bull and Broughton Streets where the Starbucks was he believed to be EIFS. He said that it was maybe 15 years.

**Mr. Shay** stated he thought Mr. Neely was correct.

**Mr. Neely** stated Mr. Shay was correct. The lower level did get banged up and the upper level seemed to have withstood reasonably.

**Mr. Shay** said it was a durable material that was not maintenance-free. He thought that was the way it was sold to architects 20 years ago, but it was not. He said you have to go back and make sure that it was sealed occasionally, but it was a far superior product in terms of the ability to resist water and be maintained over time than cement stucco.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked beside the fact that it does not wick water, what were the other properties that would make us want to use it.

**Mr. Shay** stated it was less expensive than stone, and more expensive than conventional stucco.

**Mr. Mitchell** was thinking in terms of the durability and how long it would last.

**Mr. Shay** stated the cast stone, even though it was a very dense material and heavy like brick, is porous. It did have a tendency over time, especially if you have a long-lasting hard rain, to wick some water back through the material. The EIFS was a better material in that regard.

**Mr. Hutchinson** asked what were the insulation properties.

**Mr. Shay** stated the EIFS itself had almost no insulative value. You were really relying on the backup in the wall. If it was applied over Styrofoam, then Styrofoam had an insulated capacity. He did not think that was how it was detailed or proposed to be detailed on this project because it would be placed over sheathing.

**Dr. Caplan** asked them to address the awning.

**Mr. Shay** stated the proposed awning was a canvas awning that was a substitute for the steel or metal and glass awning, because of the idea of putting glass over top of your head, the glass itself becomes something that had to be more carefully fabricated than glass you would put in an ordinary window. It proved to be prohibitively expensive and he thought it was an issue that the hotel developer would like to substitute for economic reasons.

**Mr. Mark Smith** stated he was one of the owners of the project, and wanted to emphasize that they made a very expensive decision to eliminate the through-wall air conditioning units to enhance the appearance of the building. It was a very expensive and positive change. They had obtained approval to use the through-wall unit back in 2002 when the building was initially approved. In trying to make the project feasible economically, they were proposing to eliminate copper because the copper prices have gone crazy in the last year, and using metal that looked like copper won't stain the sidewalks like copper. The EIFS is essentially a stucco look-alike or a stucco substitute. As Mr. Shay stated it was more durable than stucco and will not wick the

water like stucco would, but that was essentially it. Going from stone to stucco in order to find the dollars to eliminate the through-wall air conditioning units.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) supported the comments of Staff. As discussed when this petition came before this Board previously, this site holds a very important position in the Downtown Commercial District. Downgrading real materials to synthetic materials will undervalue the significance of this structure. The ARC feels that the cast stone, copper tower, and glass entrance are character-defining features for the building, and are appropriate choices as approved in 2002 during the design detail phase of this petition.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Ms. DeLuckie that they were not agreeing with Staff as far as the roof tower, and they want the petitioner to stay with copper.

**Ms. Dolecki** answered yes.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Steffen** stated there were three separate issues, and wanted to know if the Board wished to consider them together or separately, and that either way was appropriate. First, there are the materials the petitioner would use on the walls, cornice and windows. Second, there was the metal roof tower, and thirdly was the change of awnings.

**Mr. Neely** stated he personally did not have a problem with what was proposed. He thought it was a reasonable and practical solution to an expensive project. He said they were reasonable compromises.

**Mr. Gay** stated, as he understood it, the air conditioning unit set up was previously approved.

**Mr. Steffen** stated Mr. Smith mentioned it as something that was done early on that cost raised the price of the project, but it really did not have anything to do with what the Board was deciding.

**Mr. Gay** stated it was approved, but it was approved the other way.

**Mr. Steffen** said right, and stated the Board was not being asked to revisit that issue today. The three issues they had were before them.

**Dr. Caplan** stated he was concerned about the awnings, and he thought it was something that may need to be addressed more. He could understand the roofing material, he did not know that much about EIFS and did not think any of the Board members did, and maybe the architects did not know that much about it. He was not sure he could take issue with it because they had to depend upon what Mr. Shay says in good faith. He thought there was a lot of subjectivity to the awning in the entranceway, and he thought it might be something the Board may want to discuss.

**Mr. Deering** stated he did not mind the changes, that he had use Arriscraft before, he thought it was a great product, and he thought that with nine or ten stories in the air you would not be able to tell that the copper roof was not a copper roof. He said the Board has allowed EIFS at the third story and above on other projects. With the canopy, he agreed that they not have canvas, get rid of the glass, and do something else that would have a more permanent appearance. He really liked the scale of the old canopy because it was a big building and it would look rather

weak if it was just canvas. If they could do a marquee-type thing but not out of the glass, that maybe that would help save some money, and still maintain the substantial design element that they had on the previous building.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that maybe the Board could have a motion to approve the first two parts of the petition, and ask for the third to come back to Staff.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she agreed, and said it would be acceptable to her.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the amended petition, with the condition that the canopy be restudied to have more permanence and resubmitted to Staff for final approval. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Continued Petition of Gonzalez Architects  
Jose` Gonzalez  
H-06-3550-2  
304 East Bryan  
New Construction of a Hotel Development**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting Part II Design approval for a proposed four-story extended stay hotel on the lots between 304 East Bryan Street and 324 East Bryan Street.

**FINDINGS:**

Part I Height and Mass were approved August 9, 2006.

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

The following are concerns that were expressed in the September Review Board meeting followed with the action taken by the petition to address the concerns.

1. The use of unsupported balconies, detailing, and depth.  
The applicant has deleted the balconies.
2. No entries within the stucco portions.  
The applicant has placed doors at ground level in the stucco portions on Bryan Street.
3. Columns too thin and wood columns at ground level on ground supported balcony.  
The ground columns have been changed to brick.
4. Doors to balconies in eastern bay on Bryan Street too wide; recessed panels in parapet are not evenly spaced.

The balconies and therefore, the doors, have been eliminated. The roof shape has been changed to a gable eliminating the parapet. The height is essentially the same but the form is now three stories and a gable roof instead of four stories with a flat roof and parapet.

- 5. Concern with the belt course between the third and fourth floors.  
All belt courses and the rustication in the brick section have been eliminated. Including the belt course on the brick four-story units on Bryan Street at the Parlor Floor level.
- 6. Size of windows.

The parlor floor windows, which had been elongated at the request of the Board, have been shortened again so there is no variation on the brick façade.

The concerns raised by the Board that have not been addressed include the visibility of the concrete on the underside of the stoop, the detail of the stoop entablature and railing, and the trash enclosure.

Other changes noted on the drawing are the addition of dentils to the cornice on the two bay stucco portion on Bryan Street; the scoring of the stucco raised basement on the gable roofed portion on Bryan Street; the addition of a white band at the cornice of the four-story brick section on Bryan Street.

**The following Part II Design Standards apply to the revised project:**

<b>PART II DESIGN DETAILS</b>		
<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Materials	<u>Brick:</u> Century Plus Columbia 4 rough red with a red mortar. <u>Stucco:</u> Provence Crème By Behr	<u>Brick:</u> Staff recommends that a material sample board be installed on site to study the mortar and brick color. Recent projects elsewhere in the District lack contrast and depth because the brick and mortar are so monochromatic.
Windows, Doors	<u>Windows:</u> Marvin Ultimate, Insulated aluminum clad, “Storm Plus” Medium Bronze. The lintels and sills will be Continental Cast stone in a cream color. Windows are recessed 6” from face of building. Stucco lintels will be used in stucco sections. <u>Doors:</u> Marvin Ultimate Clad entry door and sidelight system for high stoop entries.	See comment on parlor floor window changes above.
Stoops	Brick piers, concrete stairs with cast stone bull nose treads and cast stone risers, cast iron railing painted Black Suede S-H-790, painted wood column and molding, wood cornice. The stoop canopy is slightly sloped to drain.	The stoop has been redesigned to have bull nose steps



Facades	A brick façade is proposed on most of the elevations. The brick is red and the mortar is red. There is contrast with the cast stone lintels and sills.	An enlarged materials sample on site would help determine whether the red brick and mortar are too monochromatic. The belt course at the parlor level of the four-story brick section on Bryan Street should be retained to relate to historic treatments on buildings of this type.
Lincoln Street: Lower building new	The center door opening has been infilled with brick and two door openings have been added on either side of the bricked area.	
Balconies:	Balconies have been retained on the east, rear, and Lincoln Street elevations.	There has been no change in the balcony detail. Please clarify depth of balcony and whether it meets the ordinance. Also, clarify whether the balconies on Lincoln Street project or are just railings across the openings.
Renovation of the one-story historic building	The renovation restores the arched opening on Bryan Street and installs a double door. The existing openings on Lincoln Street are being infilled with an unidentified material and two doors installed. The adjacent portion of the new building is setback some on Bryan Street so the old building “reads”.	The basic character of the building is retained, however, the infilling of the openings on Lincoln Street is visually incompatible. The use of glass with glass doors would seem to be a better approach.
Roof:	Most of the roofs are behind parapets; however, the new gable roof appears to be metal.	Please provide a sample of the roof material.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval of Part II Design Details and change in roof shape of the eastern unit on Bryan Street with the conditions that the belt course is retained at the parlor level of the brick four-story section on Bryan Street and provision of roof material sample for review. Also, the clarification of the balcony projections.

**Dr. Caplan** stated Staff brought up things that were of great concern, yet Staff recommended approval of the project without addressing the concerns. He asked if the Board was to assume that Staff had discussed the concerns but were still willing to accept it as it is, with the exception of the things Staff had asked for.

**Ms. Ward** stated that Staff did want to see the details provided to them. Especially with the treatment of the portico under the base and clarification of the balconies that were the main thing. She said the parlor level windows had been decreased in height, however, what was submitted still appeared to be visually compatible and she wanted to note that the change was made.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if Staff felt that they were items that were visually compatible.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that Mr. Gonzalez had brought the petition up many times, and the Board needed to get it going.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if the Board asked for the windows to be elongated and they shortened them more.

**Ms. Ward** stated it what was previously submitted. The windows were elongated to address some of the early comments that the Board had said, because they were all the same size going all the way up the building. Back in September, this was what they had submitted. The windows were shortened a little bit, but they were still longer than the other windows, and Staff felt they were visually compatible.

**Mr. Mitchell** said what he heard was what the Board asked for the petitioner did just the opposite.

**Mr. Gay** stated the mortar between the bricks matches the bricks and it seemed strange. He asked why they would not use white mortar.

**Ms. Ward** stated the applicant is stating that he wanted to address that. She said there was both a white and red mortar on the sample, and Staff had concerns about the monochromatic quality that it might create. That was why Staff asked that a sample panel to be erected to look at it prior to construction of the walls.

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

**Mr. Jose` Gonzalez** stated he wanted to clarify a few things, tell the Board that as a firm they had met several times with the neighbors, and that they had made some revisions in response to the neighbors. He wanted to make sure the items were properly discussed so that there was absolutely no confusion about it. He said the massing was changed significantly on one side, primarily to transition from the residences on the square to the commercial. In doing so, they had to realign the spaces within the building, but they were able to do that. In the neighborhood meetings it was discussed that the brick on this particular building be differentiated than the brick that was used throughout the rest of the project. To clarify, the brick that was on the west was brick that matches the building that was on Bay Street that was currently part of the hotel. The other brick the neighborhood had requested, Mr. McDonald of Historic Savannah Foundation be responsible for selecting the brick. They had several samples in their office, and Mr. McDonald came to their office and selected the brick that was before the Board, as the brick to be submitted. He said it was a pencil white mortar joint that was a very small mortar joint on the brick. The brick on the west matches what was used on the building on Bay Street. The building gets a very thin white mortar joint.

**Mr. Deering** stated he had tried to do that before with modern bricks and modern building material, and not having a masonry substrate, and that buttered line joint they used to call it in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, is very difficult to achieve. The brick that was selected he thought it looked like what they built schoolhouses out of in the 1950's. He said he built probably eight sample walls of various bricks and tried to achieve that buttered joint, and it was almost impossible. He wanted to warn the petitioner that it might not succeed.

**Mr. Gay** asked how they did it in the old days.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said they had good masons.

**Mr. Deering** stated there were two or three bricks wide behind it and it was easy enough to achieve, but if you use a steel substrate, it was almost impossible.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated Mr. Deering was correct. He said they were using a concrete block substrate, and he thought they could get a good ability to get the joint tight. That was a problem, and in the old walls, it was almost all masonry.

**Mr. Deering** stated the Philadelphia red brick had a little bit of the different appearance that what was being presented.

**Mr. Gay** stated he would like the brick to be a little redder.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated they had no objection at all. He said the Neighborhood Task Force and Mr. McDonald would select the brick. They had dozens of bricks in their office, Mr. McDonald came and went through several, and the one that was selected was submitted. One of the representations that were made to the neighborhood was that the window was supposed to be a Marvin wood window. It was not going to be a clad window on the elevations. The ideal was that it should be residential in character, and they had agreed that on the façade the windows would be a wood and not a clad window. The painting of the window would be the same dark brown, which is called medium bronze, but it is not really a bronze, it was almost a brown like the MPC logo behind the Board. It was used throughout the balance of the building. He said he wanted to clarify that, and they had no problem using the approved windows they had used throughout the building. It was something that was representative of the neighborhood, and it was not clear on the documents. As you move through the rest of the building, there was no EIFS so there was no need to discuss it. The building was either brick or stucco, and it was all on masonry or a concrete substrate. The historic building on the corner was being restored to the greatest extent possible to its original configuration with an exception to an area that was seriously altered in the past. As a gesture to the integrity of the building, they did not feel that it should be infilled with some sort of a dummy approximation of the original. They had filled it in with stucco in the doorway. As you go around the west, the rest of the building was brick with cast stone lintels, as was used in the west of the building. In the back of the building, the open balconies had been eliminated. The only balconies that exist face the courtyard. All of the detailing had been taken off the streets. The canopy would all be done in wood and it would be painted white. He hoped they had addressed all of the concerns, and if they had not, they would be more than happy to do so. He thought the neighborhood had been very kind in meeting with them. They met regularly, and everything from window dimensions had come about because of the meetings. One of the discussions was in regard to the windows, they worked with it until they found a window scale that everyone felt comfortable with, and it was slightly different from the elevation from the adjoining structure to differentiate it as a different building.

**Ms. Ward** stated she left one comment out of the Staff report, and Mr. Gonzalez may want to comment on it. Regarding the historic building in the Lincoln Street façade, the openings had changed to have the arches put in as an effort to correspond to the neighboring buildings. Right now, they were just rectangular openings with no historic fabric inside of them. It was previously submitted to infill them with a glass storefront treatment, and Staff felt it was a much better way to solve the issue as opposed to creating new openings within an existing opening to keep it simple. It still reads as former garage door openings that were here before.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if it was Staff's preference was for the original drawing that was submitted.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated they felt the storefront was not a traditional use of material in that kind of structure. The kind of openings that would have been there, even though they did not want to represent them as fake brick openings, they felt it was a better response to the building.

**Dr. Caplan** stated they did not address the depths of the balcony. He asked if they were 36 inches or less.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated he wanted to ask the question of Staff because he was not clear regarding the question. He asked if Dr. Caplan was asking if the other balconies were three feet or less.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said yes, it was the rule.

**Dr. Caplan** stated they did not know that because it was not indicated.

**Mr. Deering** stated on the building on the end that was closer to Habersham Street, on the Bryan Street elevation there were six-over-six windows, on the east elevation they had the drawings, and the Bay lane elevations were two-over-two windows. He thought they should all be the same.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated it was brought to his attention and that it was an error. They were six-over-six.

**Mr. Deering** stated in the gable that could be seen, historically, most houses would have had a small window in the gable where the end could be seen.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated they did not have a problem inserting it.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if there was any comment or anything further on the utilities or the trash receptacles.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated they had a photograph of the current one they were using, and they did not envision expanding it. With increased load, they have additional visits to remove the garbage.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if it was going to be shared by the other hotels.

**Mr. Gonzalez** answered yes.

**Mr. Seiler** stated one of the neighbors say last month that it frequently overflows.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated the trash was overflowing because they had an issue about them not coming out as they were supposed to and maintain the level. They did not need to expand it; they just needed to have the pick-up more often than what was being done.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Bill Stuebe (Architectural Review Committee – Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated the ARC applauds the great work that had been done on the project, and they had brought it to what they hope was going to be a great project. There were a number of little details that needed to be addressed, to be sure that it all comes together the way it should. He said he had prepared a list of the details and passed it out to the Board for them to see what they were.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if Mr. Gonzalez or a representative had a copy of the list.

Mr. Stuebe answered yes; they had given it to them before. He stated the concerns as follows:

**Historic Savannah Foundation Architectural Review Committee**

Comments Re: 304 East Bryan Street

October 10, 2006

**ENTRANCES**

Provide one-inch to one-foot drawings of the Marvin Ultimate Clad Entry Door and Sidelight Systems to be used for the high stoop entries.

Provide for the installation of a beam framing the portico roof on high stoop entrances.

Provide a more substantial newel post for high stoop entrance balustrades.

Provide detail drawings of wooden steps at high stoop entrances.

Delete one door at base of easternmost stucco façade. Replace with a window to line up with windows above.

**WINDOWS AND SHUTTERS**

Provide details of windows. The standards specify that, “the muntins shall be no wider than 7/8 inches; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding.”

Windows specified in the eastern most building are not consistent nor do they conform to the floor plans. Six-over-six windows are shown on the south façade while two-over-two windows are shown on the eastern and northern façades. The northern elevation depicts six windows while the plans only show one window on the second and third floors.

The elevation of the ground floor of the northern façade shows a blank opening. The plan shows a guest room. However, no windows are shown on the plan of the guest room.

The top floor elevation of the first stucco building to the west shows a window and balcony while the plan shows this space as a storage room without windows.

These issues need to be clarified.

The medium-bronze color specified for the window color is inappropriate. Provide appropriate window colors for the various architectural styles used in the project.

“Stucco is not structural and is not a recommended material for sills” (See H-06-3690-2) Similarly, stucco should not be used for lintels. Replace stucco sills and lintels with a more structural material.

The standards provide that, “Shutters shall be hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening.” Provide specifications for shutters including materials to be used and color(s).

### HVAC

A3.00 shows HVAC equipment on the roof level of the section. Will there be additional HVAC equipment and where will it be placed? Will vents be necessary in the rooms? If so, how will they be handled on the exterior?

### FAÇADE DETAILS

Provide elevation and section of the white band at cornice of the four-story brick section.

Red mortar is inappropriate for the project. Provide appropriate mortar samples.

### PARKING

The site plan notes eleven parking spaces. However, only nine autos are shown on the plan. Is there parking under the eastern most section? If so, how is the entrance to the space under the building configured? Will parking under the building negate the guest room referenced above?

**Mr. Neely** stated their drawings showed two doors.

**Mr. Stuebe** stated there should be one door and one window. Normally, at the bottom level of a house you have one door going in and not two doors going in.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if Mr. Stuebe was speaking as an individual or on behalf of the ARC.

**Mr. Stuebe** stated he was speaking on behalf of the ARC

**Mr. Steffen** asked if they were all suggestions from the ARC.

**Mr. Stuebe** answered yes, they were.

**Mr. Paul Hansen** stated he was a neighbor who had been a part of the meetings they had with Mr. Gonzalez. He said they agreed because they felt there were some inconsistencies with what had been presented today, over and above what had been talked about in the meetings they had. Some progress had been made with the façade of the buildings. When they had talked about the building, it would be a wood porch and wood treads and risers, and what they have now was concrete and some sort of material over the concrete that was not detailed out. In other instances, the porches show a concrete slab with wood over the top with no understanding of how the wood was fastened to the concrete, and it showed an exposed edge of concrete over the porch. There were no details that show how the surface interfaced with the sloped roof, not details of the cornice work, they talked about the things that needed to be brought out and worked up, and he was sure Mr. Gonzalez would do that. Their concerns as property owners was there were so many little things that they felt like it needed to come back to the Board, let the Board make sure they have had a full submission in that everything was detailed properly, and not to relegate this many things to Staff to look at and approve. He said it was a huge building, in their opinion the only way it would be successful was the detailing had to be consistent with the style of the architecture, and they do not see that right now in the project. They would encourage that the Board have the architect detail the building correctly, and bring it back to the Board for review and approval.

**Mr. Graham Sadler** stated he was also a neighbor and a part of the group that met with Mr. Gonzalez. He wanted to echo what Mr. Hansen said regarding the details, and to commend Mr. Gonzalez. He said it was a very large structure that the Board approved, and they had asked Mr. Gonzalez to transition from the neighborhood to the commercial area without bringing the Bay Street hotel culture onto Bryan Street. The morphing of the tything lots was unfortunate.

The gable roof and changing from concrete to wood was very important to them because it had much more of the sense of Warren Square. He commended Mr. Gonzalez for giving a lot of thought particularly to the eastern portion of the building. It was a massive space that was approved, and many people are uncomfortable with the stagefront aspect of the project. It could be a lot more frightening in terms of impact on the neighborhood. He said once they get the details wrapped up they would have something that would transition a lot better than what they had seen previously.

**Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated the list that they had was submitted to Mr. Gonzalez, and they had talked at length today on the telephone about it. He had addressed most of the issues with her personally. She said what they ask from the ARC is that they all be addressed in design details. The Historic Savannah Foundation would like to thank the petitioner for working closely with them and with the residents of Warren Square over the past month. They felt the changes in height and mass have significantly reduced the scale of the structure, allowing it to better integrate with the neighborhood. The design details and materials are the final challenge to incorporate an appropriate commercial structure in this residential neighborhood. Historic Savannah Foundation is committed to working with Mr. Gonzalez and the residents of Warren Square to reach an agreeable solution.

**Mr. Steffen** stated from their comments and based on Mr. Gonzalez's response that they would disagree with what Mr. Hansen said, that they felt there was enough here that it could go back to Staff.

**Ms. Dolecki** stated she could not speak for Warren Square, but would say that the comments they wrote on the list go back to Staff, it would be o.k. with them. They did not address the comments in their conversation that Mr. Hansen had, and she could not speak for that.

**Mr. Steffen** stated to make it clear to the public, he was asking the questions not because they were telling the Board what to do, but he thought it was important for the Board to know what they were being asked to do. He wanted to make sure he understood.

**Ms. Dolecki** stated that they had not discussed the questions with Mr. Hansen.

**Ms. Cathy Ledvina** stated she was also part of the committee that worked with Mr. Gonzalez on the project, and he had made many improvements to the Bryan Street façade of the project. Unfortunately, she thought what they were all forgetting was Lincoln Street. A one-story historic corner building will be remaining and would be restored. However, behind the corner building was a significant portion of the rear lot that was being developed, and was being treated as a single building like the other ones, which was wonderful. She said she was familiar with the north-south streets, and many significant buildings were not constructed on Lincoln Street, which was a north-south street. There were other properties with the same massing, the 35-foot front on Lincoln Street, that have been developed on the lane. She showed photographs of buildings at 117 Lincoln Street, 339 Whitaker, and 143 Abercorn that were all within the 35-foot range of the building that was proposed. What was similar with all of the buildings were the three-bay façade rhythms. She said if you look at the setback requirements from the guidelines, you would see what was and was not permitted, and if you look at the example, the setbacks were not typically permitted. The architect and the Board had approved a setback for the Lincoln Street building already, and with the recent proposal, the petitioner is asking for another setback. The two-story, masonry three-bay portico, with balconies on top and in the middle did not articulate into a three-bay rhythm. The portico was three-bay, but the building overall was only two-bay, and for a 35-foot width, it should be articulated with a three-bay rhythm and simplify the detail to get rid of the heavy brick two-story portico in the front of the building. If he chooses to set it back, the only thing the Staff had set about the Lincoln Street building was that it was setback to offset the historic building, which was nice, but she did not

think it needed to be done because it was going to be a new building when compared to the very historic building. That was the only thing that Staff had addressed, and it was one of her major concerns, that the building was being articulated as an east-west building and not a north-south small street building. It was not in keeping with the historic properties that were already present in Savannah in rhythm and proportion with the heavy two-story portico.

**Mr. Joe Saseen** stated it was a lot of brick that was massive. There was nothing wrong with the design in certain places, but it seemed they needed something to break up the mass. He said he was not an architect, but the building would look much more attractive if they were separated to break up the huge mass of brick

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Steffen** asked the Board to discuss it before they asked Mr. Gonzalez to come back and address the specifics. He thought they had gotten into some details that were probably beyond the purview of the Board.

**Mr. Deering** stated he did not think they had gotten into anything that was beyond the purview of the Board.

**Mr. Steffen** stated they were talking about the parking and things like that.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated they had.

**Mr. Deering** stated they were only talking about openings.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the Board needed to focus on what they could do.

**Mr. Deering** stated the Board had to understand that Staff might not think they want to review all of the items individually.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated the Board might not want them to. She thought the Board was running into dangerous territory where there were too many people trying to design a project. She said it was not the Board's purview, and they could make some recommendations, but the minutia that was contained in the memo with the exception of the direct references to the ordinance, it bordered on designing and trying to redesign the project. If the Board did not like the design that was presented or if the Board wanted more detail that was one thing, but she did not think the project should be redesigned

**Mr. Deering** stated there was nothing in the memo that the Historic Savannah Foundation gave the Board that was about redesigning the project. It was about clarifications to the drawings that were submitted, and the details that would be required of almost any other petitioner in submitting a petition this large. He said Mr. Shay's firm does it, and other firms submit projects with all of the details taken care of. There were drafting omissions where there were windows not on the plan, those things should be clarified and there were quite a few of them. There were some details that Staff had brought up that he and others addressed last month that were not addressed in the petition. There were simply no answers to some of the things the Board brought up, there were no details to some things that should be detailed and he agreed with the Historic Savannah Foundation because it was a good list.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated deleting a door at the base at the eastern most stucco façade and replacing the window was a design detail. The medium-bronze color specified for the window colors appropriate was a design detail. She said she did not want to go through the list, but there were some valid concerns. She thought it had come to the point that they were over



designing Mr. Gonzalez's project, and if the Board personally wanted some more design details, then we should address Mr. Gonzalez and please present some more details based on the concerns.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated he was not particularly blown off course by the fact there were many details, and the project had been going on for a while. When there were details that were very important and substantive to the issue as a whole of what it should be, it did not bother him that they go longer. The point was to end up with something that Mr. Gonzalez and everyone was going to be satisfied with, and particularly for the community in the area. He said he had no problem dealing with the details and let's just go ahead and do it. He said he did not look it as trying to design his project, but the fact there were so many things was indicative of the fact that many people had spent a lot of time going over it. In the end, Mr. Gonzalez would appreciate it as well, he was fine with it, and let's do what we have to do.

**Dr. Caplan** stated he was personally a little distraught over this because he thought Mr. Gonzalez had been very patient, and he made some very significant and nice changes. He said Warren Square was a particularly sensitive area; he personally had a great deal of interest in Warren Square, and was most appreciative of the changes. However, many issues needed to be addressed. He wanted to read something that was agreed to by the Board back in January of 2004 as a response to a request by an architect for some procedural changes, and the Board agreed to it.

Continuance: "When a petitioner is asked by the Board to request a continuance, the Board must be specific regarding what items or issues need to be readdressed. Items not specifically discussed by the Board should not be readdressed at the continued meeting. These items were assumed to be approved. The Chair should summarize the reason for the continuance."

He said the reason he read it was, he thought the items needed to be addressed but it should stop there. He would like Mr. Gonzalez to take the list and the other things that had been asked, it was part of the minutes, the Board would ask Mr. Gonzalez to readdress those, and not bring anything else in. In the meantime, he would ask Mr. Gonzalez to please, stop changing the plans. Do not put an infill where a window was previously. Let's get this project going. He said he knew that was what Mr. Gonzalez wanted. He had been on the Board for six years and they have been talking about this project for a year, he is leaving, and he wanted to see it finished before he is gone. He thought all of them did and he knew Mr. Gonzalez did. He would like Mr. Gonzalez to ask for a continuance with the items that were mentioned or address, and nothing else brought in.

**Mr. Gay** asked why doesn't Mr. Gonzalez address them right now. Most likely, many of them were things that he would just say fine to.

**Dr. Caplan** stated there were so many that if they could do it right now was fine, but they need to be addressed and the Board needed to stop it right there.

**Mr. Gay** agreed.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated first of all as to Mr. Gonzalez not changing the items, one or two of the Board members actually thought that the change was a better change in terms of the arch versus the window. She did not think the Board should say do not change it because that was what Mr. Gonzalez does and that was what he was supposed to do, he was an architect. He was supposed to interpret the Board's concerns, and come up with changes.

**Dr. Caplan** stated the Board did not ask for that to be done.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated they did. She said she heard Mr. Mitchell say he liked it, and she did not get a chance to say she liked his interpretation. The Board was not a unanimous group, but her point was that if the Board found there were details that should be brought back that were violating the ordinance or the guidelines, and then the Board ought to direct Mr. Gonzalez. The ARC does not direct Mr. Gonzalez, the Board does and the Board ought to identify the details they would like Mr. Gonzalez to address. He did not have to address this in her opinion.

**Mr. Gay** said if Mr. Gonzalez was willing to do it then let him do it.

**Dr. Caplan** stated what the Board needed to do was one way or another, either today or another day, if the Board was willing to take each one of the items right now and review them, that was fine. What he wanted to do was stop the procedure. He said let's do this and get it done either this month or next month, but let's get it done.

**Mr. Steffen** stated two things had been said he thought was absolutely crucial to the way they do business on the Board, and absolutely correct. He said Dr. Caplan had indicated that the Board did not want to present to the people who come before them that they were a moving target, or, they come back with one set of concerns and then next month there were a whole new set of concerns. That was absolutely wrong, and he agreed 100 percent that the Board needed to let the petitioners know what was expected of them when there was a continuance. Secondly, he agreed completely with Ms. Fortson-Waring that it was the Board's responsibility to tell a petitioner what the Board expected of them, and what things the Board wanted addressed. It was not the responsibility of any organization or any individual in the public to dictate to the petitioners what they were or were not to do. As was said just a moment ago, when a member of the public comes to the Board, he was very interested, and the Board was very interested in knowing what their opinions were, and specifically when Mr. Stuebe gave the Board a list they were glad to take the list and say, "we want to know what the public or what Historic Savannah thought was important." Ultimately, it was the obligation of the Board to decide what was important. There were many visitors today, and he wanted to make that clear to the public that the Board had been charged with the responsibility, Ms. Fortson-Waring was absolutely correct that it was not the Board's job to give lists presented by the public to the petitioners and say, "come back to us and talk about it." It was the Board's job to decide what was important and what was not.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that he was not suggesting that the Board do that. He was suggesting that the Board talk about each one of the items as they do on any type of item that was brought up by the public.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated the Board all understood what their responsibilities were. He said with all that put aside, sometimes there were things the Board forget, and just because something was presented by someone in the public, most of them were professionals in some aspect of what the Board does in that field. He was not inflexible as not to listen, because whatever was coming to him was valid and it was something he might have overlooked, then he was going to give it some consideration.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated her point was to make that consideration, to identify what it was based on what had been brought to the Board's attention. Identify what it was they want Mr. Gonzalez to address.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he wanted to hear from Mr. Gonzalez, but he did not want him to address every single item on the list because they do not know if those were important to the Board right now. If Mr. Gonzalez wanted to tell the Board what issues had been satisfactorily resolved, and what Mr. Gonzalez thought were still out there, that the Board needed to deal with, he would be glad to hear it.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated he appreciated the fact that the neighbors came to meet with him regularly, he knew everyone was busy, but to take the time showed a nice concern. He thought they would have one or two people, but the neighbors were all consistently there. Therefore, he thought their comments should be regarded. First, he said he would like to request a continuance to address the issues.

**Mr. Neely** said, "So moved".

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** seconded the motion.

**Mr. Steffen** stated to Mr. Gonzalez that he had to follow procedure, and the procedure was there was a motion and a second made by the Board for continuance as requested. He needed to ask the Board to have discussion on it, and if the Board wanted to have him speak some more they could do that, but he had to go by the procedure. He asked if there was any discussion on the continuance motion.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated she did not mind Mr. Gonzalez discussing it briefly after the motion, but she would like to go forward with the motion.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if they were in Board Discussion.

**Mr. Steffen** stated they were in discussion on the motion to continue the petition.

**Dr. Caplan** stated he just wondered if it was legal to make a motion at this time in the discussion. He did not know if they were in Board discussion or not.

**Mr. Steffen** stated they were.

**Mr. Neely** stated he wanted to withdraw his motion if he could, and asked if the procedure was correct.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he could.

**Mr. Neely** stated for the Board to have a brief address of some of the more important items.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated the seconder did not accept it.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the motion was still on the floor, and they were going to follow the rules. There had been a motion made on a continuance, and asked if there was any further discussion on the motion. It could be voted up or down.

**Mr. Gonzalez** asked if he could withdraw his request for a continuance.

**Mr. Steffen** answered no, and said he would still allow Mr. Gonzalez to talk at the end of it, but to go ahead and have a vote on the motion by a show of hands because there may be a difference.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Neely made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review continue this item with details to come back to Staff. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**Mr. Steffen** stated because they had a motion for continuance, and as Dr. Caplan mentioned, it was very important for the Board to know what issues they expect to have addressed. He

wanted to have Mr. Gonzalez to address the Board briefly, and then the Board could add clarification to that if they needed to.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated he agreed with Dr. Caplan, because of everyone involved, he wanted to be clear on what items they would address. He stated he was going through the Architectural Review Committee's list, and if there were any issues that he had left out that were in the Staff's recommendations, he would be glad to address those as well. He thought the list also incorporated some of the residents' comments, and he would discuss what he heard from the neighbors.

For the windows they would provide the cut-sheet as they normally do; the wood windows on the residential part and the difference on it. He had no objections to them being white, which was brought up even though it was not on the list. The beam detail on the portico, they had no objection to it, and said it should have a recess on the soffit. The newel post, they would do it as well. They indicated the steps would be wooden, they were incorrectly drawn on the plans and it was a true error. Deleting the one door he would take issue with it because he liked the way the two doors look, he would let the Board decide on it. With the issue of the windows that had subsequent discussions, he wanted to clarify that the windows shown were not incorrect, they were dummy windows. The reason they did that in the Disneyesque concept was in order to maintain the integrity of the residential look. He said it would have been absurd to have just a single window and then a blank. He said they could do it with a fake window, a simple reveal of a window that was blocked in, or whatever the Board preferred. They were not drawn incorrectly, that was exactly what the intent was, and he apologized for the confusion if it was not clear on their documents. The color they would keep the bronze to match on the rest of the building, but they would do the white on the windows. On the stucco issue, he thought it was just a misread. He said it was true stucco, the lintels and the sills were expressed as projections on the built-up stucco, and that they were not additional stone lintels with stucco infill. They preferred it for one reason; to maintain the integrity of the waterproofing. The older detail in some buildings that were done with stone details with stucco up to it leak, and they would not do that.

**Mr. Deering** stated he gathered Mr. Gonzalez was talking about stucco lintels and sills on the stucco building.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said that was correct, and it was only there. Everywhere else it was stone which they had said, and he wanted to clarify the issue.

On the shutters, they had done the shutters as was discussed with the neighbors, and they were operable shutters that were black. That was the suggested color and they would provide the detail for the shutters. The HVAC equipment was concealed. He said they show a detail in there that the condenser units were concealed behind the parapet. There were no vents or grills, no PTAC units or anything on the façade issue, they were not showing any because none exists. The drawings were accurate in the representation. They do not show a roof plan of the final condensing units because it would be designing the mechanical plan. They were representing that they were totally concealed behind the parapet. They clarified the brick issue; the rest of the brick matches the building, and the other brick was a pencil joint with white mortar joint. In regard to the parking space issue, as part of the massing realignment they had done at the last minute for the neighbors to reduce the massing, they ended up taking up a bay. The drawings were incorrect in terms of the last minute change because the change was made so late the drawings did not show the change of the unit represented. He did not have any problem with these changes. These were the comments and said they should be taken as he listed them, and this was what he thought they should do unless the Board wanted to add something else.

**Mr. Deering** stated he had to agree with Ms. Ledvina on the Lincoln Street elevation, that the Board had never permitted the brick detailing.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated they could delete it.

**Mr. Deering** stated he would rather they just delete it because it did not seem to fit the environment.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated they did not have a problem with deleting it.

**Mr. Gay** stated Mr. Hansen brought up the eastern most building with the slanted roof, and asked how it tied in to project into the next building.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated it actually met perfectly because it was the perfect flashing against it.

**Mr. Gay** stated it would go up and then the roof would go back.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said that was correct, and there was no conflict there whatsoever. He stated they could provide an extra detail. He said Mr. Deering pointed out that he would like a window on the end of the gable. If that was the pleasure of the Board, they would be delighted to take care of it.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he would ask the Board for their consent on two things. One, was that the Board did not specify that it was continued to the November meeting, and he wanted the Board's consent that it was what they had voted on.

**The Board consented.**

**Mr. Steffen** said secondly, Mr. Gonzalez had gone through the issues he believed the Board had articulated to him, for what the Board wanted continued. There were two other questions from Board members, and asked if there was anything else from the Board they believed the petitioner needed to address in the continuance.

**Dr. Caplan** stated the discrepancies on the drawing between the windows.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that was what he was clarifying, as it was one of the issues.

**Dr. Caplan** asked what was the elevation a mistake or was the room window the mistake.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated it was neither, it was a dummy window and was intended to be a dummy window to maintain the rhythm on the exterior, but it was not an operable window from the inside. He said there was another comment he had failed to mention, that the neighbor had pointed out to clarify that the entire stoop with the exception of the brick supports would be a wood detail, wood steps, and that was what they would represent and it would be shown on the drawing.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if there were any other issues that the Board wished Mr. Gonzalez to address on the continuance. He stated that he would strictly ask they limit their discussion to those issues at the next meeting in November, and remind the public and those present on the project they were more than welcome to address any of the issues they had under consideration. He said he thought the Board would favorably look at new issues being brought up, unless Mr. Gonzalez came up with a design that was substantially different from what he had presented to the Board today. He thanked Mr. Yellin for providing him with the recitation on the legal issues involved along with the notice that it was very helpful, and he wanted to thank

him for sending a copy to Ms. Chisholm because it closed the loop for the Board. He appreciated the professionalism on behalf of both of those individuals. He then recognized the instructor and students from the Savannah College of Art and Design in the Historic Preservation program, who were also students of Mr. Hutchinson.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated if they had not read the By-Laws, they were not all architects. She said she and Mr. Steffen were lawyers, and that was why the students would not hear them say the appropriate design words. She stated if they would look at the occupations of the members of the Board, they were not all architects or design people, but they were there to try to apply the ordinance and the guidelines as best they could.

**Mr. Steffen** thanked the students for coming.

Mr. Gay left at approximately 3:45 p.m.

**RE: Continued Petition of Poticny, Deering, Felder  
Architects  
H-06-3651-2  
501 West Harris Street - Battlefield Park  
New Construction of Part II Design Details of a  
Hotel Development**

The Preservation Officer recommends a **continuance**.

Present for the petition was Mr. John Deering.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

### **NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for Part I, Height and Mass, new construction of a 2.5-story cottage style hotel building labeled "Building F". In the previous submittal for Part I, this building was labeled Future Development and was not reviewed. In addition, the applicant is requesting approval for Part II, Design Details of the entire hotel development, comprised of a four-story main hotel building, a three-story building, and four cottage style buildings. The buildings are labeled "A" through "F" in the submittal as noted on the drawings. The proposed new construction is sited on five vacant parcels zoned B-C (Community-Business). A recombination subdivision plat will need to be filed and recorded prior to issuance of a building permit.

### **FINDINGS FOR PART I:**

**The following Part I, Height and Mass, Standards Apply for Building F:**

1. **Development Standards:** (No setbacks are required. No minimum lot area or maximum lot coverage is required for non-residential uses in a B-C zone). *The front yard setback is unclear. Staff recommends reducing the setback and placing the building closer to the street to be consistent with the proposed neighboring structure (Building B). Sidewalks and setback dimensions should be indicated on the site plan.*
2. **Street Elevation Type:** two- and one-half-story hotel building in the form of a semi-detached duplex (residential building types). *The proposed building is very similar in exterior appearance to Building E, which faces Harris Street.*

3. **Entrances:** Building F has a double stoop entrance along Charlton Street. *As in the previous Part I submittal for Building E, which is very similar, Staff recommends restudy of the double entrance. The wide span of the buildings call for a wider or more substantial entry. The porticos are not proportional to the width of the units.*
4. **Building Height:** (Three-story maximum height zone): The proposed two- and one-half-story building is approximately 30 inches tall.
5. **Floor-to-Floor Height** (Residential: First floor not less than 11 feet; each floor above, not less than 10 feet): The proposed building appears to have a 10-foot first floor height and an 8-foot second floor above. *In the previous submittal, the Board determined that lower floor-to-floor heights would be compatible in this area because historically they were more like what can be found in the Beach Institute.*
6. **Proportion of Structure’s Front Façade:** Like Buildings C, D, & E, Building F is 43 feet wide and 2 to 2.5 stories tall.
7. **Proportion of Openings:** Like Buildings C, D, & E, the window openings in Building F are 2.5:4.5.
8. **Rhythm of Solids to Voids:** Building F is comprised of four bays with independent portico entries. *Like the previous submittal for Building E, the number of bays appears incongruent with the width of the building. Staff recommends restudy to make the openings more proportionate to the width of the bays, possibly introducing three openings into each “unit”.*

**FINDINGS FOR PART II:**

On August 9, 2006, the Historic District Board of Review granted Part I, Height and Mass approval with the condition that a site plan indicating setbacks and sidewalks be provided and the following Staff comments be addressed during the Part II submittal:

1. An entrance be incorporated into the Charlton Street façade of Building B within the proposed storefront-type openings;
2. Raise the spring course on Building B to meet the 14-foot minimum first floor height standard. This has been addressed by the applicant.
3. Restudy of the double entrances on Buildings D and E.
4. Restudy the height and shape of the roof in conjunction with the second floor porch on Building D.
5. Restudy the rhythm of solids to voids in Building E as the number of bays appears incongruent with the width of the building.

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

Standard	Proposed	Comments
<b>(I)(5) Commercial Design Standards:</b>	<b>Buildings A and B:</b> a stringcourse is located above the ground level. All other standards apply to retail/commercial storefronts.	The standard is met.
<b>Windows and Doors:</b> Double-glazed windows are permitted	<b>Building A:</b> A frameless glass entrance door is used on	Provide detail of the glass entrance and how it connects to

<p>on non-historic facades and on new construction...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. Centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically. Sashes shall be inset not less than 3" from the façade of a masonry building.</p> <p><b>Shutters</b> shall be hinged, 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 durable wood. The historic review board may approve other materials upon a showing by the applicant that the product is visually compatible with historic building materials and has performed satisfactorily in the local climate.</p>	<p>Charlton and Harris Streets. Entrances are flanked by two smaller louvered false openings. Ground floor windows appear to be 6/6 double-hung windows. Second and third floor windows are 6/6 double-hung sash, aluminum clad wood windows made by Kolbe &amp; Kolbe. These windows are flanked by metal louvered panels, which shield the air conditioning units. The fourth floor windows are unclear. Steel shutters are indicated on the east elevation facing MLK on both the third and fourth floors.</p> <p><b>Building B:</b> Entrances are located on the sides within a recessed glass wall made of a Crittall steel frame window system attached with a steel beam. Window openings contain</p>	<p>the exterior wall (recessed or flush). Staff recommends restudy of the louvered openings. The use of louvers and shutters within this building competes with the number of actual windows. Verify ground floor window manufacturer. Verify Kolbe &amp; Kolbe muntin details (7/8" inch with spacer bar). Provide colors for metal louvers to Staff. Staff has concerns that the metal louvers create an appearance of false shutters, which would not typically be approved in the historic district. Clarification of the fourth floor fenestration; the extensive use of closed steel shutters is not recommended. Paired or grouped window/door openings would be a more appropriate treatment. Verify window details for fourth floor. The steel shutters on the third floor appear out of character with the rest of the building and should be louvered and operable if used.</p> <p>Staff recommends incorporating an entrance on the south elevation facing Charlton Street within the ground floor central portion of this building as per Part I recommendation. Verify</p>
	<p>2/2 and 6/6 double-hung sash Kolbe &amp; Kolbe windows. Decorative louvers to screen PTAK systems are located below windows fixed to walls.</p> <p><b>Buildings C-F:</b> 6/6 double-hung sash Kolbe &amp; Kolbe windows. Shutters are depicted. Entrance doors appear as paneled doors with transoms above.</p>	<p>Kolbe &amp; Kolbe specifications and materials of PTAK screens.</p> <p>Verify window muntin specs. Provide shutter material and indicate that they are operable. Provide door material.</p>
<p><b>Roof Shape:</b> Parapets shall have a stringcourse of not less than 6" in depth and extending at least 4" from the face of the building, running the full width of the building between 1-1.5' from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum 2" overhang.</p>	<p><b>Building A:</b> A crenellated parapet screens the fourth floor flat roof portion behind. A brick rowlock course is located approximately 2.5' from the metal coping cap.</p> <p><b>Building B:</b> A flat parapet with recessed panels is proposed. A brick rowlock course is located approx. 2.5' from the metal coping, both of which project</p>	<p>The band course and coping cap do not appear to meet the projection standards.</p> <p>See above.</p>



<p>Gable roof pitches shall be between 4:12 and 8:12. Roofs visible from the street shall be covered with standing seam metal, slate, and tile or asphalt shingles.</p>	<p>approx. 1" from the face of the building.</p> <p><b>Buildings C, E, &amp; F:</b> side gable roofs with gable end chimneys with an 8:12 pitch. Buildings E &amp; F will be surfaced in standing seam metal with 16" panels and a 1.5" ridge. Building C will be surfaced in Asphalt shingles (section indicates metal).</p>	<p>Staff has concerns about the proposed standing seam roof material. The sample provided indicates a rectangular ribbed seam. Staff recommends using a rolled (or simulated rolled) seam. The proposed roof seam appears as a modern commercial roof material and these are traditional type cottage style hotel rooms.</p>
<p><b>Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches:</b> Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street. Infill between piers shall be recessed so that the piers are expressed. 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 placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between balusters shall not exceed 4". Supported front porticos shall be constructed of wood...</p>	<p>Front portico entries are proposed on Buildings C through F. They will be supported by a continuous masonry base surfaced in brick veneer, to match the foundation material, with a .... Decking material. 8" wood chamfered columns with a base and capital support a flat roof with Hardi-trim fascia. The roof is surfaced in standing seam metal.</p> <p>A metal awning covers the entrance on Charlton Street. It is supported with a steel tension rod and features and ornamental cap.</p>	<p>See comments from Part I approval regarding porch proportions.</p> <p>Verify stair tread and riser material and floor decking material. Provide detail of balustrade and material.</p> <p>Staff recommends approval. This feature enhances the entryway and reinforces architectural elements present in this style.</p>
<p><b>Fences:</b> Walls and fences facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building; provided, however, iron fencing may be used with a masonry structure.</p>	<p>A brick and iron fence is proposed for parking across the street from the main entry. Brick piers are 8'-4" and 7' tall with a decorative iron railing in between on a 1'-4" tall brick coping wall. The ADA ramp on Building B will be similar to low portion of wall with 1" iron pickets.</p> <p>A 4' tall wood vertical picket fence is proposed with a 5' tall gate and 8" wood posts to be located between the cottage style buildings and the main hotel buildings. They are recessed from the facades.</p>	<p>The location of the masonry and iron fence should be noted on the site plan.</p> <p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p><b>Materials:</b></p>	<p><b>Building A:</b> Surface in brick veneer (color similar to Savannah Grey) with a brick stringcourse and upper story pilasters. Lintels and sills are cast stone, off white color.</p> <p><b>Building B:</b> Surfaced in brick</p>	<p>Provide mortar samples for Buildings A &amp; B. Verify fourth floor material on Building A. Staff recommends erecting a sample 4'x4' panel of the brick and cast stone material to remain on the site for the duration of construction.</p>

	<p>veneer (red brick) with a brick stringcourse and cast stone lintels and sills.</p> <p><b>Buildings C through F:</b> Foundation of brick veneer, with Hardi-Plank siding and trim.</p>	<p>Verify chimney material and decorative brackets</p>
<p><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. HVAC units shall be screened from public right-of-way. Through-the-wall air conditioners shall be installed in new construction when they are incorporated into the design of the windows system and screened by a decorative gate. Refuse storage area shall be located within a building or shall be screened from public streets and lanes.</p>	<p>Through-the-wall air conditioning systems have been screened with decorative panels and metal louvers.</p>	<p>Verify location of utilities and refuse on site plan and/or elevations.</p>
<p><b>Color</b></p>		<p>Submit color samples for exterior walls, trim, windows, roofs, fencing, etc. to Staff for approval.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**Continuance to address comments from Part I approval and Staff comments per findings above.**

**Mr. Steffen** stated he was a little confused about Staff’s recommendation. He asked the Part I issue involving Building F was Staff’s recommendation to the Board that it be continued.

**Ms. Ward** stated if it was standing alone and she didn’t have to make a recommendation for Parts I and II, she would recommend approval for Part I with the condition that the petitioner address the proportion and the rhythm of solids to voids. However, since it was coming for Parts I and II at the same time, she felt Staff had to recommend a continuance.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if the information that Staff received from the petitioner was not enough and if a continuance was still appropriate.

**Ms. Ward** said right, because she still had not seen any clarification on the proportions. She said they had talked at length about it but she had not received anything.

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

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Deering** stated he would like to address Staff’s issues, and thought they had made some revisions to the window openings on Buildings F, C, D, and E. He said Mr. Howington would

address them. He wanted to talk about the issues on the larger buildings that Staff had brought up, and to address the issues from Part I that was talked about in the previous meeting.

He said the first one was the entrance along the building façade of Building B. The standards that they have in the guidelines were written basically for the Savannah Historic Landmark District that was the other side of Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (MLK). He did not know if Chadbourne took into account the different building patterns in the Central of Georgia Historic Landmark District, because there were some distinct differences. One of the things discussed the last time were that the buildings that were there were very small residential buildings or large 19<sup>th</sup> Century and early 20<sup>th</sup> Century industrial buildings. The buildings that exist along west Jones Street were far longer than 85 feet and had no entrance from the street. That was the feeling they were trying to create in developing the buildings in tandem. This building in a false architectural timeline may have been built first, with another building being added to the building at a later period of time, much in the same way the Central of Georgia District was developed. Every time they needed a new building, they just built another big building. They did not necessarily address the street because there was no need to. That was why they took the particular clue from the building, and the one just to the right was the same way. It had no street fronting entrance, and they felt it was appropriate in the neighborhood. As Staff said, the stringcourse on the building was moved up to the 14-foot floor-to-floor height so that it would meet the ordinance.

The other issues that were brought up on Building A, the louvers on either side of the window were a modern interpretation of the different louvers and ventilation systems found on the 19<sup>th</sup> Century warehouse buildings. They thought it was a more refreshing way to take this sort of element and incorporate it into a slightly more formal building without having to have all of the grills below the windows as in certain situations. It was a different way to create bays on the larger "A" building, without having to have all the PTAC louvers below the windows. They were trying to create a little bit of variation, and notice some of the historic architecture in that particular, very special, Historic District. The shutters that Staff mentioned on the fourth floor were not shutters. He did not intend for them to be corrugated, he wanted them to be flat zinc panels, so when you look up all you have was the stucco outline and the flat zinc panels adjacent to the windows. Again, to provide a little bit of variation, and to follow some of the patterning where the fourth floor would have a window, but have a flat zinc panel on each side and not the corrugation. He was not fond of the corrugation because he thought it was too casual for the building. They wanted to keep the shutters on the eastern elevation blank and simple because MLK had larger buildings along it; even on the site that was Parker's convenience store right now, there was a larger building. They felt that Building A should front Harris and Charlton Streets, but not have a formal façade on MLK. Mr. Parker may choose to take down his convenience store and build a three-story building, and it would create what they were proposing; the blank side. It should really read like the blank side of the building. They could provide details to Staff on the flat, metal shutters. They were like on the back of the silver building or the building where Gottlieb's was, but they were the flat, metal industrial 19<sup>th</sup> Century steel shutters. He thought they were very appropriate for the district, and they work really well on the predominately-blank side. The standing seam roofing would be one-inch high. They worked hard with the Coastal Heritage Society (CHS) to try and develop this particular site into something that they would find acceptable. The CHS had guidelines also, and they had been trying to meet with them and meet all of their guidelines as well. The standing seam roofing would be a one-inch tall standing seam without the big blocky thing that was seen on the sample, and coated with a material called Hydrostop that gives it a more historic appearance. It mattes down the metal appearance so that it did not appear like a brand new metal roof. It would be on the cottages. The PTAC grill cover keeps it from being louvers below the windows. They would like to use a grill material that has been used very successfully in the Historic District. For instance, on the client's other property across MLK, the Marriott Courtyard, they use a very nice grill cover below the windows, and he thought it fit in architecturally very well. It

was actually a very nice material, he commended them for using it on that side of the street, and they would like to use it again. They would like to submit it as well.

He said Mr. Howington had addresses Staff's issues with the cottages, and he thought if the Board found it acceptable, then they would not have to have a continuance.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she was thrilled that it was going to be a wonderful addition to the area. She said she was glad that the CHS was involved, and asked if the site had any historic significance with the grounds.

**Mr. Deering** asked if Ms. Seiler was referring to an archeology survey.

**Mr. West Townsend** stated there was one being performed right now.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if the archeological survey hold up or delay the project.

**Mr. Deering** stated it was between Coastal Heritage and the landowner.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she had a member of the public ask her if they were certain that there weren't any relics there that would be misplaced with the building of the cottages.

**Mr. Deering** stated in order to create a land swap deal and buy all of the property to assemble it into one unit, the petitioner has had to do many things to satisfy CHS's requirements in which one of them was an archeological study.

**Ms. Seiler** stated it was not just CHS, it was everyone's history there, and it was quite a valuable area.

**Mr. Deering** agreed that it was.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if Mr. Howington was going to address Building D with the double porches.

**Mr. Deering** answered yes, and introduced Mr. West Townsend of McGibbon Group who was the developer of the property and other hotel properties in Savannah.

**Mr. Townsend** stated that CHS was doing a dig now that was under way. He said he was told that morning that some real interesting bottles and some foundations from a previous that period was found. The dig would be ongoing for another month or two.

**Mr. Howington** stated they had been working exclusively with CHS and had met with Ms. Ward yesterday to address everyone's aesthetic concerns, especially the cottages in question on the submittal. He handed out some revisions on some of the items that were addressed. He said it was very similar to the submittal, but there was some concern with the rhythm of the base. They had actually changed it to better enhance the base of the building. Another concern was to make them look separate and keep the rhythms very consistent, and they had applied to it. With the question of Building F, the future building, they did not initially put it in the first submittal because there was some land acquisition issues, which they were not sure of, and they were not sure they were going to be able to do it. Since it was very similar and an exact replication of Building E, they submitted it in the submittal for review.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked what the rationale was for removing the shutters.

**Mr. Howington** stated it was requested from the CHS, and they had been working hand-in-hand with them. He said if you look in the back of the submittal in the photograph pages, you

could see some of the cottages that were actually there. On photograph PH1, they were trying to mimic the actual worker cottage village that was there, and that was how they arrived at this style of cottage. In meeting with CHS, it was actually some of their requests to help diversify the cottages to put some shutters on some and take some off others. To provide some with a true standing seam roof and others with a shingle roof, and some with and some without chimneys to help diversify.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated he liked what they had decided to do with the standing seam because the one and one-half was way too much. The one inch was more reflective of what the old ones looked like, and the kind of finish they were talking about to matte it, because all of the old ones were tar-covered.

**Mr. Howington** stated he had met with CHS, and they had been using the tinder frame shop as an example. It had been restored and the standing seam would look very much like that.

**Dr. Caplan** asked about the porch on Building D, and asked if it was Mr. Howington's recommendation that it remains.

**Mr. Howington** stated they could change it. It was recommended to them to put it that way because there was a very similar picture. In addition, if you look at the back, the second picture with the children playing in it had a house cottage in that area with a double porch very similar to it. That was the thinking behind the double porch, and they widened it after meeting with Staff, to help with the basing to accommodate it.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if it was the resident's first property like this.

**Mr. Howington** stated he thought it was their first property like this in a while.

**Mr. Deering** stated Mr. Townsend thought it was the most unusual hotel project ever done anywhere.

**Mr. Howington** stated it was a very unique site.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation - HSF)** stated the HSF commends the petitioner for breaking up the massing of the hotel complex into the cottages. Their comments today were based on large-scale development like this, and because each of the structures were so complex in their own right, the ARC would suggest the petitioner separate each structure into its own submittal for the design detail review to make it simpler to read. With large-scale development like this, it was a lot to present at one time.

**Mr. Bill Stuebe (Downtown Neighborhood Association - DNA)** stated he was speaking as President of the DNA. He said urban planning had shown that long expanses of buildings without openings were alien to pedestrian traffic. The 85-foot façade was that, and it was one of the reasons it was in the guidelines. With the development of the history museum or the roundhouse museum complex, there would be a lot of pedestrian traffic on the streets going east west, and he would like to see another entrance or some storefronts, to break it up and make it more pedestrian friendly.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated she would agree as a private citizen, she would always want to see development that encourages pedestrian traffic, but it was not within the Board's purview.

**Dr. Johnson** stated he would think as it was pointed out that it was an industrial area with huge buildings, and what they had done with the structure was visually compatible with what was already there. If it was on Bryan Street or Warren Square, they would need to break it up, but he felt it was fine.

**Mr. Steffen** said it seemed to him that the Board had a situation where Staff wanted to have the petition continued for further clarification. Obviously, they could only do that with the consent of the petitioner. The petitioner had indicated to the Board that they do not believe a continuance was necessary, and that they had provided the Board with enough information to allow them to proceed with a few things coming back to Staff. He said before the Board entertained a motion on it, he asked Mr. Deering to specifically let the Board know what the petitioner's feelings were as to what would and what would not go back to Staff, or anything else he wanted to add.

**Mr. Deering** stated they would certainly submit the revised drawings of the cottages with the three-bay rhythm, the widened porch, and the three-bay rhythm in the pair of houses within one building. He said they were happy to give better details on the louvers in Building A, the zinc paneled fourth floor of Building A, and the steel shutters on the east side of Building A, which was the largest building on the site. A better sample of the standard seam metal roof, and with most construction products they put up a sample masonry wall with the cast stone and the joint detailing. Therefore, they were happy to provide a sample wall that showed the different materials, how they were used, and how they were put together.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if Mr. Deering was asking for the items to come back to Staff or back to the Board.

**Mr. Deering** stated he would like them to go back to Staff.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated she would prefer to see them come back to the Board. She said there were a lot of design details, and she thought that Staff's concerns were warranted. She would personally feel more comfortable with a continuance with all of the things mentioned being brought back to the Board. If, the petitioner would entertain a continuance.

**Mr. Deering** stated he would like to have a vote today. He thought it was very important for the schedule of the project, they have spent three years putting together this project with the land acquisition, and they would like to try to get it moving. He said their firm typically did a great job and it could be seen even with large structures like the Liberty Street parking garage, that they don't do shoddy detail work. He strongly thought they could bring back a few details, go on with the project, and make it a very successful project.

**Mr. Steffen** asked about what specific details.

**Mr. Deering** stated the louvers on Building A on each side of the windows, the zinc metal panels on the fourth floor of Building A, the steel shutters on the east elevation of Building A, and material samples to satisfy Staff with a standing seam metal roof.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion to that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as amended, with details to be submitted to Staff for final approval. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it was passed. Ms. Fortson-Waring was opposed. Mr. Deering and Mr. Neely recused.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated they were approving height and mass, but the details would come back to the Board.

**Mr. Steffen** stated it would come back to Staff.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated Ms. Seiler said the Board, but she did say the Board in the motion.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if Ms. Seiler wanted the details to come back to Staff or to the Board.

**Ms. Seiler** said she was fine with it going to Staff.

**Mr. Steffen** stated there was a motion made and seconded that it be approved subject to the specific details going back to Staff.

**RE: Petition of BMW Architects  
Michael Johnson  
H-06-3689-2  
109 West Broughton Street  
Rehabilitation/Addition**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Bryce Bounds

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for exterior alterations to the historic building at 109 West Broughton Street. Alterations include the installation of a new storefront and pedestrian entrance at the ground level and a rehabilitation of the upper levels of the building.

**FINDINGS:**

The historic building at 109 West Broughton Street (aka 111 West Broughton Street) was constructed in 1875, and is a rated structure within Savannah’s National Historic Landmark District. The commercial structure original featured three separate storefront entrances within each of the three bays. The bay to the west is maintained under separate ownership and has been for decades.

The two bays that comprise 109 West Broughton Street were altered circa 1955 for the J.C. Penney Company store. At this time, the second floor window openings were modified from their original arched design with decorative cast iron headers to rectangular openings surrounded by a band course. The glass storefront featured three entrances topped by a leaded glass transom. Subsequent alterations include the removal of the two side entrances creating a single recessed commercial entrance featuring a terrazzo floor and T-111 on the storefront. Preliminary demolition revealed that none of the original character-defining features including the leaded glass transom system exist behind the existing storefront panels. The terrazzo entrance flooring remains and will be preserved.

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

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<b>(k)(1) Preservation of historic structures.</b> An historic structure...visible from a public street or lane, including but not limited to walls, fences, light fixtures...shall only be moved, reconstructed, altered, or	The applicant intends to refurbish the existing non-historic storefront, install a balcony above and five light fixtures on the façade and within the recessed entrance, restore the stucco on the existing upper	The standard is met. While this request is not a true restoration, it is an attempt to improve the existing non-historic storefront and facade. Staff recommends deleting the proposed cast stone nameplate in the eastern

<p>maintained in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior architectural features of the historic structure or appurtenance thereto.</p>	<p>stories – removing the band course around the windows and install new windows within the existing openings. The existing metal cornice and gable nameplate will be restored.</p>	<p>gable as it creates a false sense of history. The nameplate on the bay to the far west, maintained by a separate owner, does not actually have a nameplate as depicted in the drawings.</p>
<p><b>(I)(5)e. Commercial Design Standards:</b> Retail storefront glazing shall be not less than 55%. Such glazing shall be transparent...Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18"-24" base on contrasting material, to the lintel.</p>	<p>Storefront glazing is comprised of wood clad windows by YKK or approved equal.</p> <p>The base of the storefront is 2' in height and is wood or wood composite.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. If alternate manufacturer is selected, the applicant must amend the application and resubmit to Staff for approval.</p> <p>See below comment on wood composite material in storefront (I)(5)j.</p>
<p><b>(I)(5) Entrances</b> shall be recessed and centered within the storefront.</p> <p>Outside entrances to upper floors shall align with one of the upper windows farthest from the center of the building's façade.</p>	<p>A recessed central entrance currently exists and will be reused in the proposed design.</p> <p>A pedestrian entrance providing access to the residential units above is located on the far west side of the façade and aligns vertically beneath the windows above. A solid panel door with sidelights is proposed.</p>	<p>The standard is met. Clarify panel material surrounding entrance doors.</p>
<p><b>(I)(5)j. Storefronts</b> shall be constructed of wood, cast iron, and Carrera glass, aluminum, steel or copper as part of a glazed storefront system; bronze, glazed brick or tile as a base for the storefront. The historic review board may approve other materials upon a showing by the applicant that the product is visually compatible with historic building materials and has performed satisfactorily in the local climate.</p>	<p>A wood or wood composite storefront system is proposed with insulated glass windows and transoms.</p> <p>Marvin Ultimate French doors are proposed for the main entrance.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval with the condition that the storefront use solid wood. If a wood simulated or composite material is chosen, it should be resubmitted to the board for final approval.</p> <p>Clarify panel material surrounding entrance doors.</p>
<p><b>(I)(9) Windows.</b> Historic windows, frames, sashes and glazing shall not be replaced unless it is documented that they have deteriorated beyond repair. Replacement windows on historic buildings shall replicate the original historic windows in composition, design, and material.</p> <p>Double-glazed windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction...</p>	<p>Historic windows on the third floor will be retained and restored. Second floor windows openings will receive new cast stone sills and lintels. The existing windows are not original, but are one-over-one wood frame, single-pane glass windows. Marvin Ultimate double-hung sash, one-over-one, double-pane, wood windows are proposed.</p>	<p>Staff recommends that if the existing windows must be replaced it should be with a one-over-one, single pane glass wood window. We have consistently denied requests for double-pane windows in historic buildings along Broughton Street and elsewhere in the historic district as they are only allowed on new construction and non-historic facades.</p>
<p><b>(I)(11) Balconies.</b> Residential balconies shall not extend more</p>	<p>A 2'-7" projecting balcony is proposed over the main entrance</p>	<p>Staff recommends conceptual approval of the balcony.</p>



than 3' in depth from the face of a building and shall be supported by brackets or other types of architectural support.	for the residential units above the commercial ground floor. The balcony is approx. 23' wide with a wood-sloped floor, supported by a wood bracket to match the existing brackets in the existing cornice. 3'-8" tall wood paneled newel post – like ends are proposed with a wrought iron balustrade and wood base.	Although this was not an original feature of the building, it is a small addition for the residential uses, is reversible, and does not damage or obscure any character defining features. Staff recommends restudy of the bracket under the balcony. The bracket detail does not appear as a bracket but more of a decorative element.
<b>(I)(11)f. Balusters</b> shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between balusters shall not exceed 4"...	A wrought iron balustrade with a wood base is proposed.	Elevations indicate a wood railing and base. This is not an appropriate treatment for an iron balustrade. Horizontal members should also be iron.
<b>Light fixtures:</b>	Four 37" tall wall mounted gas light fixtures are proposed on the four columns within the new storefront. They project 1'-11" from the face of the building. A 40" tall hanging light fixture is proposed within the recessed entry.	Staff recommends approval with the condition that the finish material (color) should be submitted to Staff. A 56" tall fixture was submitted as well and it is unclear where it will be located.
<b>Colors:</b>	Body: "Portabello" SW6102 Trim: "Dark Room" SW7083 Windows: "Practical Beige" SW6100	Staff approval.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval of the proposed alterations with the following conditions:

1. Deletion of the new cast stone name plate in the gable;
2. Any material changes from the YKK window system or wood storefront be resubmitted for approval;
3. Clarification of panel materials surrounding entrances;
4. Replacement windows utilize one-over-one, single-pane glass, wood frame windows, or existing windows be retained;
5. Restudy of the iron and wood balustrade and bracket detail on balcony;
6. Clarification of 56-inch light fixture and submit finish color of fixtures to Staff.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she noticed the historical pictures that were provided, and then when she went by there, the balcony threw her. She asked if the research showed any balconies in the area that previously existed.

**Ms. Ward** answered no. She said they compared it to things like the Marshall House.

**Mr. Deering** said that the Oglethorpe Club Lodge that used to sit where Pasticcio's was had the projecting New Orleans style balcony.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she knew the example of the thinner New Orleans style, but she tried to imagine walking under one and the only place you could walk under one was the Marshall House coverage.

**Ms. Ward** stated it would not project as far as the Marshall House. She said two feet seven inches was probably shallower than most awnings project from the face of the building.

**Ms. Seiler** asked along that block there was no history of anything jutting out.

**Ms. Ward** answered not that she found. She said the applicant may address it.

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

**Mr. Bryce Bounds** stated it looked like they would be going with a wood system for the storefront as opposed to the YKK that was mentioned. It did not appear that what they needed could be provided. He said Ms. Ward was correct that they would be using a 37-inch light fixture. The cut sheet that was provided was for both 56 and 37-inches, the proportion simply changed for the size. They would be happy to remove the cast stone nameplate that was not original, and they would study the support system for the balcony and resubmit it to Staff for their review and approval. He had a picture to clarify the Staff's concerns about what was paneled and what was glass on the front storefront.

**Mr. Deering** stated that it was almost all glass.

**Mr. Bounds** stated that just about every entrance would have a glass transom above.

**Mr. Deering** asked if they would entertain keeping the storefront and entrance design as it was, but omitting the two balustrades up above with the Newell post. He thought it was incongruous and he disagreed with Staff. He said part of the character of defining features of Broughton Street buildings were the heavy cornice above the storefront, and this takes it up and interrupts it. He just did not feel that it was appropriate.

**Mr. Bounds** stated they would be happy to consult with the client and bring it back for Staff approval.

**Ms. Seiler** stated it interrupted the flow of Broughton Street. She said it was a wonderful submittal that was a pleasure to read and easy to read, and she wished all of them looked as good. It was a delight.

**Mr. Bounds** stated they would be happy to go back and restudy the railing on the balcony and bring it into all cast iron. For the lintels on the second floor, they would not be submitting for cast stone any more. Instead, they would like to bring down a system that gently mimics without interrupting the original steel and metal lintels that the third floor had.

**Mr. Deering** asked what material would it be. If it would be a composite or something.

**Mr. Bounds** said it would be a metal stand or painted to match. He said it would not be cast stone.

**Mr. Deering** stated it had been done on other Broughton Street buildings and it was successful.

**Mr. Hutchinson** stated he wanted to commend BMW, and said he did not have a problem with the balcony. He would go along with what was recommended.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Joe Saseen** asked if there was a covered walkway in front of Silver's Department Store.

**Mr. Deering** stated it was put on in the 1960's or 1970's.

**Mr. Saseen** stated he just wanted to make sure there was a walkway there.

**Mr. Deering** stated that there was.

**Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated the ARC agreed with the comments of Staff and wanted to add there was no precedent for a non-functioning balcony on Broughton Street. The standing area on the balcony appeared to be less than two feet from the face of the cornice. That was not enough room for a resident to enjoy the view of Broughton Street. The railing appeared not to be high enough to meet code. Furthermore, the complete removal of the balcony created a cleaner façade and was more in keeping with the character on Broughton Street.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Steffen** stated he wanted to have Board discussion, because it appeared there were some rather significant items that had to go back to Staff. He wanted to make sure the Board understood all that was on the table and all that were taken back. He also wanted to hear from the Board on the issue of the balcony because he had heard through comments there was some diverge in opinion on that issue.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked about the approximation of the floor on the second floor.

**Mr. Michael Johnson (BMW Architects)** stated the floor was approximately in line with the balcony. He said the balcony was not necessarily a functional balcony, and it was an aesthetic add-on.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if the windowsill came down to the floor.

**Mr. Johnson** stated the windowsill comes down and it protrudes about eight inches above the balcony. He said it was the new cast stone windowsills. They say balcony, but he wanted to note that in proportion when looking at the actual size and extension of it, you were only looking at a two-foot seven-inch projection. It was a very small projection, and as noted, was actually significantly less than the other projections of many of the canopies that do exist along Broughton Street. He did not feel in such a way that they were in the neighborhood of architectural discussion and comparison with other balconies that were functional and extend well over the sidewalk in which you walk under. It was really more of a Juliette balcony although it was not necessarily functional.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Mr. Johnson where he got his inspiration from for the balcony.

**Mr. Johnson** stated the use of the building was moving toward the residential use on the second and third floors. It was an owner-driven request, and felt the need to express the function a little bit more to incorporate a balcony on the second floor.

**Mr. Deering** stated it was badly proportioned because the newells on each end when you look at that section were very heavy and project out a great deal. He said the bracket that was beneath them was not substantial enough to visually support those newells, and he did not think they should be adding Juliette balconies to Broughton Street facades. He did not think it was

something that was appropriate. Even though anything they do on the Board did not set a precedent, what happens is someone comes back and says they did it somewhere else.

**Ms. Seiler** agreed.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated there was an analogy between the other awnings and how much they project over the street. He said it was a completely different issue, and the newell post were from a standpoint of the scale. Aside from the fact that he did not like the balcony being there on that type of building, but the newell post were scale-wise in relation to the support under them was different.

**Mr. Johnson** stated he agreed. He said the newell posts could use a good bit of work in their scale and proportion.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated putting the balcony there on Broughton Street would be the only one that was like that.

**Mr. Deering** stated it would be the first of what would be a lot of petitions. If somebody thought they could do a balcony on Broughton Street, the next thing you know it would be like what happened to River Street.

**Ms. Seiler** stated the Board fights that battle with River Street all of the time. It is the harmonious street if you look above the first floor up, it would definitely be an interruption there.

**Mr. Johnson** stated in the interest of them moving the project forward, he would like to suggest they move forward with approval at Staff level if they look at removing the balcony. He would like the opportunity to submit a continuation to consult the client, and if they thought he would push the issue they would like the opportunity to come back with it.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she thought everything else was outstanding.

**Mr. Deering** said he commended them for the project, and he thought it was great to take the T111 storefront off and make it nice.

**Mr. Johnson** stated hopefully they would do a little bit better than just improving it because it was not saying much.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he heard Mr. Johnson saying was that he would like the Board to consider the project for approval, with the minor details that were discussed earlier going back to Staff. To remove the balcony from consideration today, if the client chose to bring it back as a separate issue, he would have to resubmit it.

**Mr. Johnson** answered correct.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the following conditions. Deletion of the balcony, deletion of the new cast stone name plate in the gable, a wood storefront system be used, replacement windows utilize one-over-one, single-pane glass, wood frame windows, or existing windows be retained. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Fortson-Waring left at approximately 3:40 p.m.

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
Jeff Bradtmiller  
H-06-3678(S)-2  
411 Whitaker Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
2. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
Jeff Bradtmiller  
H-06-3679(S)-2  
32 Barnard Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
3. Petition of Glenn Wallace  
SCAD  
H-06-3680(S)-2  
302 West Boundary Street (Turner House Street Address)  
Bus Stop Shelters  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
4. Petition of Susan Broker  
City of Savannah  
H-06-3681(S)-2  
226 Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard  
Sign Face Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
5. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
H-06-3682(S)-2  
101 West Taylor Street  
Window Valances  
**STAFF DECISION: DENIED**
  
6. Petition of Elizabeth Demos  
@ Home Vintage General  
H-06-3683(S)-2  
320 West Broughton Street  
Color/Alterations  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
7. Petition of James & Nancy Krembs  
H-06-3684(S)-2  
211 & 213 West Hall Street  
Color/Alterations  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
8. Petition of Simply Irresistible Home Accents of Savannah LLC  
H-06-3685(S)-2  
15 West York Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

9. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
H-06-3686(S)-2  
320 West Broughton Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
10. Petition of Daufuskie Island Club & Resort  
H-06-3688(S)-2  
423 East River Street  
Existing Windows  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

**RE: MINUTES**

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – September 13, 2006

**HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the minutes with the two clarifications being that Ms. Fortson’s name should be changed to Ms. Fortson-Waring on Page 4, and the sentence be removed on Page 38 stating who was coming or staying on the Board. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: OTHER BUSINESS**

- Georgia Alliance of Preservation Commissions (GAPC)

**Ms. Ward** stated she had recently attended the Georgia Alliance for Preservation Commissions in the state, and wanted to give the Board a briefing because there were no members present. She said it became apparent to her that the education should be kept up, and to schedule a Board retreat. She wanted to propose that a date be set for the retreat, and if they could not give her a date today, to send an email.

**Ms. Seiler** volunteered to assist.

**Mr. Steffen** said he would ask that it not be scheduled until they have the new Board seated. It was October, and they would only have two more meetings with this Board. He said he thought six members would come off and six new members would come on, and he would like to do the retreat immediately after the new members were on the Board. Maybe as early as January.

**Ms. Ward** stated she was thinking the retreat could be scheduled for January so that the Board would be ready to go when it happened.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he would like to get together with Ms. Seiler and look at some dates, and then at the next meeting bring them back to the Board for consideration. He asked Ms. Seiler if it was good with her.

**Ms. Seiler** stated it would be great with her.

**Dr. Caplan** said assuming the Board members who were leaving were promptly replaced, because in the past they had not been promptly replaced and would have to stay on.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he would be having dinner with Mr. Morrill next week, and he would specifically bring it up that the Board needed to have it done, and to ask to speak to Mr. Brown

about it. He said hopefully he could report back to the Board at the next meeting that the process was underway.

**Ms. Ward** stated Staff had been working very closely with the Clerk of Council's office to make sure the vacancies get advertised and the word gets out. They would not be accepting applications any earlier than October 27, 2006. If the Board had passed the word on to people and had asked them to submit, the Council would not even look at them or take them until after the 27<sup>th</sup>. The first week of December, the Council would look at them, and she imagined at the City Council meeting that was either the 16<sup>th</sup> or the 18<sup>th</sup> of December they would have some decisions to be made. She said if the Board had people to recommend, just make sure they send in their application after the 27<sup>th</sup> date.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the City would not consider a name unless the people send in a specific application.

**Dr. Caplan** stated historically they have had vacancies for a year, and a number of the Board members who came on, came on four months into the year before they were appointed.

**Ms. Ward** stated they have been trying to get the word out as best as they could. She had hoped to get something on the website after the date, so people could get the application off MPC's website and not just the City's.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the way the appointments tended to go in the past, especially with six openings, individual Council members were going to have their specific person. He suggested if the Board had someone they knew would be a good Board member and they really want to be on, his strong recommendation to them was to adopt a Council member, and have that Council member to sponsor them. When there is a meeting when they would say they had six appointments, each and every one in the Council would have their one person they want. If the Board really wanted to get someone appointed, that would be the way to do it.

**Ms. Seiler** asked when City Council gets together, do they discuss whether or not a person would be appropriate for the Board.

**Mr. Steffen** stated his understanding was it was not that often. That normally someone would say I really want this person and someone else would say I want this person so let's put them both on. There is not a lot of discussion about whether they were qualified.

**Dr. Johnson** stated it was getting better.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the process of having the applications had made it a lot better, because now there was something for people to look at in writing, and it says what the person was about. He still thought when there would be six openings at one time, each Council member would have their specific person.

- Schedule board retreat

**Ms. Ward** stated some of the things that were brought up on the last training session she thought would be really good to talk about at the retreat. She said they could work on an agenda for it or have contacts or communications to provide an agenda item so that anyone could disclose it if they have it. This is a small town and she knew it was hard to not listen sometimes, but it was important for procedural due process. Other Boards were doing things that she thought were interesting as far as presenting awards to those who had done outstanding projects so that they were recognized, and it would set the bar for other projects that come forward, especially if they were meeting the standards. Staff is trying to put together

a preservation calendar for the end of the year too, and she was hoping at the next meeting that everyone could be present to get a picture of everyone to put on the calendar. Not that the Board would be a month or anything, they were going to focus on architecture, and the Board could go on the back as the Commission. One other thing she pointed out was how proud she was to serve on the Board after looking at the items that the other Commissions' were doing throughout the state. She said the conference was held in Rome, Georgia, and they came under such pressure from their City to fix up some of the blighted areas, that they actually compromised their standards and were not allowing aluminum clad simulated divided light windows on historic buildings in the downtown. The buildings were only three stories tall, she had some pictures to show, and it really did make a difference. People always come to Staff and say that you cannot tell, but you really can. She had heard some other people in the audience say they had to change their standards too, that it was important there was consistency, and to keep the standards up.

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

**RE: INFORMATION ITEMS**

**Mr. Steffen** stated Ms. Ward gave him a very extensive and helpful list of some things going on down on River Street. He said that all Board members should get a copy of the list before the next meeting, and it was something the Board had to deal with.

**Mr. Deering** stated Mr. Art Lamas's building at Abercorn and Broughton Streets where Café Mohca used to be, the new café had put mirrored-film glass on the Broughton Street side. He said it was completely opaque during the bright of day and it was like walking past a big mirror. He did not think anyone asked the Board if they could do that.

**Ms. Ward** stated it was against the ordinance.

- Historic Preservation Department Third Quarter Report
- A Decade of City Anniversaries
- New! Historic Preservation License Plate

**Mr. Steffen** stated he hoped everyone received the informational item in the packet regarding the City Anniversaries and the Preservation License plate.

**RE: ADJOURNMENT**

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

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp