

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW
REGULAR MEETING
112 EAST STATE STREET

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

August 22, 2007

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

Joseph Steffen, Chairman
Swann Seiler, Vice-Chairman
Dr. Charles Elmore
Ned Gay
Sidney J. Johnson
Brian Judson
Richard Law, Sr.
Eric Meyerhoff
Linda Ramsay
Dr. Malik Watkins

HDRB Members Not Present:

Gene Hutchinson

SDRA Staff Present:

Lise Sundrla

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

Thomas L. Thomson, P.E./AICP, Exec. Director
Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director
Janine N. Person, Administrative Assistant

RE: CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:08 p.m.

Mr. Steffen asked speakers for their petitions to keep discussion to a minimum due to the length of the agenda.

RE: REFLECTION

RE: SIGN POSTING

All signs were properly posted.

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-07-3784-2
PIN No. 2-0016-04-003
501 West Bay Street
New Construction Part I Height and Mass –
Hotel/Condominium

Request to Continue to September 12, 2007.

**RE: Continued Petition of Houston & Oglethorpe
Richard Guerard
H-07-3832-2
PIN No. 2-0005-30-002
143 Houston Street
New Construction/Rehabilitation/Addition Part I,
Height & Mass, Three-Story Condominium**

Request to Continue to September 12, 2007.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the items as presented. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

**RE: Petition of Eric Craig Meyer
H-07-3845-2
PIN No. 2-005-16-021
527 East Broughton Street
Rehabilitation/Alteration**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Lee Meyer
H-07-3854-2
PIN No. 2-0014-13-010
502 East Harris Street
Awning/Stucco/Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Sign Mart
FedEx/Kinkos
H-07-3857-2
PIN No. 2-0004-44-010
5 West Broughton Street
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of James F. Reardon
H-07-3859-2
PIN No. 2-0015-36-010
126 West Harris Street
Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Robert Aiken
Request for a One-year Extension of Approval
H-06-3610-2
PIN No. 2-0032-45-014
108 East Gaston Street
Extend to July 13, 2008**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah 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: Petition of Dawson + Wissmach Architects
H-05-3477-2
PIN No. 2-0004-07-03
126 West Bay Street
Addition of a Story**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Josh Ward.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting to add an additional story to the roof of 126 West Bay Street.

FINDINGS:

1. The structure is located within two stories above Bay Street height zone.
2. The roof addition is proposed to be setback 15'-5 ¼" from the edge of the front (south) façade and 11'-3" from the River Street elevation. It will be setback from 10 to 17 feet from the west elevation due to the angle of the building.
3. The roof is proposed to curve from south to north. At its highest point, the roof will be 8'-10" above the parapet.
4. Materials for the addition are metal standing seam, clear anodized aluminum storefront and stucco elevator penthouse.
5. The applicant has re-created Factor's Walk at this location.
6. The shape of the addition is based on the cotton-grading monitors that were historically on some of these buildings. It is a reversible treatment.
7. An additional story requires Board of Appeals approval. A Finding-of-Fact from the Board of Review is required.

8. Line of sight renderings have been provided indicating that the visibility of this story will be minimal.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of a Finding-of-Fact that the additional story as presented is compatible, based on its ability to be removed without adversely affecting the main structure; its lack of visibility from the public right-of-way; and the greater public good in the re-creation of Factor's Walk at this location.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked about construction on the building.

Ms. Reiter stated that construction had started on the building because it had already been before the Board.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Josh Ward stated that he would like to come back to Staff. He said the plan was being revised and they were making the footprint on the rooftop smaller. The east and west walls would be brought in to the stairs and they would lose approximately 20 feet on either side of the rooftop addition, thus it would be less visible from Bay Street. They also wanted to push the elevator tower further from Bay Street to make it less visible.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve a Finding-of-Fact that the additional story as designed is compatible and the petition as amended for greater setbacks, with the condition that an amended drawing be provided for the file. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Steffen stated that if there were any changes made later that they should go back to Staff and it could be done at Staff level, but if it was a large change then it might have to go back to the application process.

**RE: Continued Petition of Charles Oxford
H-06-3669-2
PIN No. 2-0032-08-005
601 – 605 Tattnall Street
New Construction Part II, Design Details of
Three Two-Story Townhomes**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Charles Oxford.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction Part II, Design Details, of three attached two-story townhomes at 601-605 Tattnall Street.

FINDINGS:

The project received Part I, Height and Mass approval on December 13, 2006, with the condition that the footprint be reduced to meet the 75 percent lot coverage standard. According to the applicant, a variance for Lot 2/603 Tattnell Street was issued. The proposed submittal for Part II meets the Historic District standards as outlined in the table below with the following exceptions:

The following Part II Design Standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
<p>Windows and Doors: Residential windows facing a street shall be double- or triple-hung, casement or Palladian. Double-glazed (SDL) windows are permitted on new construction, provided 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. Snap-in or BTG muntins shall not be used. Windows facing a street shall be rectangular and have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3. Window sashes shall be inset not less than 3 inch from the façade of a masonry building. In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.</p>	<p>Six-over-six, double-hung sash, Windsor Legend Series cellular PVC windows are proposed. These windows have a 7/8” simulated divided lite with double-pane glass. The building section indicates that the widows are recessed 3”+ from the exterior brick.</p> <p>Jack arch brick headers and sills are used on the brick portions and stucco lintels and sills appears on the stucco portions.</p> <p>Six-panel wood doors with a transom above are proposed on the street elevations.</p> <p>Double French Doors are proposed on the south elevation facing the interior courtyard. They will not be functional and are for additional interior light.</p>	<p>The proposed windows are not wood clad and have only been approved in other design review districts for use of the 1/1 DHS. It is not clear if the simulated divided lite has a putty glazed appearance or if there is a spacer bar. The applicant states that the window has grills-between-the-glass spacer bars.</p>
<p>Garage Doors: Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width. Overhead garage doors shall not be used on street fronts, adjacent to sidewalk, unless they are detailed to resemble gates.</p>	<p>Drawings indicate flush panel overhead doors for garages fronting Jefferson Street. They will feature 1-inch by 4-inch applied wood trim to simulate a pair of wood swinging doors.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Roof Shape: Parapets shall have a stringcourse or not less than 6 inches in depth and extending at least 4 inches from the face of the building, running the full</p>	<p>Flat behind a parapet. The stucco portion features a 3-foot parapet with stucco banding. The brick portion features a 1.5-foot parapet with a 1.5 inches projecting</p>	<p>At the request of Staff the applicant has agreed to lower the band course 6 inches to create a wider parapet at the top, strengthening the roofline of</p>

<p>width of the building between 1 and 1.5 feet from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum 2-inch overhang.</p>	<p>band course and metal coping at the top.</p>	<p>the building. The applicant has stated that due to code requirements for brick veneer walls the stringcourse cannot project more than the 1.5 inches as proposed.</p>
<p>Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches: Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street. Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone... Wood portico posts shall have cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave.</p> <p>Residential balconies shall not extend more than 3 feet in depth from the face of a building and shall be supported by brackets or other types of architectural support.</p>	<p>Low stoop side entrances are proposed on a brick foundation with round 10-inch fiberglass Ionic Columns and a low-pitched hip roof above surfaced in three-tab shingles. The columns extend outward of the wooden architrave. A simplified iron railing with decorative detailing is proposed for the brick stair and stoop with a molded iron handrail.</p> <p>An interior ground floor porch is proposed on the south end of the Tattnall Street façade. This portion of the building is recessed and will be minimally visible from the street as it will be obscured by a masonry fence.</p> <p>A balcony is proposed along the north elevation in the recessed portion of the building. The wall section shows five brackets. These brackets are indicated on the elevations. The balcony projects 3 feet. The guardrail is approximately 3 feet 6 inches high. The railing is a geometric pattern railing with a molded handrail. There is no apparent access to the balcony, except through a window.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p> <p>Staff recommends approval.</p> <p>Staff recommends approval</p>
<p>Fences: Walls and fences shall not extend beyond the façade of the front elevation; walls and fences facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building; iron fencing may be used with a masonry</p>	<p>The Tattnall Street façade features a stucco fence with a central iron gate. The fence is comprised of 9 to 10 feet stucco piers with 7.5 feet tall walls between the piers. The Huntingdon Street side features a fence in front of the recessed portion of the</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. The bi-folding doors allow the owner to access the parking by not consuming the interior of the lot when open and screen the cars from the public right-of-way.</p>

<p>structure.</p>	<p>building. It features 7.5 feet tall brick piers with wood paneled bi-folding doors to provide access to parking.</p>	
<p>Materials: Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco. 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>Brick and stucco have been proposed for the exterior. Brick is Hanson Century Plus – Carolina Collection with Lafarge Savannah Ivory Mortar. The stucco color has not been determined at this point. The applicant intends to erect a stucco sample panel on site and submit colors to staff upon site visit.</p> <p>A brick exterior chimney is proposed on the south elevation within the interior courtyard. The gas fireplace features a “B Vent” which does not require a traditional chimney.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval with the final stucco color selection to be resubmitted to staff for final approval.</p>
<p>Color:</p>	<p>Doors: Charleston Green with white trim Garage Doors and Iron: Charleston Green Windows: white</p>	<p>Staff approval.</p>
<p>Lighting:</p>	<p>Hanging lanterns are proposed within the stoops fronting Tattnall Street. 19.5 inches high, 9.5 inches wide sconces are proposed along the Huntingdon and Jefferson Street entrances. All are metal.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval</p>
<p>Utilities and Refuse: Meter boxes shall be located on secondary and rear facades and shall be minimally visible from view. HVAC units shall be screened from the public right-of-way.</p>	<p>HVAC condenser units are to be mounted on the roof and will not be visible from the public right-of-way. Electrical meters are located at the rear on the Jefferson Street façade.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval with the stucco color to be reviewed at the Staff level.

Mr. Steffen asked Staff if the Board should consider whether the window should be approved for the particular area of the Historic District, but that it had been approved for uses in other places.

Ms. Reiter stated that the City Housing Department uses it exclusively on all of their new construction in areas like Cuyler-Brownsville and Mid-City.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Charles Oxford stated that the window was a cellular PVC extruded frame with a standard brick mold and thick windowsill. He said the interior was a stained grained pine with four 9/16 inch jams, the covering on the sashes was extruded aluminum clad with stained grain wood inside, or it could come with a cellular PVC inside. It is a 6/6 pattern with 7/8 inch simulated divided lite with the shadow bar in between the panes.

Ms. Reiter asked if they would be using the wood clad window.

Mr. Oxford stated that the sash and inside frame was wood and the only part that was cellular PVC was the white part around the outside.

Ms. Reiter stated that it would meet the Historic District ordinance.

Mr. Steffen stated that the windows complied with the ordinance and asked if the petitioner would come back to Staff with the stucco color.

Mr. Oxford stated he was unable to pick a color without seeing all of the brick in place. He said he wanted to place samples up for Staff to approve.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the drawing for the front portico did not meet code because the pickets were drawn at six inches on center.

Mr. Oxford stated that they should be four inches.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the roof on the portico was shingled. She said with the low slope it would not need a shingled roof.

Mr. Oxford stated he would place a membrane underneath so if it was punctured by a nail it would seal back up.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Gay** made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the stucco color to come back to Staff for final approval. **Ms. Seiler** seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-06-3711-2
PIN No. 2-0031-16-006
217 West Liberty Street
New Construction Part II, Design Details for a
Condominium Building**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of Part II, Design Details for a mixed-use office and condominium building at 217 West Liberty Street.

FINDINGS:

The demolition of the existing non-historic structure and Part I Height and Mass were approved February 14, 2007.

A change from the initial submission is that the first and second floors will now possibly provide 17,240 square feet of office space. Floors three through five will contain 16 condominiums. According to the applicant these numbers are subject to change.

A concern has been raised that the rears of structures visible from squares and residential streets deserve a higher level of design treatment. In this case, the upper floors of the proposed building will be visible from Pulaski Square and some of the surrounding streets. The applicant should explore ways to accentuate this elevation perhaps with a cornice or other decorative treatment. This might help mask the view of the elevator penthouse also.

The following Part II Design Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Windows and Doors:	Peerless double-hung and Crittle steel windows with fixed light. The Peerless windows are model # 432H double-hung windows with historic grid profiles, muntin width 7/8 inches with spacer bar. Cast stone headers and brick sills are proposed. The solid entry doors will be wood painted Forest Black. The glazed doors will be wood painted "Almond Wisp". The garage door is a flush, hollow metal door painted to match the brick masonry. The rear utility doors will be flush, hollow metal painted to match brick masonry.	It is recommended that the window headers and sills match. The windows should be recessed from the face of the masonry a minimum of 3 feet.
Roof Shape:	Flat with parapet. Wood cornice and brackets. There is an elevator penthouse on the roof. It will have a sand finish stucco painted to match the color of the brick masonry.	
Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches:	Rubbed, painted concrete balconies with 5/8-inch metal pickets and brackets below. The balcony slab edges and undersides will be rubbed and	

	<p>painted to match the stucco color. The brackets will be made of a ferrous metal painted "Forest Black".</p> <p>The steps on the Tattnall Street side are cast-in-place concrete and the posts are ornamental cast stone.</p>	
Fences:	A solid 7'-7" brick fence is proposed for the East and Lane elevations and a portion of the Liberty Street elevation. Part of this wall on the lane encloses a service yard with two metal doors.	
Materials:	Brick: Carolina Brown wirecut 420 with Polyblend "Light Smoke" mortar. Cast stone Base: Arriscraft "Pecan"; Stucco	
Color:	Stucco: Match Arriscraft "Pean" Windows, columns, and trim ICI Almond Wisp Metalwork ICI Forest Black.	

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with discussion of additional treatment on the upper rear elevation to give a finished appearance from the square, that the window headers and sills be like material, and that the windows are set in at least three inches from the masonry façade.

Mr. Steffen asked about the cornice and decorative treatments recommended by Staff.

Ms. Reiter stated it was for further Board discussion. She stated that the Board had approved the Crittall windows system for the Kessler Hotel and the railroad hotel off Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay Architects) stated that they were amenable to Staff's comments. He said they were asked by the client to study whether office space could be provided on the two levels, and he did not know if it was resolved. The parking that was needed would be provided in the same way as the office building that was approved at approximately the same time across Tattnall Street, and said that there was 1,000 space parking provided by the City of Savannah one block away.

He said they agreed with the comments about the headers and the sills, and that the headers would be cast stone and the brick sills be a brick made from the same cast stone material as the headers. They like the individual bricks because it gives them an adequate pitch on the stones on the sill, and said that there was a flaw in the drawing on the rear elevation. There was an error in the rear elevation drawing showing a double-row lot cornice underneath the fancy

cornice that should wrap around the building, and it was inadvertently left out of the drawing. They could see if the brick that were turned on the side and the parapet done in the cast stone brick to add more of a color and textural variation. He was not keen on the idea of reintroducing the fancy bracketed cornice on the back of the building because he did not want to confuse the back of the building with the front.

They were in agreement with the three-inch offset and said there was a typical window detail on the drawing showing a minimum of three inches.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Dolly Chisholm (Representing the Beehive Foundation, Historic Savannah Foundation, Downtown Neighborhood Foundation, and surrounding residents) asked the Board to continue the item to September 12, 2007, because they have appealed to the Board of Zoning Appeals regarding Part I Height and Mass. She said a lawsuit was pending in the Superior Court of Chatham County regarding the project seeking declaratory judgment, injunctive relief, and mandamus; the underlying Historic District Ordinance and the interpretation. They felt the case should not be heard, it was premature, and asked the Board to table it. They had spoke to Judge Brenann of Superior Court to set it down for the injunctive request hearing and they were told they would have it within the month. She felt that would take place prior to September 12, and there would be a ruling from the Superior Court at that time and then the petition could go forward.

Mr. Steffen asked Ms. Chisholm if she was asking the Board to continue the petition and was not suggesting that the court had stayed the Board's proceedings.

Ms. Chisholm stated she was asking the Board to consider continuing the item.

Mr. Shay stated there was urgency because the demolition permit would be issued and they want to follow it up with a foundation permit to begin laying the foundation for the building. He said whatever legal proceeding that was placed ran its course that they were not placed in a double jeopardy situation of an appeal that would be subject to a second appeal if it comes back at a later date.

Ms. Seiler stated that according to Staff there would have to be modifications made and the petition would have to come back to Staff or the Board, and asked if Mr. Shay would grant the courtesy of the continuance to the September meeting.

Mr. Shay stated he could not do much on the project, stated it was not a matter of courtesy, but they would prefer to have the matter heard today. He said the appeal would keep them from moving forward, and did not want a situation where the Height and Mass had been granted by the Board, and end up with a second appeal over the matter because it came afterward.

Mr. Steffen stated Mr. Shay was voicing his concern about the Board not continuing. He said if the Board ruled on it today it would provide another decision that would be subject to being appealed on the original ordinance. In order to prevent it from happening or having two appeals going on at the same time, it would be better to continue the petition and not have the Board make a decision. Especially if it was an issue that was relatively a minor impact to the project and did not think it was a risk that the applicant wanted to undertake.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition to the September 12, 2007, meeting. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and it passed 7 to 1.

**RE: Amended Petition of Patricia and Alan Silver
H-06-3735-2
PIN No. 2-0005-04-008
14 Price Street
Addition Revisions**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Christopher Dean.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The petitioner is requesting changes to a previously approved application. Changes include: stucco instead of Hardiplank siding; infill of previously open spaces on the east end of the addition; doors and windows on the east, west, and north elevations

FINDINGS:

1. North, south, and east facades are minimally visible due to proposed six-foot brick wall.
2. Previously, the design included what appeared to be a breezeway. This has been deleted, with the breezeway enclosed to accommodate a foyer. The design indicates a door with sidelights and a flanking column and pilaster under a projecting second story overhang. A simple door with a transom would be more architecturally appropriate to the simple architecture of the Price Street structure. The wall on the first floor should move forward to eliminate the overhang in order to simplify the design.
3. Stucco — Is hardcoat stucco to be used? What is the color?
4. As indicated by the petitioner at the last review, windows are to be Norco simulated divided light windows.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the addition with 1) simplification of the addition by eliminating the overhang, column and pilaster, simplification of the entry, and 2) a clarification on the stucco/stucco color to be used.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Christopher Dean (Residential Concepts Design Group) stated that the stucco would be a hard coat stucco and said that Mr. Silver had a sample of the color to submit to Staff for approval. He said they agree with simplifying the door and doing a door transom, but it was a way to get a recess to protect individuals from the elements. It was a previous front door to the structure and did not have an overhang, so when it is raining the applicant is exposed, and that was the only benefit and the sole decision for using the recess.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he did not have objections to the overhang but agreed with Staff regarding the columns. He asked if there was an objection to removing the columns.

Ms. Ramsay asked if they would be willing to work with Staff to simplify the columns.

Mr. Dean stated they do prefer to have the columns because they define the entrance, and they would work with Staff on different designs that would be more appropriate.

Mr. Alan Silver (Owner) stated they wanted the sidelights in order to get light into the structure, and to distinguish it from the historical structures. He said the properties on both sides have porches and more substantial entries, there were other properties in the area that have side lighted doors, and it was not without precedent in the area.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the addition with simplification of the door and entry way, and the clarification of the stucco and color coming back to Staff. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it

RE: Petition of Jim Morehouse
H-07-3812(S)-2
PIN No. 2-0016-22-005
119 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Shed Style Awning

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Jim Morehouse.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The petitioner is requesting approval for a closed end shed style awning with an eight-foot projection. Color — Coastline plus Ocean Blue 2746 vinyl.

FINDINGS:

1. The application was originally submitted to Staff May 2, 2007. Staff approved with the condition that the awning projection not exceed six feet. The petitioner is appealing that decision. The current proposed awning has no letting or signage.
2. The photograph with the awning drawn on it does not appear to be in scale.
3. Staff has consistently denied awnings that project more than six feet. Generally, they are not in scale with the storefronts. The proposed awning projects eight feet and is 30 feet 3 inches.
4. Sidewalk café's as approved by the City are to be removed at night with no permanent covering.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the awning with a six-foot projection.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Jim Morehouse (Coastal Canvas) stated there was a 17-foot-wide walkway in front of the storefront. He said according to code up to two-thirds of the sidewalk could be covered, they were not requesting to go against any building code, but the applicant wanted the capability of placing tables outside with shade and rain protection. There would be no signage on it because there could not be any signage that projected more than six feet. Most of the awnings

downtown have signage on them and were considered a sign, said this awning would not have signage, and that they were asking for the eight-foot projection.

Mr. Steffen asked where Mr. Morehouse found the authority to cover three-quarters of the sidewalk.

Mr. Morehouse stated it was the International Building Code.

Mr. Steffen stated there was a local building code that talks about six feet on the awnings.

Mr. Morehouse stated it did not refer to awnings in particular, but to signs.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated they agreed with Staff that the standard was six feet. He thought the petitioner should be held to the standard and that Staff was being more than fair. He said some historic district's do not allow vinyl, but only canvas which was more compatible. It was more than reasonable and asked the Board to uphold the standard of six feet.

Mr. Steffen asked Mr. McDonald about the petitioner's argument that it was not a sign.

Mr. McDonald stated it was an awning and the precedent that Staff referred to was that awnings were held to six feet in projection, because the awning was designed to cover the storefront and protect the door, but not for outdoor dining. Here was a case where the applicant wanted to construct an awning for outdoor dining.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that with an east elevation the awning would not keep the sun out because the sun was at a lower point, and in the afternoon, the awning would not be necessary for shade. He said he agreed with Staff's recommendation and the Board's precedent.

Mr. Steffen asked Staff if the six-foot precedent was applicable for any awning.

Ms. Reiter stated that Staff had applied the precedent for the awning that had been reviewed for years. She said the Historic District Ordinance would preempt some of the other zoning or building codes. If the International Building Code states the awning could go three-quarters, she believed that it would be trumped by the Historic District Ordinance.

Mr. Steffen stated that Ms. Seiler clarified that the ordinance says both the under awnings and canopy signs.

Mr. Morehouse stated there were other awnings and canopies in the Historic District that projected out more than eight feet. He suggested that the precedent from the past that was being referred to was in reference to a sign ordinance and this was not a sign.

Ms. Seiler stated that according to the ordinance for under-awning and canopy signs that Mr. Morehouse would have to adjust the size as Staff suggested, or the Board would have no choice but to deny it.

Mr. Gay stated that the awnings were over the doorway and not over the entire building front.

Mr. Morehouse stated if you go to City Market, awnings were located over there.

Mr. Steffen asked Mr. Morehouse if he preferred to have the Board approve the six-foot awning or deny the petition.

Mr. Morehouse stated he would discuss it with the applicant and let her decide if she wanted to pursue the six-foot awning or not pursue it.

Mr. Steffen asked if they wanted to continue it until September.

Mr. Morehouse answered no and said for the Board to do what they had to do. He said the Board could either approve it as Staff suggested with the conditions, and he would leave it up to the client regarding whether she wanted it done.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the awning project no more than six feet. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

Mr. Steffen stated that State or national building codes could be trumped, extended, and modified by local ordinances, and they often were within historic districts.

**RE: Continued Petition of Nancy & Erik Duncan
H-07-3831-2
PIN No. 2-0032-48-014
440 Habersham
Alteration to the Front Porch and a Balcony
Addition**

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

Present for the petition was Ms. Nancy Duncan.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for an amended application for porch rehabilitation and addition of a second floor porch on the building at 440 Habersham Street as follows:

1. Retain all existing columns and grooved balusters.
2. Install fretwork spandrels between the columns of the porch. Instead of dowels, use grooved spindles to match those on the porch railing.
3. Construct a balcony/porch on the second floor above the main entrance similar to the houses across Habersham Street, using pickets to match the grooved pickets on the main porch.

FINDINGS:

The historic residence at 440 Habersham Street was constructed in 1902, and is a rated structure within Savannah's National Historic Landmark District. The building is one of a number built by the Home Building Company for the same owner. The building exhibits a transition between high style Queen Anne and Colonial Revival details. Almost all of the similar buildings within the ward feature turned columns and balusters with decorative brackets and fretwork. The Colonial Revival detailing is consistent with the later date (1902) of this example.

Some also exhibit porches over the entry similar to what is proposed. A building at 701 Whitaker, built in 1897, exhibits the same round columns and grooved spindles.

The owner proposes to add fretwork with grooved spindles and curved detail to match corner bracket and a new second story small porch with grooved spindles.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval with final dimensioned elevation drawings of final fretwork and small balcony to be resubmitted to Staff for final approval.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the submission was incomplete because there were no drawings or sketches and there was no height for the balustrade. He said there were samples of different fretwork it was not specified which they would use. He did not know what the Board could approve.

Ms. Reiter stated it was a minor issue of fretwork and thought it could come back to Staff.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the whole project should come back to Staff so that the heights, dimensions, and details could be explained. He said it was difficult to ascertain what the applicant wanted to do.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Ms. Nancy Duncan stated she would welcome the Board to her home to show them what she wanted to do. She said they were one corner away from the corner of Habersham and Gordon Streets, that Whitfield Square could be seen from their porch, Amethyst Inn was next door, and there were rowhouses across the street. There were trolleys, buses, and lots of tourist activity with pictures being taken, and her house was the eyesore on the block. She said they would comply with what the Board wanted, the fretwork would be custom made, and would have it cut to whatever size they wanted.

Mr. Steffen stated that Staff asked for the final fretwork and small balcony drawings be resubmitted to Staff for final approval and asked if she had any objection.

Ms. Duncan answered no, and said they were going to order it from across the country because they do not know of anyone locally. She said if there were a local vendor they would use them.

Mr. Steffen asked if Ms. Duncan had objection to the drawings being resubmitted and going back to Staff for approval.

Ms. Duncan stated she was not a professional, that it was the best that she could do, and asked if she should hire an architect.

Ms. Ramsay stated that Ms. Duncan's house would not look like the ones across the street with the modern codes. She explained that the Board had standards for submissions that included detailed drawings, and added that a draftsperson could do the work.

Mr. Steffen stated that Mr. Meyerhoff stated that the petition come back to Staff, and that Staff was wanting to approve the project, but there needed to be final drawings of the fretwork and the balcony. He said that Mr. McDonald with Historic Savannah Foundation had services to help with the drawings to get Staff approval.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the concept was not an objection, but the objection was the written rules regarding submittals that come to the Board. He said that the petitioner's submission did not meet the rules, and whether there be a continuance for a submission, but the Board could not approve what they do not know.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated they object to the addition of the spandrel spool work to the house. He said that Staff had stated that the porch, columns, and railings were original. Where the column capitals and entablature meet, there was no space to receive the spandrel between the columns. It was an example of trying to retrofit an original porch with architectural detail that came from a previous Queen Anne era. He felt it would be bad practice, policy, and precedent for the Review Board to approve because it was not an original element of an original porch. He felt the additions were inappropriate to the house and it violated the standards and guidelines, and asked the Board to deny the request. He said they did not have an opinion on the porch on the second floor level, but thought it should be designed appropriately. He agreed with Ms. Ramsey that with current code requirements, that people might not like the design because it would not look like the ones across the street.

Ms. Duncan stated there were other residences that had the same of the exact same features and showed photographs of them. She said if other spandrels were preferred, that it would be fine and she was not opposed.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he did not have an objection to what was being done, but that he objected to the submission process.

Ms. Duncan stated she thought she knew what she wanted to do.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the Board needed to see what she wanted to do with dimensions and an actual drawing.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition to the September 12, 2007, meeting. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: Petition of Greenline Architecture
 Keith Howington
 H-07-3839-2
 PIN No. 2-0016-33-001
 201 Papy Street
 New Construction of a Five-Story Hotel, Part I**

The Preservation Officer recommends **continuance for revisions**.

Present for the petition was Mr. John Deering.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The petitioner is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval of a New Embassy Suites hotel on a site bounded by Oglethorpe Avenue on the north, Papy Street on the east, Turner Street on the south, and the Thunderbird and a vacant lot on the west.

FINDINGS:

1. Staff has met with the applicant on April 24, 2007, and July 2, 2007. The petition was continued at the July 11, 2007, meeting of the Historic District Board of Review. Since the HDBR meeting Staff met with the applicant on July 17, 2007, July 30, 2007, and August 14, 2007, and there were several e-mail exchanges.
2. The following summarizes the substantive revisions to the previous submission:
 - A functional pedestrian entry has been placed on Oglethorpe to access both the hotel and the leased space on the corner.
 - A pair of recessed French doors has been added to the leased space to outside seating on Oglethorpe, and this is balanced on the other end of the hotel with a pair of outdoor seating balconies at the first floor level.
 - The building has been stepped back from the Thunderbird Inn one window width at the fourth and fifth levels. The balcony is 10'-2 ½ " by 26'-6 7/8". This enables the windows on the deck to be operable. False-glassed windows will be placed on the remaining west wall overlooking the Thunderbird. The applicant has stated that a greater block of rooms cannot be removed and placed on the Turner Street side of the building, because a dead end corridor cannot be longer than 20 feet without an additional stair exit.
 - The parking garage will be a separate submission, but will be built first. It will have commercial space on a part of the ground level and the hotel trash will be handled internally in the garage structure.
 - Balconies have been added to the Oglethorpe Avenue elevation.
 - No PTAC systems are being used.

SUMMARY OF STAFF CONCERNS:

1. **Orientation of the building:** The lot has 240 feet along Oglethorpe Avenue by 286 feet along Papy Street, for a total of 68,640 square feet. The ordinance standards state that the building should be oriented to the principal east-west street, which is Oglethorpe Avenue. The applicant states that Traffic Engineering will not permit drop off on Oglethorpe, but no study has been done setting all or a part of the building back from Oglethorpe to allow adequate room for a court-style drop off entrance.
2. **Height:** The building is 70 feet tall. The revisions to drop the building down to the Thunderbird and allow windows on the west façade are inadequate. This building seems to be a site-adapt of a corporate model that does not work within the Savannah Plan. Studies should be made to reorient the building using the site to more advantage. The building could probably be reduced in height and more rooms gained in the process. Perhaps even a garden court could be gained.
3. The proposed Oglethorpe entry plan does not appear to match the elevation. It is still only a door to a corridor. Most of the "grand entrance" is an unusable terrace above the sidewalk, much in the manner of the Civic Center or the front of the DeSoto Hotel.

4. The mass of the building is segmented by pilasters that do not continue visually to the ground, particularly on the Papy Street side. It appears as a classical building that is built on a podium of some other style. The ground floor piers do not relate to the pilasters above.
5. There is a mixture of materials that do not relate well together – the brick entrance fronts seem unrelated to the rest of the structure – most of the building is stucco. This is not appropriate for such a large structure and does not modulate the scale very well. Smaller masonry units would help to reduce the scale of the building. There are a number of masonry unit railroad structures, both extant and historical, which could provide precedent for design of the building.
6. A footprint for a parking structure is shown. This is a major part of the complex and must be completed before ground is broken for the proposed hotel. No drawings have been reviewed for this parking structure, and it is unclear that there is adequate parking for the proposed 160 plus-room hotel, relocated Hampton Suites parking (approximately 100 spaces), retail space of approximately 7400 square feet, and restaurant and convention facilities for 684 people. The relationship and size of the parking structure to the proposed hotel is a design issue that is in the purview of the Board, and the two buildings should be considered together.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in the BC zone.	The proposed structure is essentially built to the lot line.	This standard is met; however, the Oglethorpe Avenue side provides no relief for the pedestrian from the 70-foot-height on one side, and street traffic on the other. There is no tree lawn and the result is a harsh pedestrian experience not within the intent of the Comprehensive Plan.
Entrances: A building on a Tything Block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street. For large-scale development primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street. Buildings less than 60 feet wide located on a corner Tything lot abutting a north-south connecting street shall locate primary entrances on both the east-west and north-south streets unless a corner entrance is utilized. Buildings greater than 60 feet in width shall have an entrance located on the east-west street	The entrance is on Papy Street which is a secondary street to Oglethorpe Avenue. The entrance from Oglethorpe Avenue is basically to a corridor although it does have access to the restaurant and locked access to the hotel.	The issue of access on Oglethorpe needs to be discussed again with the City Traffic Department and Staff.

<p>regardless of the location of any other entrances.</p>		
<p>Building Height: The site is located in a five-story zone.</p>	<p>Five stories are proposed. A 20-foot first story, four 10-foot stories above, and a 10'-4" parapet is proposed. The plan is an H shape with a one-story entrance section on Papy Street.</p>	<p>The height zone standard is met, however, because of the large footprint, the mass, and scale of the proposed structure; it overwhelms all of the context, both historic and non-historic. There is an abrupt transition from the 70-foot height of the proposed structure down to the Thunderbird Inn, which is two-stories. There is no modulation of height except on the side street.</p>
<p>Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development: The frontage of tall buildings shall be divided into architecturally distinct sections no more than 60 feet in width with each section taller than it is wide. Buildings greater than four stories shall use window groupings, columns, or pilasters to create bays not less than 15 feet, nor, more than 20 feet in width. Roofs shall be flat with parapets or be less than 4:12 with an overhang. If pitched the roofs shall be bracketed, corbelled, or have an entablature.</p>	<p>Through groupings of windows and manipulation of the façade there are architecturally distinct sections to the building. The roof has a parapet.</p>	<p>An attempt has been made to modulate the mass of the building above the first level; however, the scale of this structure is larger than anything within its context. The pilasters do not extend to the ground nor are they vertically aligned.</p>
<p>Proportion of Structure's Front Façade: Also, Historic District Ordinance Visual Compatibility Factor general paragraph states New construction shall be visually compatible with structures ...and places to which it is visually related. The (visual compatibility factors) shall be considered in determining the visual compatibility of such a building. Greater weight shall be given to adjacent historic structures.</p>	<p>A one-story covered center entry is proposed. It appears that motifs have perhaps been taken from the Landmark railroad buildings to the south.</p>	<p>The juxtaposition of the railroad motif with the design of the rest of the proposed structure is incongruous. The effect is that the upper part of the building sits on a podium.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Structure on Street:</p>	<p>The structure faces Papy Street. A request has been</p>	<p>See below</p>

	made to take part of the Papy Street right-of-way to widen the sidewalk.	
Walls of Continuity:		The siting of the building to front Papy rather than Oglethorpe Avenue diminishes the success of Oglethorpe as a boulevard. The building abuts a very narrow sidewalk with no street trees. The intent of the Comprehensive Plan is to re-establish connectivity with the expansion areas on either side of the Historic District. The proposed building does not enhance Oglethorpe as a boulevard, nor does it front the primary street. Staff recommends looking at setting the building back from Oglethorpe and installing a tree-planting strip at curbside to give “breathing room”, and enhance the pedestrian walkability of this boulevard.

RECOMMENDATION

Take public comment and continue the petition in order for staff to meet with the developer.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. John Deering (Greenline Architecture) stated that in looking at the site and developing the design from the beginning, they want the drop-off and primary entrance on Papy Street, then move around onto Turner Street and into an auto court. He said there would be an auto court on site, that they were not building the lot to 100 percent, which was allowed with the zoning. They created an entrance on Oglethorpe and helped to reinforce the boulevard having a large building. He showed photographs of one-story buildings that he thought helped reinforce Oglethorpe as a gateway boulevard with a large building on the site. The side on Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (MLK) was not like the Savannah Plan that Staff mentioned in the write-up because the Savannah Plan was on the east of MLK.

He said they were within a five-story height zone and tried to minimize the mass by dropping down against the Thunderbird, and by creating an auto court and a one-story section along Papy Street between the two projecting lineal buildings with a connector in between. They had met the minimum floor-to-floor heights in the standards and ordinances, and the corporate model for Embassy Suites did not look like their model. It was an edge district that was a perfect place for larger buildings with larger sites.

He said they had addressed the Oglethorpe entry plan. There were four doors along the Oglethorpe entry side, a recess with French doors into the guest suites, a central main entrance

on Oglethorpe, another recess with entrances into the restaurant lease space, and a corner entrance. To work within the proposed Downtown Master Plan, half of the building on the first floor was lease space for the restaurant that provided interaction between the pedestrians and cars on Oglethorpe.

He said because the site was a parallelogram and the building was square, they had three more feet of sidewalk with a 12-foot 9-inch wide sidewalk that allowed for palm tree plantings. (*Inaudible – stepped away from the microphone.*) They agreed with Staff regarding the pilasters on Papy Street, and said with today's approval they could make the change in the design phase.

He said the parking structure was two separate buildings that he felt the Board could review at different times. If they get approval with conditions they would be happy, and they know they have to meet the parking criteria. They were looking for temporary off-site, on-street parking for the Hampton Inn, and then they could construct the hotel and parking garage at the same time. They would come back with a parking garage submittal.

He said that Mr. Keith Howington had met with St. Phillip's Monumental AME Church regarding the Bishop Turner monument, and they were in favor of improving the streetscape along Turner, enhancing the monument, and if there was retail along Turner and Fahm Streets in the parking deck they could possibly name it after Bishop Turner or something related to the church.

Mr. Buck Lindsay, the architect had met with the City regarding moving the street slightly, reducing the width, and creating a 24-foot-wide sidewalk along Papy Street to allow more interaction with the street. They would change the materials of the street and do blue stone and brick sidewalks, better and bigger plantings along Papy Street, and enhance the side streets.

He said the hotel responded to the City Manager and City Council's request to build hotels to help reinforce the convention industry. The hotel would provide meeting, banquet, and ballroom facilities for 684 people, and said some of the hotels being built do not have meeting or convention spaces.

He asked the Board not to continue the petition but approve it and allow them to work with Staff regarding the details. He felt they had met the zoning ordinances, the standards, guidelines, and everything that was in place.

Mr. Steffen stated that Staff's recommendation was that they meet with the developer and asked for a comment.

Mr. Deering stated they had brought the developer's comments to Staff and SDRA and did not know what else they could do.

Mr. Gay stated he did not understand why they were reluctant to present the parking garage when it was crucial and because it sounded like a complex addition with the retail.

Mr. Deering stated the parking garage was a short-term, quick construction project and subject to the Board's approval, and the hotel was a 14-month construction project. He said they want to get started with construction documents and the approval process to get the building underway.

Mr. Gay stated that he wanted to see the garage.

Mr. Deering stated they would not do anything incompatible with the neighborhood. He thought the garage was a separate building and wanted it considered that way.

Mr. Johnson stated he was also concerned about the parking and traffic.

Mr. Deering stated the developer was considering building more parking than was necessary. He said there were 239 spaces necessary between the Hampton Inn and the Embassy Suites. The proposed parking garage would be a minimum of 330 spaces that would provide parking for the neighborhood as well as the hotel.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that between the parking garage and the building at the entry there was approximately 240 feet by 120 feet of an open area. He said they could take 10 or 15 feet and place it on the Papy Street side rather than add the City to widen Papy Street. It would create a grander entrance and reduce some of the 250 feet mass of the straight wall along Papy Street

Mr. Deering stated they did not have to do anything with Papy Street, and without moving the street they would still have 16 feet of sidewalk.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated they could enhance the entry by pushing it back into the vase open space to some degree so it would not look cramped. He said with the drive on Papy Street they would reduce the entry from seven to eight feet between the door and the car.

Mr. Deering stated he felt they had handled it by providing a one-story and five-story section. He said it did not feel like it was encroaching on the street but it would feel open because there was one-story between the two five-story sections.

Mr. Gay stated they had said they were talking to the City.

Mr. Deering stated they had thought about it and said that Mr. Lindsay had met with them.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it appeared as a corporate standard hotel and there were a lot of contortions to place the entry where it always is, instead of looking at Savannah and designing a hotel that fits Savannah with an entry on Oglethorpe.

Mr. Deering stated another reason the entry was not placed on Oglethorpe was Graphic Engineering and the Department of Transportation did not want any drop-off along Oglethorpe because of the traffic problems. He said it was mentioned that it backs up from MLK to Oglethorpe at peak hours, and a drop-off would aggravate the situation.

Ms. Ramsay stated that Staff made another recommendation on how it could be studied or changed.

Mr. Deering stated he thought it was not a bad solution.

Ms. Ramsay stated it was the Embassy Suites standard solution.

Mr. Deering stated that Embassy Suites were not built in an urban environment and did not know what the standard was for an urban environment.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the other Embassy Suites on the website were similar.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation representing the Architectural Review Committee) stated they would support the height or lot coverage variance if the petitioner would be willing to set back the Oglethorpe side of the building, to allow for three or four live oak trees. She said they were concerned about the canyon effect everyone was talking about coming up

Oglethorpe into the city, and if the primary entrance was not on Oglethorpe, they could set back a couple of sections for a tree lawn on the opposite side of the sidewalk. It might create a better feel for the drive-through.

Mr. Harold Yellin (Representing the Petitioner) stated that the petition was for Height and Mass of the hotel and not the garage. He said the Height and Mass approval of the hotel was not related to the garage. If they were discussing the use approval and the ability to gain the approval of the use for the property, or the Certificate of Occupancy, it would be an issue. He did not think they had an obligation to build a garage and said if they were to do all of it through off-street parking and get a Zoning Boards of Appeal approval, there would be no garage before the Board. If they chose to do first floor or underground parking, there would not be a garage issue. He said to insist upon a consideration of the garage was not correct because there would be plenty of time to do it. The construction of the hotel would be 14 to 16 months, building the garage would be approximately six months, and they would be back before the Board. There was not a reluctance to come before the Board, but they do not want the hotel plan to be held up because of garage plans that were not ready. He said there had been other petitions before the Board in the past where parking was handled differently, and they should not be penalized for having the room for the garage.

Mr. Buck Lindsay stated that the Embassy Suites had been a rectangular mass over the years that went straight up with an atrium in the middle. He said that recently the Embassy Suites had introduced a new prototype that was a linear tower going straight up with a one-story element projecting from the front of the building. What they have was different from either of the Embassy Suites models. It was an “H-shaped” plan that was successful in breaking down the mass of the building to a more appropriate scale for the location. One of the wings was similar in concept to the Hampton Inn. He said it was a building with significantly smaller mass elements relating to the adjacent architecture.

Ms. Jeanette Scott (Representative of the St. Phillip Monumental AME Church) stated the churches interest was in the monument on Turner Boulevard that was formerly Hull Street, and they were interested in having the historical monument preserved. She said the company would be preserving the monument and that they would be watching clearly and closely to see that it was done. They were excited about the plans and were happy the applicant included the church and discussed the plans with them.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the hotel she had downloaded appeared to be the “H-shape” plan with a one-story projection in the front.

Mr. Steffen stated whether it was a corporate template or not that it was irrelevant. He said it was relevant whether it fits into Savannah’s Master Plan. He said that Staff recommended a continuance to have an opportunity to meet with the developer, and the petitioner recommended approval of Height and Mass today allowing some issues to go back to Staff for further review.

Mr. Meyerhoff restated that there was a tremendous open area on the first floor plan between the proposed garage and proposed hotel with parking and circular driving. He said so that there would not be 240- or 280-foot walls along the street that the hotel could be rearranged to give more breathing room on Oglethorpe Avenue and Papy Street.

Mr. Richard Law stated he was concerned about the number of hotels built downtown with insufficient parking.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition to the September 12, 2007, meeting. Dr. Elmore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Deering stated that the submittal date for September 12 was the next day, and they definitely wanted to be placed on the agenda.

Mr. Steffen stated they would provide some flexibility and it would be discussed before the end of the meeting. He said that the Board had not expressed a formal opinion whether the developer should meet with Staff, and he encouraged the petitioner to make it happen because it was important to Staff.

Ms. Seiler stated that the Board understood that they do not deal with parking.

Mr. Thomson stated one of the critical issues for Staff was that the parking garage was an afterthought in the hotel and they believe there was a better design for the hotel and parking that does not place the parking garage on the corner and the hotel next to it. He said the owner through their architect stated they wanted to do it the way they had shown it. The support today was another chance to make a point because there was a better design for this location.

**RE: Petition of Greenline Architecture
Keith Howington
H-07-3842-2
PIN No. 2-0016-36-010
148 Montgomery Street
New Construction of a Five-Story Hotel, Part I**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Keith Howington.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of Part I Height and Mass for a six-story SpringHill Suites Hotel on the Tything Block bounded by Montgomery Street, Oglethorpe Avenue, Jefferson Street, and York Lane.

FINDINGS:

1. Staff has met with the applicant on May 21, 2007, May 31, 2007, and July 2, 2007. The application was discussed and continued at the July 11, 2007, meeting of the Historic District Board of Review.

Further meetings were held between Staff and the petitioner on July 17, 2007, and July 30, 2007. There were also several e-mail exchanges.

2. The following summarizes the substantive revisions from the first submission:
 - The main entry on Oglethorpe Avenue has been moved east one bay to comply with Park and Tree's concern to save both street trees.
 - The mass of the building has been stepped down to the lane and lower buildings on the north side of the lane. The mass is capped at the third floor level at this point.

- The lane elevation is basically a “U” shape. At the lane edge a 53’-2” wing at three stories is on the east end and a 52’-4” wing at six stories on the west end. 87’-4” of the lane elevation is at one-story with a pool screen wall at the second story level. The remaining 47’-3” is at grade. The six-story mass of the hotel is recessed 30 feet off the lane except for the Montgomery Street end.
- The sixth story is recessed 6’-6” from the Oglethorpe parapet and 4’-6” from the Jefferson Street parapet for two-thirds of the Oglethorpe Avenue block face.
- The sixth story will require a Finding-of-Fact from the Review Board regarding its compatibility. This Finding-of-Fact will be sent to the Zoning Board of Appeals.
- Brick is proposed as the material for the Montgomery Street end of the building. The east end will incorporate cast concrete, stucco, glass and metal panels. A 30’-4” glass section will separate these two ends creating the appearance of multiple building fronts along Oglethorpe Avenue.
- Storefronts are proposed on Montgomery Street, and there is leased space east of the main entry. There are multiple public entrances along both Montgomery Street and Oglethorpe Avenue.
- The trash container is internal to the property.
- The PTAC system has been removed from the glass entry portion of the building.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in the BC-1 zone.	The main block of suites has been recessed from the lane.	The building steps down to the lane for two-thirds of the site.
Dwelling Unit Type:	Suites, hotel, and leased space.	Interactive public activity has been provided along Oglethorpe Avenue and Montgomery Street.
Entrances: A building on a Tything Block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street. For large-scale development primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street. Buildings less than 60 feet wide located on a corner Tything lot abutting a north-south connecting street shall locate primary entrances on both the east-west and north-south streets unless a corner entrance is utilized. Buildings greater than 60 feet in width shall have an entrance located on the east-west street	Two entrances are located on Montgomery Street. Three entrances are located along the Oglethorpe Avenue block face.	The intent of this standard is met. The East entrance on Oglethorpe is 72 feet from the corner; however, two leased spaces have been provided on this block front in addition to the main entrance.

regardless of the location of any other entrances.		
Building Height: The site is located within a five-story zone.	A sixth story is proposed.	The sixth story has been recessed from the Oglethorpe Avenue and Jefferson Street block faces and is recessed thirty feet from the lane for two-thirds of the site. A Finding-of-Fact that the sixth story is visually compatible is recommended since Oglethorpe Avenue is a broad boulevard.
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development: The frontage of tall buildings shall be divided into architecturally distinct sections no more than 60 feet in width with each section taller than it is wide. Buildings greater than four stories shall use window groupings, columns, or pilasters to create bays not less than 15 feet, nor, more than 20 feet in width. Roofs shall be flat with parapets or be less than 4:12 with an overhang. If pitched, the roofs shall be bracketed, corbelled, or have an entablature.	The Oglethorpe Avenue façade is divided into three architecturally distinct sections by the use of materials, height change, and setbacks. The western section is the width of one and one-half Tything lot, the center glass section is the width of one-half Tything lot, and the eastern section is the width of two Tything lots. These are further subdivided by window groupings and two-foot recesses.	The intent of this standard is met.
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:	Each division of the building appears taller than it is wide.	This standard is met.
Proportion of Openings:	The window opening proportions at 4:8 are not less than 5:3. The windows are aligned vertically.	The intent of the standard is met.
Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:	The bays along Oglethorpe are roughly 15 feet and 23 feet.	The intent of the standards is met.
Rhythm of Structure on Street:	The building has been subdivided to form a rhythm of three masses with pedestrian entrances.	The 60-foot-lot widths have been articulated in the main divisions of the elevation façade.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies:	Metal awnings are proposed over the entry and storefronts.	The awnings together with the variety of storefront entries, creates a rhythm of entrances and pedestrian cover along the block face. Staff recommends that the metal canopy over the east

		storefront be subdivided to cover each storefront and entry separately rather than extend across all three.
Walls of Continuity:	The street face walls are maintained the length of the block.	
Scale:	The scale has been subdivided by a variety of materials and textures such as the various depths of rustication at the pedestrian level. The building steps down to the historic structures across the rear lane.	

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of a Finding-of-Fact that the sixth floor is visually compatible.

Approval of Part I Height and Mass, with the condition that the east storefront canopy be subdivided into three units.

Ms. Lise Sundrla (Savannah Development and Renewal Authority - SDRA) stated that in the past month she has served in a role working with the Metropolitan Planning Commission (MPC) Staff with reviewing large-scale development, specifically hotel developments coming into the downtown area. She said that it was brought up that there were many hotels with an interest in the downtown from a planning and proposed perspective, and has become a consideration of the Downtown Master Plan process. This was an opportunity to be used as a model to show that by taking into consideration lot coverage, Height and Mass, interactive street level use, a mixture of quality use of materials on a structure, and working in conjunction with MPC Staff on having a collective design that will not detract from the adjoining neighborhood and historic structures that would not present a curtain wall or canyon effect along the major corridors. She applauded the petitioner’s in the development portion for coming to the SDRA to come up with a quality design that would be a positive impression and addition to the downtown.

Mr. Steffen stated that SDRA’s efforts and the efforts of others in the meetings has allowed the Board to use more tools with trading off some of the items and make recommendations for a slightly larger height in one area to step down and accommodate the neighborhood and allow things the Board could not do.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Keith Howington (Greenline Architecture) stated they had been working with Staff and SDRA to come up with a solution to keep the street viability alive along the corridor. He said they created a retail/lease space in the center, the entrance to the hotel, and a corner lease space to create the effect. A portion of the rear elevation has been stepped down to help respect the 19th Century structures on the north. They met with the neighbors and they had legitimate concerns and wanted to abide by them as much as possible. He felt they had addressed the issues and asked them to present a list of their concerns.

Mr. Steffen asked if they had a problem with dividing the storefront canopy into three as Staff suggested.

Mr. Howington answered no.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Enoch Dumus (Chatham Area Transit – CAT) stated that there was not an agreement with the bus stop location on Oglethorpe and Montgomery, and there concerns were that it was a major transfer point for CAT with the buses. He said if the construction takes place, they would be forced to deal with where the passengers would wait to make connections. Some discussion had taken place with Tripplett(?), they had not received a response to their concerns and wanted to make the Board aware of the major transfer point that would disrupt the service if there was no resolution.

Mr. Steffen stated that it was not within the purview of the Board concerning traffic flow, parking, or any of those things, including bus service. He encouraged them to work with the developer and work out what could be worked out, but the issues would not come before the Board.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if Mr. Dumus' concern was during the construction period or having the hotel and bus stop there.

Mr. Dewes stated it was the total concept because it changes the dynamic. He said it was convenient and had been that way for many years, and their eyes were open to the whole process.

Ms. Sundrla stated that SDRA would work with CAT to facilitate the discussions and assist through the process. She said that there could be a win-win solution from the standpoint of improving the sidewalk and accessibility.

Mr. Walter Hartridge (Representing Mr. Gene Brooks and Surrounding Neighbors) stated that the hotel was in a five-story zone and said that Staff recommended approval of six stories. He said there were initial concerns about overshadowing of the historic structures on York Street, and he felt that there were constant variances and higher buildings on Bay Street and the Historic District. None of the plans show anything about parking except for underground parking that had not been indicated on the plans, which was integral to the parking. It was a franchise of SpringHill Suites to be placed on Oglethorpe and Montgomery in the Historic District, east of MLK at six stories with no parking plans to show it could be built as designed. This was why they oppose approval of the Height and Mass today.

Mr. Gene Brooks (313 East York Street) stated he appreciated the setback and met with the owner's representative, architect, and Mr. Deering, and they expressed concerns for a setback from the lane. He said they intend for traffic to come from underground and use the York Street Lane as a public thoroughfare. They intend on having conference rooms and people other than those staying at the hotel will be parking there. He said it was an impractical design for egress from the structure and suggested that the area be stepped back and the mass be lessened.

Mr. Louis Leonard (311 East York Street) stated that he met with the architects and owners and there were improvements to the previous design. He said there were still concerns about the Height and Mass, the six stories, and the overshadowing of York Street properties. He said that using York Lane as a thoroughfare would put approximately two hundred cars on a 22-foot-wide lane with service vehicles, delivery trucks, and workmen. He understood that overflow parking would be at the Robby Robinson parking garage on York Street at Montgomery and this parking garage frequently has a full sign. Any parking they were trying to leverage through the Robby Robinson garage was not viable. He said he asked the applicant where they would

make deliveries to the hotel and they answered the lane. He asked how many vehicles a hotel could have in a day in a 22-foot-wide lane with service trucks using the lane. The lane would also be used for the pick-up of garbage. He thought that it would be a problem with the site being used for a hotel and did not think it was an adequate site, and said he was concerned about the damage that the historic structures could receive from digging 24 feet for the underground parking garage. He asked the Board to continue the petition so that these problems could be addressed.

Mr. Brooks stated that the building at five stories would be the largest building on the north side of Oglethorpe, and would be larger at six stories.

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that the ARC applauded the petitioner for working with HSF and SDRA to make the street level on the Oglethorpe elevation a pedestrian-friendly corridor, and for stepping down the proposed structure to York Lane. She said they were satisfied that compromises by all parties involved were made, and they were in full support of the Height and Mass of the structure.

Mr. Steffen stated that the Board did not feel that the parking, ingress and egress, and traffic flow issues were boring or relevant, but know that they were serious. Unfortunately, the Board has zero to say about those issues, cannot make decisions based on traffic flow, delivery trucks, or whether parking was provided elsewhere. He said the Board was concerned with Height and Mass. Mr. Hartridge raised the issue about parking being provided within the structure and said that the Board was interested in knowing but only as it relates to the design.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the Board approved Height and Mass would it preclude the further study of egress to the parking lot and asked if the Board was approving it as a part of Height and Mass.

Mr. Steffen answered no and said that the Board did not have anything to say about it. He said if Height and Mass was approved, the petitioner could continue working with the neighbors and work on those issues and the ingress/egress parking issues.

Mr. Law stated that he liked the design of the hotel

Mr. Steffen stated the Board was asked to make a Finding-of-Fact that the sixth floor was visually compatible from a historic standpoint. He said they could not make a decision on whether the ZBA approved the six feet. The Board had been asked to approve the Height and Mass with the condition that the storefront canopy be subdivided into three units, and the architect stated they were willing to comply.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Finding-of-Fact that the additional story is visually compatible, and approve Height and Mass with the condition that the storefront canopy be divided into three units. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Steffen stated the order of the agenda would be changed and he called the following petition.

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay Architects
Patrick Shay
H-07-3862-2
PIN No. 2-0016-03-008
23 Montgomery Street
Demolition/New Construction**

The Preservation Officer recommends continuance for revisions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting to partially demolish two historic structures and build a six-story hotel incorporating the facades into the new development. The development will consist of a hotel with underground parking and retail shops on Bryan and Montgomery Streets. See applicant’s submission for further comments about the project.

FINDINGS:

1. Staff met with the applicant, property owner, and representative of the hotel developer on Monday, July 30, 2007.
2. The site is located within a four-story height zone; therefore, the applicant is seeking a two-story height variance.
3. The two historic structures were built in the early 20th century. The westernmost structure does not extend to the lane. The adjacent use extends behind this building.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in a BC-1 zone.	The structure is basically built to the zero lot line.	
Entrances: A building on a Tything Block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street. For large-scale development, primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street. Buildings less than 60 feet wide located on a corner Tything lot abutting a north-south connecting street shall locate primary entrances on both the east-west and north-south streets unless a corner entrance is utilized. Buildings greater than 60 feet in width shall have an entrance located on the east-west street regardless of the location of any other entrances.	In addition to a corner entrance to the retail, three other entrances exist or are proposed for Bryan Street, and an additional entrance is proposed on Montgomery Street.	This standard is met.
Building Height: The site is located in a four-story zone.	The applicant is requesting approval to building a six-story	A two-story variance would be required from the Board

	<p>structure. The six-story structure extends over the rear portion of the historic two-story structure. A portion of the new structure is at four stories.</p>	<p>of Appeals. The original Chadborne study suggested an overlay district for this ward in which, on the square no building should be higher than the louvers on the steeple of the First African Baptist Church. The site divisions as proposed does not preserve the rhythm of the Oglethorpe plan lot layout.</p>
<p>Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development: The frontage of tall buildings shall be divided into architecturally distinct sections no more than 60 feet in width, with each section taller than it is wide. Buildings greater than four stories shall use window groupings, columns, or pilasters to create bays not less than 15 feet, nor, more than 20 feet in width. Roofs shall be flat with parapets or be less than 4:12 with an overhang. If pitched, the roofs shall be bracketed, corbelled, or have an entablature.</p>	<p>The new four-story section is approximately 60 feet, and the corner building is approximately 60 feet. The rear six-story portion extends across the original lot divisions and does not align with them.</p>	
<p>Proportion of Structure’s Front Façade:</p>		
<p>Proportion of Openings:</p>	<p>Metal windows in a 5:3 ratio vertically aligned are proposed, as well as metal windows in a square or 5:5'-10" proportion.</p>	<p>The windows on the corner portion of the building appear to relate more to the hotel on Bay Street, both in shape and depth.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:</p>	<p>Punched openings are typical of Savannah.</p>	<p>The depth of the windows in the new construction is not shown, but it appears to be very shallow giving little shadow relief.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Structure on Street:</p>		
<p>Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies:</p>	<p>A number of pedestrian entrances are proposed along both Bryan and Montgomery Streets.</p>	<p>The use of pedestrian entrances along both streets is desirable and in keeping with the recommendations being developed for the Downtown Master Plan.</p>

Walls of Continuity:	The proposed structure maintains the wall of continuity along both street frontages.	
Scale:		The building at six stories is too massive for this square and overshadows the church. There is very little detail at the pedestrian level to help break up the mass and the upper floors of the corner portion have a very flat appearance.

There are many features of the proposed development that follow the principles being discussed in the Downtown Master Plan process, including varying the height and including multiple entrances and pedestrian activity along the street.

The proposed height, however, adversely impacts two historic structures and is contrary to the Chadborne Vision for the square in this ward. This vision was incorporated into the adopted height map when the six-story zone was limited to Bay Street, in deference to the historic church and commercial buildings on this square.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has met with the applicant and requested that revisions be studied that would lower the corner building to five stories (equal to or lower than the louvers on the church steeple), explore adding two stories to the rear of the eastern historic building, and explore air rights to add three stories to the rear portion of the western historic building. It was also discussed that if these changes reduced the number of rooms, to dedicate the lane portion of the Montgomery Street retail to rooms.

Additional revisions would include bringing the windows into compliance with the Historic District Ordinance, adding more elements of scale to the street level through scale of modular materials or design ornament, and reinforcing the Oglethorpe Plan.

Mr. Steffen asked Staff to tell the Board which part of bringing the windows into compliance with the Historic District Ordinance, which would fall under Height and Mass and Design Detail.

Ms. Reiter stated that the size of the opening with the Solids-to-Voids, and depth. She said that many of the windows appear flat and that she receives a number of phone calls that there does not seem to be recessing in the masonry wall as the ordinance required.

Mr. Steffen stated that the original photograph of the church had louvers that appeared to be a story higher.

Ms. Reiter stated that they were talking about a lower level and that Chadbourne only saw the church as it was now.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay) introduced Mr. Harold Yellin, attorney and point person for the appeal for the height variance, Reverend Thurman Tillman, Pastor of the First African Baptist Church, Carol Gould, the restoration consultant who participated in the negotiations, Whip Tripplett from Northpoint Development, and other guests. He said the relationship between Northpoint and the First African Baptist Church extends to the project, and the model showed some of the work that was done in helping the church to build the restoration project. It includes the preservation of the church and the red brick buildings across the street. There were two historic buildings in the middle of the block and, if approved, could be fully restored. They had worked with the church over the last ten years to help them find an economical way to restore the buildings, until they developed a partnership relationship with Northpoint. The front of the buildings would be restored and preserved, the steeple had been presented and if the project was successful, he would look forward to reintroducing the same improvements that had expired since approved.

He said the building mass related to the historic facades on Bryan Street. The three- and two-story buildings would be fully restored, and the improvements had been approved. The mass steps up with a four-story section, and then it steps up again into an articulated mass. It is necessary to have the six-story in order to preserve the front portions and not demolish the buildings and gain building mass. There was an effort to introduce street-level retail along the façade and at the corners. The building mass goes all the way to the corner of the property line and anchors the corner, and a corner that was beveled or edged back would not be appropriate.

He said when Mr. Chadbourne was here and saw the building that was there at the time it made sense not to overshadow the buildings. Mr. Chadbourne was not aware of the historic appearance and the steeple would be the tallest in Savannah. One of the main conditions of the Staff report was if the corner was reduced to five stories it would be more acceptable, but when the building loses volume it is no longer economically viable. Although the Board does not consider economics, the economics of the restoration of the church relies on the project. The hotel would be constructed on land that the church owns, and sometime in the future the building would become property of the church.

The ground floor hotel rooms on the street level where pedestrians could look into the windows were undesirable circumstances for the guests and passersby, and it was not a desirable compromise. He said using the air rights of the adjacent buildings where EOA was located was an intriguing idea, but there were a number of problems with it. EOA has not expressed an interest and there were covenants that run with the purchase of the property that states it had to be continued in the current purpose. They considered the things they were asked to consider when they met with Staff and SDRA, but they could not make all of the concessions they were asked to make. Their desire for a Finding-of-Fact would be for something to allow them to move forward with the project.

Dr. Elmore asked if the principal problem was Height and Mass.

Mr. Shay answered yes and said that the building needed to have more Height and Mass. He said the mass of the building would serve to screen the backside of the Doubletree Hotel. They feel the proposed building would screen the backside of the building and when looked at from Franklin Square or City Market you would see a beautiful front. They need the additional height to make the economics of the hotel viable, be able to restore the historic building fronts, and provide economic benefit for the church.

Dr. Elmore asked what role would the development play in restoring the church's steeple to the regular height.

Mr. Shay stated that the developer would pay a land lease to the church in advance, and the money would be used to restore the existing church and hopefully provide some interpretative facilities on MLK. He said the church could be made into more of a religious institution instead of a part-time church and full-time museum.

Dr. Elmore asked if the steeple went back up, how would it mitigate the sixth story.

Mr. Shay stated they did not want the adjacent building mass to be taller than the steeple. The building mass would allow the economic benefit to restore the church, remove the cement from the outside of the building exposing the brick, and raising the steeple. It would still be much taller than the proposed building.

Mr. Steffen asked about the recommendation of Staff regarding adding revisions to bring the windows in compliance with the ordinance, and adding more elements of scale to the street level through scale of modular materials or design ornament, and asked Mr. Shay to address them.

Mr. Shay stated they would propose that the windows comply with the provisions of the ordinance, especially about the depth of the windows. He said they were at the early state of Height and Mass and had not come to the full conclusion of the materials or the outside of the building, but could design them so the windows were recessed into the building mass. They were willing to continue the petition to restudy the streetscape elements and improve it.

Mr. Steffen asked if they had any objections with the Board approving Height and Mass and allow the two elements to come back to Staff.

Mr. Shay stated that it was not a problem.

Ms. Ramsay stated in the Oglethorpe Plan there was a hierarchy of uses and importance of buildings where the trust lots were the important buildings and the Tithing lots were less important buildings. She said she echoed Staff's concern that with the tall building on the corner, the Oglethorpe plan had been violated.

Mr. Shay stated he did not think the Oglethorpe Plan was a height map and said it set out that the trust blocks would be the more important buildings. He said they were set aside for religious and other institutions. The sanctuary would be on the trust block, and the Tithing block would be providing commercial revenue for the city.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the church was not the only trust lot there because there were three other trust lots with two-story buildings on them. She said the Tithing lots across the way have three-story buildings on them. To have a six story building on one of the Tithing lots throws off the balance. It seemed like the height was related more to Bay Street than to the square the building was on.

Mr. Shay stated that the immediate context was the building on Bay Street, and they were relating one side of the building to the building on Bay Street, and step down the massing to the existing two-story historic buildings on the Bryan Street range. The other trust blocks were occupied by commercial buildings and violate the Oglethorpe plan.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Yellin asked if they could hold their comments and respond after the interested parties gave their comments.

Mr. Steffen stated that was fine and it was their discretion.

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that HSF supports the restoration of the First African Baptist Church, strongly supports the restoration of the steeple, and would do anything within its power to make it happen. He said it was improper to link the promise to money that could be gained by building a building that would endanger the ward and the church building. What was before the Board were the aesthetics of the building, how it impacts the ward, and whether it was compatible with other buildings in the ward, and HSF felt that it was not. The six-story building was not appropriate, was incompatible, does not meet the height map, was two stories above what the height map provides, and they were opposed to the Height and Mass. They asked for a continuance and said there were other ways to add square footage to the project without overwhelming other buildings in the ward.

Mr. Steffen asked if HSF had an opinion on Staff's recommendation.

Mr. McDonald stated they support Staff's recommendation.

Mr. Thurman Tillman (Pastor, First African Baptist Church) stated the church was in favor of the project. He said in keeping with the Height and Mass, they understood that the plan dealt with scaling down in the lanes. This structure was acceptable to them because it was scaled down, it comes forward toward the church, and it would preserve two buildings that the church had wanted to do something with. They did not want to own buildings that continued to be blighted in the community. This was an opportunity to do something with the two buildings and do some needed restoration to the steeple, the inside, and remove the stucco on the outside of the church. He said they were working with others and believe it would be an asset to the church, the community, and unborn generations.

Ms. Carol Gore stated that the First African Baptist church was the first systematic redevelopment of the hotels preexisted in the properties surrounding the church. She said they were landlocked in their predisposition of the existing properties, and it was a working partnership. The properties for the church were not incorporated many years ago into a Master Plan and they would not be present today if it had been incorporated. There were slaves that purchased the property many years ago with their freedom, and they were asking the Board to consider not just the historic value of the building, but the history of the church, what it means to the church, community, and congregation. She said that she wholeheartedly supported working with Staff concerning the differences; however, they had met with the architect, developer, and the Hilton Hotel representatives. There were 120 rooms and it was reduced to 109, which was the minimum and the reason they were asking for the height variance.

Mr. Steffen stated the procedure was to let the petitioner to give their statement, and then the public makes comments. He said the comments could be for, against, and sometimes their neither, then he allowed the petitioner to come back if there were specific responses to comments made. He asked if the petitioner wanted to come back and answer questions.

There were none.

Ms. Seiler stated she did not see why the church and their business deal was brought into this when what is before the Board is the petition on the building alone. She was delighted that the church's steeple was being restored, but felt it was another issue. The Board had a responsibility to protect the history of the ward and that was what needed to be looked at. If you look at the model and what was being proposed, she agreed with Staff regarding Height and Mass that the building would be too massive for the site and overshadow the church.

Mr. Steffen stated it was an unusual situation in the sense that the Board hears from adjoining land owners, and in this case, the adjoining landowners were involved with the petition. He said that those who represent First African Baptist Church had every right to comment on the project.

Dr. Elmore stated he understood about the Height and Mass, but the First African Baptist Church and First Bryan Baptist Church were the two oldest continuous black Baptist churches in America. He said the Board should bend over backwards to give them what they want for what they need to do to make the historical church what it needed to be. He knew that Height and Mass was supposed to be separate, but the Board needed to do what was right.

Mr. Steffen stated that one of the challenges the Board always had was to look at Height and Mass in relevance to everything that was around it. He said the building on the north side was of equal Height and Mass, there were buildings on the other side that were not, and sometimes the Board was faced with the dilemma with where to look for the answers and the answers are not always clear. Height and Mass issues were not as easy as it might see sometimes. He said there were two potential motions and reminded the Board that if they had other ideas about other possible motions he was always open. One motion would be to accept Staff's recommendation to continue the matter for further discussions, and the second motion would be to approve the submission as submitted. If approved as submitted, the petition had indicated they were willing to allow the window revisions and the elements on the street scale to go back to Staff for further review. There would have to be a Finding-of-Fact that the sixth floor would be allowed on the site because the Height Map would not allow it.

Ms. Reiter stated that there would need to be a reason why two stories over the four stories were appropriate.

Mr. Steffen stated that the Board's charge was to say that it was historically compatible, and it was up to another agency to decide whether they want to do it.

Dr. Elmore asked how many stories tall was the Doubletree.

Mr. Shay stated it was a six-story building, and the proposed building was identical in height.

Mr. Gay stated that one was on Bay Street and one was not on Bay Street.

Mr. Steffen stated unless there were other options he would accept a motion of a continuance or of an approval with the issues going back to Staff, and with a Finding-of-Fact that six stories was historically compatible.

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Elmore made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the Finding-of-Fact that the sixth story was historically compatible and with the condition that the windows comply with the Historic District Ordinance, and that the elements of the street scale level through the addition of modular materials or design ornamentation go back to Staff. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion. Mr. Meyerhoff, Mr. Gay, and Ms. Seiler were opposed. Ms. Ramsay and Mr. Law abstained. The motion failed 2 to 3.

Mr. Steffen stated that the Chairman had the right to vote in the case of a tie vote and said that it was not a tie vote and he could not vote. He could tie the vote but if he did the vote would fail because a tie vote was not a passage.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition with revisions going back to Staff for further review. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion. Ms. Seiler, Ms. Ramsay, Mr. Gay, Mr. Meyerhoff, and Mr. Law were in favor. Mr. Johnson and Dr. Elmore were opposed. The motion passed 5 to 2.

**RE: Petition of Gonzalez Architects
Wayne Anderson
H-07-3843-2
PIN No. 2-0004-38-007
2 East Broughton Street
Awning**

The Preservation Officer recommends **denial**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Wayne Anderson.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The petitioner is requesting permission to alter a canopy at the rear corner stair tower of 2 East Broughton Street to accommodate a new awning, signage, and a set of canvas curtains.

FINDINGS:

1. This petition is continued from July 11, 2007. In July, the Historic Review Board approved general maintenance to the building but denied the awning as proposed for further study.
2. The current proposal includes attaching a frame to the existing s-curved canopy at the rear stair tower. The proposed canopy would be 11 feet 6 inches across and approximately eight feet deep. The canopy would be vinyl laminate with recessed lighting underneath, attached with concealed brackets. The colors are off white with taupe, advertising "Bull Street Chophouse." Lettering is 8 ½ inches high.
3. Drapery: The proposal includes drapes flanking the doorway. The drapery is off-white with dark taupe 18 inches panels along the bottom.
4. Designed by Savannah architect Cletus Bergen and constructed in 1947, the building has been recognized as a historically significant structure due to its simple design and windowless construction. It is a rated building within the Landmark District. In addition, it sits within the Broughton Street Urban Renewal District, which states that alterations should adhere to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.
5. As it currently stands, the existing canopy is secondary to the prominent tapered awning/canopy that spans the façade of the building. The proposed addition to the canopy would change the size and shape from an s-shape to a dome shape. In addition, the vinyl draperies introduce an element to the building not seen on a building from this period in the past in Savannah. As proposed, the canopy and draperies appear to conflict with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Historic District Standards Section 8-3030 (k) (1), which states that "In considering proposals ...the documented original design of the structure may be considered."

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial of the proposed canopy and draperies.

Mr. Wayne Anderson (Gonzalez Architects representing the owner) stated that they respected the canopy was removable if someone wanted to restore it to the original. He said it was subtle and would not overpower the other canopy, but they needed to establish a presence for the restaurant. It was a second story restaurant which was difficult historically to make a success, and felt that they needed to create a dramatic entrance. He said is had a nice entrance that needed some kind of interest. The canopy was only two feet deep and if it rains there would be no protection for the guest. He felt that was important and said you cannot tell that it was an “S” shape. They chose to do something subtle with a little depth while adding elegance to the façade.

Mr. Steffen asked if the S-shaped canopy was original to the building.

Mr. Anderson stated that it was not on the original drawings.

Ms. Ramsay asked the purpose of the curtains.

Mr. Anderson stated it was common in the Art Deco period to add drapery to entrances to add elegance to create a dinner theatre theme. It would give the feeling that you were going somewhere special.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked Mr. Anderson to explain the new fabric awning canopy. He said the underside showed recessed lights and asked if fabric was at the top. He asked what held the canopy up.

Mr. Anderson answered yes and said that it was a very well constructed canopy. He said the canopy was attached to the existing canopy with metal brackets.

Mr. Steffen asked why it was not in the nature of a sign because it was a temporary canopy.

Ms. Reiter stated a sign was not presented, and said that they were enveloping an existing canopy with another canopy.

Mr. Anderson stated as he read the regulations it looked like it could be at Staff approval because it was a removable awning.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated they agreed with Staff.

Mr. Steffen stated a question was asked about the curtains and said the design goes back to the original design of the building and the 1930's and 40's of doing a canopy-type entrance, and he thought that was what the applicant was wanting.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Meyerhoff** made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review deny the petition as submitted. **Dr. Watkins** seconded the motion. **Mr. Meyerhoff, Dr. Watkins and Ms. Ramsay** were in favor. **Ms. Seiler, Mr. Gay, Mr. Johnson, and Dr. Elmore** were opposed. **Mr. Law** abstained. The motion failed 4 to 3.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion. Mr. Johnson and Dr. Elmore were in favor. Ms. Ramsay, Mr. Meyerhoff, and Dr. Watkins were opposed. Mr. Law abstained. The motion passed 4 to 3.

**RE: Petition of Dawson + Wissmach Architects
Neil Dawson
H-07-3861-2
PIN No. 2-0005-06-012
10 East Broad Street
Awning/Roof/Windows/Doors/Rehabilitation**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Neil Dawson.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of alterations as follows:

1. Remove existing one-story brick masonry addition from north side of the building.
2. Replace one-story addition with two-story brick vestibule addition and ticketing window. Existing clerestory to remain.
3. Remove existing windows and doors from openings on west elevation.
4. Replace windows with new multi-pane true divided light aluminum clad awning windows, and Loewen Cyprium Collection simulated divided light metal clad casement windows with simulated divided light clad transoms. Install new mahogany doors with true divided lights in all existing door openings.
5. Replace roof with 24-inch by 48-inch Rheinzink "Pre-weathered Graphic Gray" roof panels.
6. On rear, remove all windows and doors from openings and re-create arched openings to match front openings. Use same window combination as for front. Install mahogany door in rear opening.
7. On south elevation remove brick infill from arched openings and infill with arched mahogany wood doors.
8. On south elevation circular opening will remain solid (no louvers installed).
9. On west elevation (main façade), add two metal canopies with zinc reveal panel on the underside. Canopies are proposed to be supported by steel tension rods. Aluminum letters with copy "Morris Hall".
10. Remove existing porches and non-historic decorative iron from rear elevation.
11. Paint cast iron cornice and downspout boots Benjamin Moore "Dark Olive" #2140-30.

12. Replacement brick will be Carolina Ceramic extruded straight brick “Bur Ironspot” in utility size (3 5/8” x 3 5/8” x 11 5/8”).

FINDINGS:

The building is to be used for performances, thus acoustical integrity is important. The Board will need to make a Finding-of-Fact that the simulated divided light windows are compatible for this application.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of a Finding-of-Fact that the Loewen metal clad simulated divided light windows are appropriate for this use.

Approval of remaining alterations as submitted.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Neil Dawson (Dawson + Wissmach Architects) stated that Staff’s comments were in line with their comments on the project.

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Elmore made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve a Finding-of-Fact that the simulated divided light windows are visually compatible and approve the petition as submitted. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of McCorkle, Pedigo & Johnson
Phillip R. McCorkle
H-07-3869-2
PIN No. 2-0032-07-001
342 Drayton Street
New Construction of an 18-Unit Condominium,
Part I Height & Mass**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Phillip McCorkle.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass for a three-story condominium building.

FINDINGS:

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.	The proposed structure is built to the zero lot line on Drayton Street. It is set back 10.8 feet from the adjacent property. It	

	is set back 5.2 feet and 28.5 feet from the lane and 6.2 feet, 10 feet and 31'-7 ¾" from the front property line.	
Lot Coverage: The R-I-P-A zone allows maximum building lot coverage of 75 percent.	69 percent lot coverage is proposed.	No variance is required.
Street Elevation Type: The propose street elevation type for new construction shall comply with the following: A proposed building on an east-west connecting street shall utilize an existing historic building street elevation type located within the existing block front, or on an immediately adjacent tithing or trust block.	Three low stoops 4 feet high are proposed.	Low stoops are found in this ward including on the adjacent historic residence. This standard is met.
Entrances: A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street.	Three entrances face Charlton Street.	This standard is met.
Building Height: The building is located in a four-story height zone. A crawl space or partial basement that is four feet or less above grade shall not count as a story.	The building is three stories ranging from 44'-4" to 47'-8".	The height map standards and floor-to-floor heights have been met. The proposed height is 9 feet lower than previous submissions. The proposed structure is 3 feet lower (44'-4") next to the adjacent historic house.
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development:	N/A	
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:	The façade has been subdivided visually into three sections each taller than it is wide. The center section is deeply recessed.	
Proportion of Openings: The distance between windows shall be not less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows. Paired or grouped windows are permitted, provided the individual sashes have a vertical to	Rectangular openings, vertically aligned are proposed. Single and paired windows are proposed with the first floor windows being longer on the main façade. The ratios of the single window are 2:5 and each segment of the paired windows is 2:5.	The ratio of window height to width does not meet the standard. The width of each window needs to be increased one-foot. The distance between windows is greater than two times the width of the windows. This can be corrected by widening the windows.

horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3.		
Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:	<p>The segments of the building are divided into three-bay rhythms.</p> <p>There are two entry openings to the underground garage from the lane.</p>	<p>Three-bay rhythms are typical of this ward.</p> <p>Please provide a better understanding of the garage entries including a section detail of the east entry, with the two flanking surface parking spaces.</p>
Rhythm of Structure-on-Street:	<p>Three stoops are proposed to establish a rhythm of entrances. Setbacks are used to further establish a rhythm.</p>	<p>The segments approximate the widths of structures within the ward.</p>
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, and Balconies:	<p>Recessed porches are proposed on the end with shutters on the Charlton Street elevation to suggest shuttered porches used elsewhere in the ward. Balconies are proposed on the Charlton Street elevation.</p>	<p>Porches, stoops, and balconies are typically found in this ward.</p> <p>Staff again stresses the desirability of having folding shutters on the open porches that can screen the porches.</p>
Walls of Continuity:	<p>The front façade follows the wall of continuity established along this block face.</p>	
Scale:	<p>The scale of the elements within the façade, with the correction of the window opening width is compatible with other buildings in this ward.</p>	
Dumpster:	<p>The dumpster is not internal to the building.</p>	<p>Please provide a detail (elevation and dimensioned site plan detail) of the screening for the dumpster.</p>

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of Part I Height and Mass with the condition that the window widths and spacing be brought into compliance with the ordinance and be reflected on the Part II submission, and that the additional information on the openings to the parking and dumpster enclosure be provided.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Phillip McCorkle stated that they were not asking for variances because the lot coverage was small. He said they appreciated Staff’s recommendation and said that the windows would comply with the requirements of the design standards. They objected to any consideration of issues not on point, which were the design and development standards. He said the minutes of the previous meeting discussed whether the architect had stamped the plans, the interiors that the code stated could not be done, Mr. Hartridge’s wall that they were two and one-half feet away from and was now out of consideration. They had discussed building code violations,

congestion from traffic, noise from the air conditioners, which were inappropriate for the Board, and the turning radius for entering the garage. He understood the ordinance was being revised and it would be suggested that when people submit applications that they attend the City Engineer meetings to make sure it works before the Board would consider a proposal. He said it was not a requirement yet but Mr. Guerard volunteered to go to the meeting with the City Engineer's to make sure the turn radius and parking works, and they have been given the o.k.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that they might need two exits and entrances to each of the units, and if it affected the exterior it would be the Board's right to add it as a comment if they were denied by the Building Department because of a violation. He said it would have to come back to the Preservation Officer.

Mr. McCorkle stated they would certainly have to do that.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that the revisions were made to the project to make it more compatible. He said the Architectural Review Committee felt progress had been made, and said that they applaud the concept of pulling back the central bay to make it look like two, three-bay buildings. The side galleries had brick parapet walls and he had displayed marked them out to show a detail that might bring the building more into capability with other buildings in the ward. The cornice on the next-door houses does not extend all the way over but steps down, and was a wooden element. He asked the petitioner to look at the detail and study it and asked the Board to recommend the revision.

Mr. Walter Hartridge (Representing the Battersby-Hartridge House, the National Society of the Colonial Dames in the State of Georgia, Mr. and Mrs. Claude Dryden) stated that the height being brought down and the movement of the structure to the west was appreciated. He said that if the building cannot be built as designed it might cause exterior alterations, and there was an issue whether a fire escape was needed. There were statements made that architects were not required and said they should be, especially for the design phase, and that Mr. Cadman did not appear to be a licensed architect in the State of Georgia. He said that Mr. Bailey's license had lapsed that morning and was not currently licensed to practice architecture. When going into the design phase and technical aspects of what could be built, then an architect should be required to present the plans.

Mr. Lee Meyer stated he looked at the plans and echoed what Mr. Meyerhoff said regarding whatever is on the inside determined the Height and Mass of the building. He said his concern as an architect that under the state laws of registration, when there was a violation of a code it was their responsibility to report it. There was a fine of \$5,000 to \$10,000 per day for violations, you cannot use the title of architect unless you were registered with the State of Georgia, have taken the test, and passed it. The seal on the drawings does not mean anything.

Mr. McCorkle stated they agreed with Mr. McDonald's suggestion and said if the Board wanted to make it part of the Height and Mass approval, they would incorporate it.

Mr. Steffen asked if they would have objection to having it go back to Staff for review.

Mr. McCorkle stated it would be fine.

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Watkins made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with final revisions coming back to Staff. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion. Mr. Gay, Mr. Johnson, Dr. Watkins, Ms. Seiler, and Dr. Elmore were in favor. Mr. Meyerhoff and Ms. Ramsay were opposed. Mr. Law abstained. The motion passed 5 to 2.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects, P.C.
 Erik Puljung
 H-07-3870-2
 PIN No. 2-0004-19-008
 416 East Bryan Street
 Demolition/Addition**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Erik Puljung.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The petitioner is requesting to partial removal of a rear garden wall, removal of an existing shed, removal of an existing gate, and construction of a one-story garage building.

FINDINGS:

1. The structure is a two-story stucco Italianate dwelling built in 1888, with wood cladding in the rear.
2. The lot coverage maximum is 75 percent. This project appears to meet this requirement.
3. Demolition does not involve historic or rated structures, wall, fences, or other features.
4. Project includes installing two by eight beams and square columns at the patio.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Entrances:	Double garage door, 9 feet long (total) Holmes Settlers Collection, SF22	Meets the Standards
Building Height:	One-story	Meets the Standards
Rhythm of Structure on Street:	Adjacent one-story structure	Meets the Standards
Scale:	One-story, 349 square feet	Meets the Standards

The following Part II Design Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Roof Shape:	Gabled roof	Meets the Standards
Fences/Walls:	Wall section rebuilt to match existing/ gate to match existing adjacent fence	Meets the Standards
Materials:	Smooth Hardiplank, 4" overlap	Meets the Standards
Color:	To Be Determined	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval as submitted with colors to be approved at the Staff level.

Mr. Steffen asked if the petitioner had any problems with the colors being approved at Staff level.

Mr. Erik Puljung stated that it would be fine.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Dr. Elmore seconded the motion and it passes unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects, P.C.
Erik Puljung
H-07-3871-2
PIN No. 2-0004-35-003
419 East St. Julian Street
Rehabilitation/Addition**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Erik Puljung.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The petitioner requests permission for alterations to a two-story dwelling to accommodate a two-story rear addition. The addition would raise the middle section of an existing one-story rear addition. The rear open porch would be removed and added back to the structure. The proposed addition is approximately 14 feet in height (total).

FINDINGS:

1. The structure is a two-story wood clapboard structure built in 1826. The structure is a rated structure within the National Historic Landmark District.
2. Originally, the house would have been one room deep and three bays wide, possibly with a porch or a lean-to addition in the rear for utilitarian purposes. Currently, the structure has a two-story addition with a one-story open porch attached to the rear of the addition.
3. The addition does not increase the footprint of the structure; thus, the lot coverage does not change or trigger compliance with lot coverage per the Zoning code.
4. Roof: The proposed addition elevates the roofline of the addition to halfway up the gabled roof of the original section of the main 1826 structure. Regarding roofline and additions, the Standards state: Section 8-3030 12 (f) "Additions shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features of the building, including...rooflines." Section 8-3030 12 (e) "Additions, including multiple additions to structures, shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure."
5. Roof Material — Existing roof of structure to be removed and replaced with new standing seam metal roof. All roof details and color of roof need to be submitted.
6. Windows/Shutters — New windows on the second floor of new addition to be salvaged wood 6/9 windows. Window shutters are to be operable wood shutters. Shutters are to be used to enclose existing doorway on porch.

7. Porch Detailing — The existing porch is to be demolished and new porch to be built back using detailing of existing porch. New porch posts are to be capped wood box columns. The roof structure is to be modified to have more of a slope and more substantial fascia.
8. Colors — To be determined.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the addition with restudy of the roofline and Staff approval of roof material and all colors.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Erik Puljung stated that he would be happy to come back to Staff for roof sample and color, and any other type of color change that was not proposed at this time. He said he was familiar with the items and recommendations of Staff, said that he had worked on it and with Staff. He brought a study of the roofline that meets the existing historic roofline, and he explained why he submitted the elevation. A difference in this home than some of the older homes was there were nine-foot ceilings on the second floor, and there were attic and roof rafters sitting on top of the attic floor system. There was not a lot of vertical space to work with. To achieve the lower roof there would be an eight-foot plate height on the addition and then lean back toward the main house. He showed a lower roof pitch that was part of the existing porch and how the two roof lines work together. He did not feel that it was an aesthetic solution, and submitted the higher roof pitch that would allow the lean-to addition on the back and the addition to be the same pitch, and the porch roof changes to be a new pitch. Everything was more consistent and it brings the building together.

Mr. Steffen asked if they wanted to stay with the original submittal on the roofline.

Mr. Puljung stated that it was a better aesthetic choice and would discuss the lower roof pitch to achieve a steeper pitch, which he felt would approve the aesthetics. He said they would need to lower the window header height, but keep it at eight-foot as proposed or with the lower roof pitch. They prefer to keep the steeper roof that would be built over the historic roof keeping everything in tact.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the condition that the roof materials and colors be brought to Staff. Dr. Elmore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects, P.C.
Patrick Phelps
H-07-3872-2
PIN No. 2-0003-14-001
412 West Bay Street
Exterior Rehabilitation to an Existing Hotel**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Phelps.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of exterior alterations to an existing motel complex.

FINDINGS:

1. The existing motel is not considered historic.
2. The changes include:
 - Add six three-foot balcony extensions to existing breezeways to help screen rooms from Bay Street. The balconies will be brick (Pine Hall Brick “Brown’s Ferry”) at ground level and stucco and the second and third levels. A stucco covered extruded polystyrene cornice is proposed for the top of the balconies.
 - Partially enclose existing stair towers to give punched openings.
 - Replace existing metal railings with powder-coated metal railings.
 - Add powder-coated metal louvered guardrails to the balconies.
 - Remove wall fixtures and replace with pole fixtures.
 - Paint existing building to match stucco.
 - Wrap steel columns in trim and paint.
 - Apply mullions to the storefront glazing.
 - Add brick entrance tower to registration building.
 - Add aluminum Bermuda shutters to registration building windows.
 - Add new cornice to registration building.
3. Comments
 - Provide information on light poles including location.
 - Provide sample of metal louvers. Staff suggests wood louvered shutter railings in a size that mimics the scale of true louvered railings rather than metal panels
 - Provide information on the covered posts.
 - The Historic District ordinance prohibits “snap-in” (or glued on) false mullions.
 - Stucco cornices were not traditionally used historically in Savannah and do not convey as crisp a detail as stone, metal, or wood. Please clarify that the cornice will not look like the perspective rendering, which shows a rounded detail. It would be preferable to use a metal or wood cornice with a simplified detail.
 - In addition, Staff suggests that additional soft-scape, such as trees and landscape buffering between Bay Street and the building would help shade and soften the visual effect of this structure. Landscaping is shown on the rendering but not on the site plan.

RECOMMENDATION:

Conditional approval with deletion of the mullions and pending discussion of louvers, cornice, and material of post covering. Provide lighting detail (pole and lamp) and location of lights.

Mr. Steffen asked if Staff wanted some of the issues to return to Staff.

Ms. Reiter stated she thought they were minor enough that they could.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the railings were metal vertical pickets and the other was wood.

Ms. Reiter stated it was metal and she thought it should be redesigned to wood in a proportion that would be found as they were used on porches.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Eugene Maria displayed a plan showing where the placement of the proposed lighting would be and stated they were not engaged to do the lighting or the landscaping plan. He said they would be submitted separately. He displayed an example of the lantern head and the post, and stated that they would submit them. The cornice line was incorrect on the rendering and that it was issued to the client as a concept, but the submitted details show a cove-type of cornice. From top to bottom, it was two feet and approximately 18 inches deep. They understand the concern for wanting to see metal versus stucco, but the building was all stucco and they felt that adding metal or wood would not be conducive or as aesthetically pleasing to the design. They would like to keep them. They asked Staff to allow them to do a sample and be reviewed in the field, and if it was unacceptable at that point, they would remove it and not have any augmentation or amendments to the existing window. The existing columns were three and one-half by three and one-half steel column and the scale that they appear as now were not enough for the addition. They were applying the Azak material and the detail would be submitted. He said it would be cladded in plywood first and built out to the dimensions of a six by six column with the Azak product. The height of the louvers for the guardrails was to meet the 42-inch requirement for code giving a residential look in a commercial application. The height could be lowered for aesthetics, however, it would not meet code requirement. The aluminum louver was used in lieu of the wood because of the wear and tear for the application, and with residential he agreed wood work best, but they feel it would be better in aluminum.

Mr. Steffen stated that the lighting detail and post covering had been provided, Staff would review the mullion sampling in the field, the louvers and metal material would remain as they were. He said the Board could approve it with the mullions to go back to Staff for review, and they needed to make a decision on the louvers and the metal material.

Ms. Reiter stated that stick-on mullions were not allowed in the ordinance.

Mr. Maria stated they would delete them from the project.

Ms. Ramsay stated that in terms of the metal versus wood louvers, Staff had said they had not seen them. She asked if it could be left to Staff rather than the Board deciding.

Mr. Steffen answered yes.

Mr. Maria stated they could remove the mullions.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked about the cornice.

Mr. Maria stated he showed the proposed detail.

Ms. Reiter stated they were o.k.

HDRB ACTION: **Ms. Seiler** made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the deletion of the mullions and with any change to the metal louvers to be approved by Staff. **Dr. Elmore** seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

(Mr. Gay left at approximately 6:00 p.m.)

**RE: Petition of Derek Brown
H-07-3873-2
PIN No. 2-0004 -10-001A
101 East River Street
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **denial**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Derek Brown.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The petitioner is requesting permission to install a freestanding sign adjacent to 101 East River Street (Wet Willies).

FINDINGS:

Background:

- The petitioner originally received permission from the owner of Wet Willies to place a kiosk and life-size dolphin statue in front of his business. The petitioner was subsequently ticketed, in the fall of 2006, by the Department of Inspections for placing the kiosk and statue in the public right-of-way (the sidewalk in front of Wet Willies) without the City's permission.
- At the court hearing, the judge ordered the petitioner to remove the kiosk from the public right-of-way by pushing it back behind the fire hydrant, onto private property. It is undetermined if this property belongs to Wet Willies or the adjacent parcel. The judge further determined that the dolphin statue is a freestanding sign and, therefore, must receive permission from the Historic District Board of Review.
- The petitioner contacted staff on August 21, 2006, was sent relevant information, and asked to submit an application by September 21, 2006. No application was received.
- The petitioner subsequently chained the dolphin statue to the kiosk in order to avoid it being considered a sign.
- On July 3, 2007, the kiosk and dolphin statue were confiscated by the Department of Inspections.

The proposed sign is a freestanding, six-foot tall, life-size, fiberglass or plastic dolphin statue.

It is unclear if the dolphin statue is to be located on private property or on the public right-of-way. In either case, it does not meet the standards of the River Street-Factors Walk Sign Ordinance.

The River Street-Factors Walk Sign Ordinance [Section 8-3120, Section 2 (l)] states, "No freestanding principal use sign(s) shall be permitted unless sign(s) standard (pole) is located entirely on private property."

The Ordinance [Section 8-3120, Section 2 (i)] further states, "Except for signs applied to an awning, all principal use signs located in sector "B" shall be constructed from wood or from a

material of similar texture or appearance... All “announcement” and “supplemental” signs shall be constructed from wood or metal or from a material of similar texture or appearance.”

RECOMMENDATION:

Denial.

Mr. Steffen asked if there were regulations on the kiosk.

Ms. Reiter stated that kiosks were approved when on private property similar to the ticket booths across the street. She said the public right-of-way was the City’s purview and did not understand how these items were being put up. She thought the items were supposed to be taken in at night where everything was removed at the close of business.

Mr. Steffen asked if the Board had any purview on what the kiosks look like and their sizes.

Ms. Reiter stated that the Board should, but the City had not asked them.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Derek Brown stated he owned the Dolphin Magic, they were located across from the Shrimp Factory restaurant, that it was a boat tour that took people to Tybee to show them the dolphins, and that they were in the boat on the water and not in view of the public. He said they were the only tour that had something to give to children. Before they placed anything on the street, they went before Mr. Shipman and he told them to place the dolphin behind the fire hydrant. The fire hydrant comes out into the sidewalk, and they were behind the sidewalk but off to the side. The sidewalk had a slight decline and the obvious part had a flatter walk-through. He said the dolphin was not obstructing the tourist traffic and the tourist love it. He was subpoenaed to come before a judge about the dolphin and was classified as being a sign. He bought the ordinance and said there was nothing on freestanding signs. He did not chain the dolphin to the kiosk but it was permanently mounted.

Mr. Steffen asked if Mr. Brown understood where the kiosk was and asked if there was any regulation to it. He said he thought that there were other kiosks on River Street and asked if this was the only one.

Mr. Brown stated there were three or four of them.

Mr. Steffen asked if Mr. Brown knew why the kiosk was confiscated.

Mr. Brown stated he guessed it was because the dolphin was attached to the kiosk. He was in Texas on July 3rd and Mr. Shipman who was in charge of zoning had telephoned him and said he was in front of the location at Wet Willies and told the Mr. Brown to remove it or they would.

Mr. Steffen stated a lot had happened that had nothing to do with the Board and there was not much they could do. He said they could regulate signs on River Street. The judge had told the board and Mr. Brown that the dolphin as a free-standing item was considered a sign, and was not in compliance with the sign ordinance and was not compatible. He suggested investigating whether the kiosk could remain and truly incorporate the dolphin into the kiosk and make it part of the kiosk to see if it could be approved.

Ms. Seiler stated the kiosk might have to be bigger.

Mr. Steffen stated he understood why Mr. Brown wanted the kiosk and that people wanted to take pictures with it, but you would still have to comply with the ordinances were but not as a sign. He said ask the other kiosk owners what could be done as far as having a kiosk that somehow incorporates the dolphin or logo. He said there was noting that the Board could do but deny it as a sign. At some point the City may decide to regulate kiosks and say that you cannot have a kiosk down there, but that was not the case right now.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review deny the petition as submitted. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of DPK & A Architects, LLP
H-06-3580-2
227 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Amended Petition to Delete Previously Approved Items
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. Petition of Martie Gay
H-07-3783-2 Amended
126 West Harris Street
Windows and Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

3. Petition of Storyville Enterprises
Dba Bulldog Cigar Company
H-07-3846(S)-2
244 Bull Street
Sign
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

4. Petition of Coastal Canvas
John Casteel
H-07-3848(S)-2
104 East Broughton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

5. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Laura Mouhot
H-07-3849(S)-2
505 East River Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Laura Mouhot
H-07-3850(S)-2
201 West Bay Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

7. Petition of Bailey Davidson
H-07-3851(S)-2
346 Lincoln Street
Rehabilitation
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

8. Petition of Hyatt Regency
Domenick Buffone
H-07-3852(S)-2
2 West Bay Street
Color Change/Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

9. Petition of Erika Snayd
H-07-3853(S)-2
310 West Taylor Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

10. Petition of Connie S. Lyman
H-07-3855(S)-2
122 West Huntingdon Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

11. Petition of Michael Brown
H-07-3856(S)-2
36 West Broughton Street
Existing Windows/Doors
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

12. Petition of Robyn Reeder
Kilwins Chocolate Company
Civvies New & Recycled Clothing
H-07-3858-2
PIN No. 2-0004-38-004
20 East Broughton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

13. Petition of Speedi Sign
H-07-3863(S)-2
412 West Bay Street
Color Change/Sign
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

14. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Laura Mouhot
H-07-3864(S)-2
321 Jefferson Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

15. Petition of Michael S. Small
H-07-3865(S)-2
317 East Huntingdon Street
Shutters
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

16. Petition of Rhee Brothers Enterprise, LLC
Steve Y. Rhee
H-07-3866(S)-2
23 – 27 West Broughton Street
Color Change/Stucco Repair
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

17. Petition of Karen D. Keeton
H-07-3867-2
6 East State Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

18. Petition of Robert Charles Croyle
H-07-3868(S)-2
515 – 517 Tattnall Street
Wrought Iron Gate
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

G. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes – July 11, 2007

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Watkins made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the minutes as submitted. Dr. Elmore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

H. OTHER BUSINESS

- Status of Policy Changes

Ms. Reiter handed out the Policy Changes that would go into effect before the next meeting.

Mr. Steffen stated that the remaining items would be tabled until the next Review Board meeting.

I. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

- Updated Report

J. INFORMATION ITEMS

- Second Quarter Report and Intern Accomplishments

K. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp