

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW  
REGULAR MEETING  
112 EAST STATE STREET

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

JANUARY 10, 2007

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

Joseph Steffen, Chairman  
Ned Gay  
Dr. Lester Johnson  
Eric Meyerhoff  
John Neely  
Dr. Gerald Caplan  
Gene Hutchinson  
Dr. Malik Watkins

HDRB Members Not Present:

Swann Seiler, Vice-Chairman  
Sidney J. Johnson  
Dr. Charles Elmore

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

Thomas L. Thomson, Executive Director  
Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director  
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner  
Janine N. Person, Administrative Assistant  
Maris Gomez, Historic Preservation Intern

RE: CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m.

RE: REFLECTION

RE: SIGN POSTING

All signs were properly posted.

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

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

Continued to February 14, 2007

RE: Petition of D & D Signs  
H-06-3740-2  
502 West Bay Street  
Sign

Continued to February 14, 2007

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

**RE: CONSENT AGENDA**

**RE: Amended Petition of Lynch Associates Design  
David Bloomquist Agent  
H-05-3502-2  
407 East Charlton Street  
Alterations to a Rear Porch**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Amended Petition of Linda Ramsay  
Will Harley agent/applicant  
H-06-3632-2  
435 Tattnall Street  
Rear Addition and Demolition of a Non-Historic  
Wall**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Amended Petition of Hansen Architects  
Erik Puljung  
H-06-3635-2  
400 Block of East McDonough Street  
New Construction – Amendment to Add  
Recesses on the East Elevation**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Robert Croyle  
H-06-3741-2  
306 East President Street  
Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Diversified Designs  
Columbian Club, Incorporated  
H-06-3749-2  
3 West Liberty Street  
Addition to the Rear of a Building**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects  
Patrick Phelps  
H-06-3752-2  
412 West Bay Street  
Add Elevator Tower**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

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

**RE: REGULAR AGENDA**

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

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Ramsey Khalidi.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting an after-the-fact approval for HVAC units and utility boxes on the property at 513 East Oglethorpe Avenue. This item was continued at the November 8, 2006, and December 13, 2006, Historic District Review Board meetings for further study.

1. **HVAC:** Numerous condenser units were installed along Houston and Hull Streets without approval. At the suggestion of the Board, the applicant is requesting approval to pair the 20 units and screen them with a three-foot ten-inch wood fence on a concrete footing to support the units. The existing pads on Hull Street will be moved against the building and off the sidewalk.
2. **Electrical:** Numerous electrical panels were installed on the Houston and Hull Streets elevations without approval. The drawings indicate that only two panels will remain; one on Hull Street and one on Houston Street, away from the corner fronting Crawford Square.

**FINDINGS:**

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

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

Staff recommends approval of reducing the number of electrical panels from four to two, and placing them away from Crawford Square.

Staff recommends approval of the amended design for fencing the HVAC units. While it is preferred that HVAC units not be in such close proximity to the sidewalk and pedestrian activity, the petitioner has coupled the units and

screened them so as not to completely dominate the Hull Street and Houston Street elevations.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the amended application.

**Mr. Neely** asked if Staff confirmed the color.

**Ms. Ward** stated she did not, but it could be confirmed at Staff level.

**Mr. Neely** stated a dark green was discussed.

**Ms. Ward** stated the proposed original screening was dark green, but the screening had changed so many times that it had not been verified.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Ramsey Khalidi** stated the color was Charleston Green. He said the height of the fence would be 46 inches.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated according to the drawing, the scale was one-half inch to one-foot. The boarding was four-foot eleven inches by scale, and the structure was seven-foot three inches by scale. He asked if the two-foot four-inch post extended down, and if it was in the ground or above the ground.

**Mr. Ramsey** stated it was below grade, and just a little bit above the base support.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked how much above the grade.

**Mr. Ramsey** stated it was not to scale, and one inch of clearance from any horizontal member was above the slab. He said there would be a one-inch opening for the water to drain.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated there were two condensing units together, and some that were covered with a door in the middle. There were no drawings showing the length of the fence on the side gate where two condensing units were together, or how big that fencing was. On the Hull Street side the gate was between the two condensers, and it was much longer. There was nothing telling the dimension of the fence units. He felt the submittal was incomplete because they did not know the length of the fences, there was a gate at the end and in the middle, and it was perplexing what the applicant wanted to do.

After much discussion it was determined that approval of the petition be subject to the dimensions of the fencing going to Staff for review.

**HDRB ACTION:** **Mr. Gay** made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition, with final details to be submitted to Staff to include the dimensions of the fencing. **Dr. Caplan** seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Amended Petition of Hansen Architects  
Erik Puljung  
H-06-3653-2  
14 East Taylor Street  
Alterations to the Rear of a Building and  
Carriage House**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Erik Puljung.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to amend an application for alterations and additions at 14 East Taylor Street. On August 9, 2006, the petitioner received approval for the following: Demolition of a circa 1975 addition in the rear to restore the original courtyard, make exterior alterations, add an addition to the existing carriage house, rehabilitation of the main residence, and to construct a four-story porch addition and elevator shaft on the rear of the house.

The applicant is requesting to reduce the size of the rear porch from a four-story porch to a two-story porch on the main residence, to keep the existing window pattern in the carriage house, and install new entrances below.

**FINDINGS:**

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

1. The proposed exterior alterations to the lane facing elevation consist of installing two new on the second floor will remain as they are now. The brick exterior will remain and the infill brick, at the location of the pedestrian entrance will be replaced to match the historic brick on the exterior of the carriage house. Arch openings on the ground floor are still visible but were enclosed at some point. They are seven feet and six feet six-inches wide, which is insufficient for automobile access. It is unclear if the arch openings were original, or a later alteration based on photographic documentation of the western arch and the adjacent carriage house. The sister carriage house has also been altered, but is more intact. It exhibits four equally spaced window openings on the second floor with segmental arch lintels. The standards state (Section 8-3030 (l)(14) that, in existing carriage houses, original entries shall not be enlarged.

Staff recommends approval. The doors will be the same as what was previously approved; tongue and groove one-inch by four-inch with a "V" groove over flush doors. The proposed door fenestration pattern is similar to what was previously approved with the exception of the arched opening that was to be installed to the west. While the infilled arches on the ground level create more interest at the street level, it is not proven that they are original to the building, as they do not match those on the sister carriage house to the west.

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

Staff recommends approval. New windows will be double-hung, true divided light, wood frame to match existing profile and detail. French doors are also wood, painted to match the trim color.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval as amended.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Review Board does hereby approve this petition as submitted. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE:    Reconsideration of Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff  
          & Shay  
          Patrick Shay  
          H-06-3711-2  
          217 West Liberty Street  
          Demolition/New Construction Part I, Height and  
          Mass for Condominium Building**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

Ms. Ward introduced the project

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Dolly Chisholm (Bee Hive Foundation)** stated it should not be reconsidered, due to Robert's Rules states there should be a quorum of those present, and not those who could vote. Mr. Meyerhoff was present, there was a quorum, the vote should stand, and she wanted to make the point for the record.

**Mr. James Blackburn, Sr. (City Attorney)** stated Mr. Meyerhoff should recuse himself from the proceedings, which he had done. In the minutes of the meeting that reference was made to, another member of the Board was not present when the vote was taken. Only six people were present when the vote was taken, and there was not a quorum. The action was void, the issue had been appealed, and the issues will be resolved. He stated the action was proper and a Board member should recuse under the circumstances. He said a number of members terms expired at the end of December. The custom and action of the bylaws, but not the ordinance, was that a member continue to serve until a successor is appointed. On last Thursday, the City Council appointed successors to three members whose terms expired at the end of the year.

The former members were not present today, nor were the members whose term had begun when they were appointed. Although there was a quorum, there were three new members who were not in attendance and had not received notice of the meeting. He knew Staff attempted to contact the new members, and one of them could show up so the matter could be considered. If Mr. Meyerhoff recuses himself a quorum would be lost unless one of the review members comes.

**Mr. Steffen** asked those who were interested to remain at the meeting because he did not know if another member would show up, and a quorum recreated. He did not believe it would happen, but because Board members had been informed about the meeting it could happen. As a result, he passed the item until the end of the agenda stating he knew it might be an inconvenience, but thought it was proper to pass it under the circumstances. If the quorum did not get created, the matter would be continued until the next meeting.

**Mr. Blackburn** stated the applicant had a choice to request a continuance, or they could request the Board have a special meeting.

**Mr. Steffen** stated if the petitioner asked for a continuance it could not be voted on because the Board did not have quorum. They could request it of Staff, but it could not officially be voted on.

**Mr. Shay** stated he would call his client and the attorney as they get closer to the end of the agenda, or until someone showed up to make a quorum.

**RE: Petition of Ciphers Design  
H-06-3732-2  
307 – 311 East Huntingdon Street  
New Construction Part II, Design Details, for  
Condominium Building**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Sarah Kepple.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:** The applicant is requesting Part II Design approval for a three-and-one-half story, six-unit condominium building.

**FINDINGS:**

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

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Commercial Design Standards	NA	
Windows and Doors	Anderson window 400 series tilt wash double hung series 2/2 clad insulated SDL windows, white. Window sill is one course of angled rowlock bricks; headers are variously semicircular, segmented arch and flat with soldier bricks. Wood front door with arched glass transom and arched glass top panels and solid raised panels below, painted Benjamin Moore Black Forest Green. Glass panel doors to	There are similar arched openings and doors on this block. The windows meet the ordinance as far as recess from the façade. Any window specification change must be approved by staff before window purchase.

	front porch.	
Roof Shape	A complex roof is proposed with side 5:12 gable intersected by two hip roofs and a conical roof over a front bay with standing seam metal roof and finial. Main roof surface is architectural shingle. The eave projects 36" with 4x4 wood triangular brackets. A roof plan is provided.	Complex roofs are found on historic structures in this block.
Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches	A three story front and side porch is proposed. 16 inch square brick columns on the first floor and 10" and 8" pressure treated wood posts above with cap and base moldings. A 42" metal and wood handrail is proposed. Two similar railings are proposed from the rear elevation. Decorative brackets are proposed for the porch spandrel areas between the columns. The stairs are wood with wood railing without the metal top piece.	Staff recommends elimination of brick latticework under the front stairs (referred to in notes but not shown on drawing)
Fences	Two-foot tall decorative metal fences on brick base are proposed for the Huntingdon street sides of the project. A 6-foot dog ear wood fence with 6"x6" pressure treated wood posts to screen the trash receptacles is also proposed on the rear.	The fences are compatible.
Overlay District Standards	NA	
Materials	The main walls are brick "Monaco" by Carolina Ceramics. A decorative brick band in a checkerboard pattern is proposed for the top of the building. A brick soldier course is proposed at the second and third floor levels.	Brick facades are found on this block. The decorative treatment of the brick is also found on other historic buildings on the block.
Color	Trim: Benjamin Moore White #00 Accent Benjamin Moore Black Forest Green # 46.	The colors are compatible.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval with the condition that the lattice infill under the stairs is eliminated, and any change in window specifications be approved by Staff prior to window purchase. Also, that a brick sample board be erected on-site for final approval of mortar, tooling, etc.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Sarah Kepple** asked for a bay to be added to the side of the building.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if Staff had seen it yet.



**Ms. Kepple** stated she spoke to Staff right before the meeting, and was not sure how to proceed.

**Mr. Steffen** stated she could show it to the Board, but they would ask for it to go back to Staff, and it was unlikely they would approve something that had not gone to Staff. He said Staff recommended that the lattice infill under the stairs be eliminated, they erect a brick sample, and asked if there was a problem with those.

**Ms. Kepple** said it was fine.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the proposed addition falls right in the middle of the condensing unit, and asked her to explain what they were going to do.

**Ms. Kepple** stated the bay would screen the air conditioning units from the street.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Tim McCoy (313 and 315 East Huntingdon Street)** asked if the size and scale had been approved. He stated the trash receptacles were sitting on the sidewalk and it belonged to the members of the Huntingdon property owners association. No one had asked them if the sidewalk could be used for trash or a fence. There was a manhole placed in the parking lot, and he wanted to make sure it was protected because it was also a part of the association's property.

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** asked the Board to continue the project because the public did not have time to review the addition to the building. He asked the Board to request more detailed drawings of the front entryway arch and the type of roof shingles.

**Ms. Keppel** stated the sidewalk was used by the community and was on their property, and that the common area was completely fenced. Only the people in the units can use it, and it was marked as a common area behind the buildings.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if it was fenced and how they would get the trash receptacles to the street.

**Ms. Keppel** stated it wasn't completely fenced off. That it was screened from the sides and open to the parking lot.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they were clear on the property lines, that they had five feet, and were they going to building within the property line. He also asked if they had checked with the Building Department.

**Ms. Keppel** stated they could double check, but it was her understanding that they could build to a property line as long as there were no windows along the wall according to the fire code.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** suggested the motion state that the petition be pending approval by the City Building Department, or it would have to come back to the Board.

**Dr. Johnson** asked if they were moving the condenser units back, and asked about the height of the condenser units.

**Ms. Keppel** said the two condenser units were still sitting on the ground, and that the windows would be partially blocked. The windows would be partially blocked in the original drawing also.

**HDRB ACTION:** Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the condition that the lattice infill be omitted under the stairs, and the following details be submitted to Staff for final approval: the west side addition, the roof shingles, the front door entry, and a sample brick panel be erected on-site for final review. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Lance Cohen  
H-06-3746-2  
408 West Broughton Street  
Reduce Opening, Install New Windows**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval to reduce opening, denial of proposed windows.**

Present for the petition was Mr. Lance Cohen.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to replace the existing rear windows and change one door opening to a window. Also, there appear to be recently installed between-the-glass muntin windows installed on a lower rear addition.

**FINDINGS:**

1. 408 West Broughton Street is an historic structure built circa 1869. The original windows appear to have been two-over-two wood, single-glazed, double-hung windows.
2. The existing rear windows have been boarded up for some time. The contractor removed the existing windows without Review Board approval. The applicant states that the windows were not salvageable. Staff has not seen the existing windows.
3. The applicant is proposing to install double-glazed, vinyl clad, double-hung one-over-one windows by Bilt Best, and to reduce the size of the door opening to match the size of the adjacent windows. The windows have already been purchased.
4. The applicant states that the Review Board approved similar windows for 410 West Broughton Street. This is not an applicable analogy since 410 West Broughton Street had lost its historic significance, and was not a rated structure. Also, the windows were approved in 2004, prior to the recent changes in the Zoning Ordinance. Jeld Wen aluminum clad windows were approved at that time.
5. The ordinance currently states that replacement windows on historic buildings shall replicate the original historic windows in composition, design, and material. The proposed windows do not meet the ordinance. The location of the windows, however, is on the rear and is only visible from Congress Street across a vacant lot. They cannot be seen from the lane.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommended approval to reconfigure the door opening to match the window openings. However, the windows as proposed do not meet the requirements of the Historic

District Ordinance. Also, the lower windows with the between-the-glass muntins were installed without Review Board approval, and does not meet the requirements of the Historic District Ordinance.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if Staff had discussions with the petitioner regarding the appropriate windows.

**Ms. Ward** said she had discussed with the petitioner that the windows should be one-over-one or two-over-two.

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

**Mr. Lance Cohen** stated he had taken pictures of the rotten and destroyed windows. They had been covered for 40 years or more. They were sealed from the inside and outside, the building had not been taken care of, and moisture had destroyed the windows. He displayed a picture of the front half of the building at 408 West Broughton Street, with the type of windows referred to by Staff. He said the adjacent building to the right, which was Welsh's Pawn Shop, was renovated last year and there were double-hung, one-over-one windows all the way around. In 2005, the lower building had a façade change at 31 Montgomery Street. He displayed a picture of the view of Congress Lane that showed the back of 408 West Broughton Street. The first-story was 90 feet deep, but the second and third floor of the building where the windows were was only 45 feet deep. The view from standing in the lane looking up at the building, and the windows cannot be seen at all. The adjacent building at 414 West Broughton Street had one-over-one clad windows, which were the same style windows that were in the aforementioned buildings. The building located directly behind at 409 West Congress Street had one-over-one clad windows, and the building was renovated in 2000. He said they have purchased the windows and would like to use them since the windows would not be seen from the lane. In another photograph he had altered the windows to appear as they would with the new windows installed.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** said the original window on the west side had an arch brick opening, and asked how they would make the door and opening into a window. He asked if it would be compatible.

**Mr. Cohen** stated they were going to leave it as it was because the building was that way originally. The porch had been gone for many years.

After much discussion, it was decided that the applicant would make the necessary revisions with the changes coming back to Staff.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the request to shorten the door opening to match the adjacent window opening, and to deny the proposed windows because they are not in compliance with the Historic District Ordinance. Mr. Neely seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Petition of J. Steve Day  
H-06-3747-2  
210 – 216 West Gwinnett  
New Construction Part I, Height and Mass

The Preservation Officer recommends **continuance for reconsideration of design.**

Present for the petition was Mr. J. Steve Day.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval of two condominium buildings. The buildings will be built in two phases. The first structure will be the east structure adjacent to the existing historic structure on Gaston Street.

**FINDINGS:**

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

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.	There is a proposed 3-foot setback from the East property line. There appears to be a 0- lot line setback on the West Side and a four foot setback on the front. An 8-foot separation is proposed between the structures.	The setbacks appear consistent with neighboring historic structures.
Dwelling Unit Type	Each building will contain six condominiums (two per floor). The dwelling unit type is similar to an apartment building.	The previous building on this lot was a multi-family dwelling.
Street Elevation Type	A high stoop entrance type is proposed.	All the adjacent historic properties have entrances on raised crawl spaces.
Entrances	A recessed entry with three doors is proposed.	A recessed entry as proposed is not compatible in this block. Doors are set at the face of the primary façade not recessed.
Building Height:	To the Eave the buildings are 37'-0" and to the ridge 42'-3". Floor. Floor to floor heights appear to be 10'-6", 13' and 13'-5".	The height and mass of the proposed structures appear out of scale with the nearby historic structures.
Proportion of Structure's Front Facade	No comparison is given of the width and height compared to the adjacent and across the street historic structures.	The proportion of the façade does not appear compatible with nearby historic structures. The height of the front stoop at the roof is not proportional with the façade.
Proportion of Openings	The openings are unusually large since they house doors rather than windows.	The height of the front door opening is not proportional with the overall fenestration pattern.
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	The openings appear to be double doors that open inward rather than onto balconies.	Balconies are not a form found in this neighborhood. Full width porches are more compatible. The rhythm of the windows is incompatible with the typical rhythm of windows in this block. The proposed windows on the side elevations are more appropriate for a building of this proposed traditional style and form.
	A high stoop with curved steps is proposed. The height of the	The curved stoop form and height is incompatible in this

	stoop is not given but appears it may be 9'-6" with a step up to the main floor.	block.
--	--	--------

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends a continuance for reconsideration of design. The structure does not relate to surrounding historic structures in terms of Height and Mass. A pseudo Georgian style has been chosen, which is out of character with the neighborhood, and the proportions are not accurate. Balconies and false balconies are proposed instead of porches. The high stoop type is inappropriate at this location. The rhythm of openings is inappropriate for the location. The placement of 12 garbage cans on Tattnall Street is not acceptable. Tattnall Street is not a lane.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Steve Day** stated that Staff had addressed a number of issues and, in his opinion, some have validity and some do not. Staff was correct in that there were no setbacks, unless you look at the guidelines regarding fire safety. When there are windows on the side of the building between two buildings, you have to be at least three feet off the property lines. Otherwise, there would be sprinkler systems and fire shutters, which were extremely expensive.

The previous dwelling was a multi-family dwelling, as was proposed. He obtained a picture of what was there to see the mass and size of the previous buildings, and it depicted a very large building. They wanted to put something back that was not as large. Even though it was tall, they were only covering approximately 60 to 65 percent of the site, rather than 75 percent.

Staff spoke about the majority of the buildings having entrances and crawl spaces, and it was true if you look at this block only. His understanding was it was the purview of Staff to look at the neighborhood. The statement made that all of the buildings in the block were low stoop was not accurate. There was a high stoop, a double staircase, and a small porch that were similar to the proposal. In the neighborhood, the Height and Mass was compatible. On Gwinnett Street there was a building with a high stoop, and there were high stoops all the way down 100 feet of Barnard Street. He asked if they were supposed to look at the neighborhood or the particular block, and felt there needed to be clarification.

Staff indicated the entryway was setback, and it was not shown on the drawing although they intended it to be. They thought the meeting was about the Height and Mass and not the Design Details of the building which they would be prepared to look in the next meeting.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the Board views Height and Mass as if the building was shrink-wrapped. All the entryways and things that project were part of Height and Mass. Sometimes Staff would add Design Detail elements.

**Mr. Day** stated he understood, and it was his mistake. They planned to put some kind of barrier or gate across the front to enclose it, or work with Staff to come up with a single door across the front rather than a recessed area. They were proposing 37 feet, and he stated some buildings were 25 or 36 feet, a few at 30 feet, next door at 28 feet, another at 32 feet, and one at 12 feet. The building that was directly across the street would be one-foot lower at the eave than the proposed building. The existing building on Gwinnett and Barnard Streets was five feet higher at the eave. Around the corner the building was 36 feet at the eave, some were 32, and another was 50 feet high; four stories. In the proposed area a structure could be built at four stories, and they were building three stories. His point was that there was a large variation within the neighborhood.

The size of the front façade was not compatible with other high stoop structures in the neighborhood. The proposed would be two buildings at 40 feet wide each, with a gate in between of eight feet. One building in the neighborhood was 50 feet wide, and another building was 58 feet wide where there were two houses together with no separation. Further down on Barnard another building was 100 feet wide. If you tie the two buildings together which were common walls, it would be 80 feet wide. If you were to look at the neighborhood and not just the block, they were compatible.

They agree with Staff regarding the rhythm of solids to voids, that the doors shown on the front of the top two floors were too large. They would work with Staff to put in windows or doors that were compatible. He agreed that the stairs were not compatible, even though there was a building within the block that had curved stairs, and on Barnard Street within 200 feet of the building were curved stairs. He said there were high stoop stairs within the neighborhood and believed the building was compatible from that perspective.

He agreed with Staff that the garbage containers on Tattnell Street were not acceptable. However, the lane behind the property was a dead lane and garbage trucks do not go through it because of a building that was built with a ten-foot opening. The garbage containers could not be put in the lane. They were placed on Tattnell Street because it was where the garbage truck goes. They would work with Staff on a recommendation.

He asked for a continuance, but wanted to come back in February and ask for Height and Mass, as well as Design Detail approval. They would work with Staff, and if Staff felt they were not ready for design, they would come back for Height and Mass, but they wanted Height and Mass and Design Detail.

**Mr. Steffen** stated it was within Staff's purview, and Staff would work with the petitioner.

**Ms. Reiter** stated in Section 8-3030 (L)(2), Street Elevation Type it says, "The proposed street elevation type for new construction shall comply with the following: A proposed building on east-west connecting streets shall utilize an existing historic building street elevation type, located within the existing block front, or on an immediately adjacent titling or trust lot", which was south of the trust lot." Ms. Reiter stated it said historic building street elevation type, and Staff looks at historic buildings not new construction.

**Mr. Day** stated there were other historic buildings in the neighborhood.

**Ms. Reiter** stated within the existing block front was what the ordinance required.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue this petition to the February 14, 2007, meeting. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald** stated that the Historic Savannah Foundation does hold a preservation easement on one of the lots to the east, and they had communicated their design revisions and concerns to Mr. Day, which he had not incorporated.

**Mr. Steffen** stated it was extremely important to comply.

Dr. Malik Watkins arrived at 2:40 p.m.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects  
Erik Puljung  
H-06-3750-2  
413 & 415 East Hall Street  
New Construction of a Carriage House,  
Part I and II**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Erik Puljung.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part I and II, of a semi-attached carriage house at the rear of the properties at 413 and 415 East Hall Street.

**FINDINGS:**

The historic structures at 413 and 415 East Hall Street were originally constructed in 1892 as part of a series of three two-story Belgium Block semi-attached residences. The buildings are rated structures within Savannah’s National Landmark Historic District. There are currently no historic carriage houses on the lane, however, historically there were one-story frame garages and dwellings on the lane. The properties are zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density) and are on separate lots of record.

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

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIP-A zone. New carriage houses may provide up to a 4’ setback to allow a turning radius into the garage.	A 3’-3” setback is proposed on the east; a 2’-1” setback is proposed on the west; no setbacks are proposed at the rear. <sup>1</sup>	The standard is met. The garage aprons into the building on a sloped slab and not into the lane.
Lot Coverage: 75% maximum building lot coverage in RIP-A.	Including the proposed carriage houses, the buildings will cover 70.5% (413 East Hall) and 65% (415 East Hall) of the lot.	The standard is met.
Dwelling Unit Type	Semi-attached carriage house with residential unit above.	Staff recommends approval. This dwelling type is common throughout the historic district.
Street Elevation Type	Semi-attached four-car garage.	Staff recommends approval. This is behind a semi-attached residence.
Building Height:	Two-story carriage house with a height of 24’-10”. The main residence has an overall height of approx. 40’	Staff recommends approval.
Proportion of Openings	Openings have a 3:6 ratio of width to height.	Staff recommends approval. This is a common proportion in the historic district.

Rhythm of Solids to Voids	Each garage is divided into 2 bays with 2 garage doors and 2 window openings above. A solid portion of wall remains at the outer edges of the façade for a stair.	Staff recommends approval.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	Currently, there are no other historic carriage houses on the lane. One is under construction at 407 E. Hall Street, to the west.	Staff recommends approval.
Scale	The proposed carriage house is 51' wide, spanning two parcels and is 22' deep. The individual widths of the garages is comparable to each half of the residence (25' wide).	Staff recommends approval.

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

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Windows and Doors	Windows are to be Weathershield 2/2 double-sash, wood clad windows with insulated glass and a 7/8" putty glaze SDL grille and spacer bar.  Garage doors are 9' wide and 7' tall flush garage doors.	The standards are met.  Verify material
Roof Shape	A hip roof surfaced in 5 V crimp metal roofing is proposed. The main residences feature intersecting hip roofs.	Staff recommends approval with the condition that the edges be covered with coping.
Fences	An 8' tall vertical plank wood fence and gate are proposed approx. 3' from the lane and on the side lot lines. An 8' tall CMU wall will divide the properties in the interior of the lot and will not be visible from the public right-of-way.	Staff recommends approval.
Materials	The exterior will be clad in horizontal lap siding with a 4" exposure.	Staff recommends approval. While the main residence is masonry, the carriage house will not be viewed in relation to the main residence from the front, only from the lane.
Color	Siding, windows, doors: Benjamin Moore HC-83 Grant Beige  Window and door surrounds,	Approval.



	corner boards: Benjamin Moore HC-69 Whitall Brown.  Roof: Classic Bronze	
--	---	--

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval with the condition that the V-crimp roofing have a finished edge.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Erik Puljung** stated that he would explore and submit the final coping edge to Staff for review. He was unclear about an actual coping edge he could apply. The garage door material would be flush and preferably metal.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked about the height differential between the property and the 36-inch oak tree.

**Mr. Puljung** said the trees would be removed, and he was attempting to achieve a four- to six-inch difference between the lane and the finished slab of the garage.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Bill Steube (Downtown Neighborhood Association)** said he commended the petitioner for an excellent presentation, and asked if the electric meters shown on the surface of the building could be recessed or located around the corner, to keep from being visible from the lane.

**Mr. Puljung** stated it would be preferable for the meters be located to the side, but was not sure it would be approved with Georgia Power and the adjacency of the property line itself. If it could be handled through Georgia Power, he would pursue the option.

**HDRB ACTION: Dr. Johnson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the roof detail to be submitted to Staff. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**Mr. Steffen** introduced Dr. Malik Watkins, a professor from Savannah State University.

**RE:    Reconsideration of Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff  
           & Shay  
           Patrick Shay  
           H-06-3711-2  
           217 West Liberty Street  
           Demolition/New Construction Part I, Height and  
           Mass for Condominium Building**

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

**Ms. Ward** introduced the project and stated the demolition and new construction was denied at the November 8, 2006, Historic District Review Board meeting. However, upon review of the proceedings it was revealed there was not a full quorum present, and as such, during the December meeting, the Board voted to reconsider the petition at this time.

**Mr. James Blackburn (City Attorney)** stated he had given legal opinions in reference to the petition. There was a new Board member who had taken his seat, and two new members who had not yet appeared. The petitioner had suggested he would concur with a continuance, and asked for the petition to be continued.

**Mr. Steffen** asked the petitioner to come forward and make the specific request, and to make a motion and discuss it to see what the Board wanted to do.

**Mr. Shay** asked for a continuance until the next meeting of the Historic Review Board, and hope that the matter would be resolved.

**HDRB ACTION:** Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition to the February 14, 2007, meeting. Mr. Neely seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE:   Petition of Hansen Architects  
      Patrick Phelps  
      H-06-3751-2  
      532 Indian Street  
      Sign/Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Phelps.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval of a new cast-in-place concrete ramp along the east side of the site, running parallel to a series of planters. The planters will be built on the existing retaining wall and finished in stucco. New metal pipe railings will be installed and painted to match the existing. A set of concrete stairs, in addition to the ramp, will serve as a second access to the existing parking lot.

Also, approval of a wall extension. The wall will be finished with a combination of white metal panels and internally lighted glazing. A sign, approximately 15 square feet, with neon script - copy "Indian Street Studios", will be attached to the wall.

**FINDINGS:**

The site is located in the Historic District and B-C zoning district. Neon is permitted in this zone. The sign is within the maximum size of 40 square feet for a fascia sign.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** commended the petitioner and said it was a nice way to add character to the site.

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

**RE: Petition of Martha Reardon  
H-06-3753-2  
Northwest Corner of Alice & Jefferson  
New Construction Part I, Height and Mass**

The Preservation Officer recommends continuance for clarifications.

Present for the petition was Ms. Martha Reardon.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The petitioner is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval for a three-story, two-unit residence at the southeast corner of Alice and Jefferson Streets.

**FINDINGS:**

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

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.	The setbacks are not noted on the site plan but it appears that it is on the 0-lot line on the Alice and Jefferson Street sides, and 6" from the lot line on the east elevation.	The site plan and model appear inaccurate based on the photographs of the site. If the adjacent building fence is on the lot line, then there is at least 8' between the lot line and the adjacent dwelling. The model indicates an overlapping eave situation and a window opening 6" from the lot line which is not permitted by code.
Dwelling Unit Type	A five-bay-wide dwelling is proposed adjacent to a four-bay-wide dwelling.	Five-bay structures are not typical of this part of the District. However, it might be appropriate next to the four-bay structure. It cannot be determined without accurate comparison drawings.
Street Elevation Type	A high stoop is proposed adjacent to a high stoop. A new high stoop townhouse was approved in 2005 for the southern portion of the proposed lot.	The street elevation type appears compatible.
Entrances	A central entrance is proposed facing Alice Street.	The entrance faces a principal street.
Building Height:	An overall height of 40'-2" is	No drawings were submitted

	proposed. Floor-to-floor heights: 8', 11+' and 10+'.	comparing the height with adjacent properties. The model appears to be inaccurate, the drawings are not scalable and no floor-to-floor comparison was given between the proposed building and the adjacent property.
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade		The five-bay proportion and proportion of height to width appear in scale for what is presented. However, it cannot be determined how it relates to the adjacent property.
Proportion of Openings	No dimensions given on the window openings.	
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	A five-bay-wide rhythm is proposed. There is a ground floor entry.	Ground floor entries should align with the windows above.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	It appears that the adjacent structure's stoop encroaches on the public right-of-way.	The site plan does not include the adjacent stoop. Again, the site plan does not appear to accurately reflect the siting of these two houses.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	See Rhythm of Structure on the street above.	
Scale	The elements of the design seem to be in scale with the overall height and mass. However, it is not clear how the scale relates to the adjacent and nearby historic structures.	The applicant has provided most of the materials listed on the check-list on Page 6 of the application. However, the dimensions to not appear accurate.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends a continuance to present of accurate drawings and a model, including a comparison of height with adjacent structures.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that a fireplace on the first floor level in the west wall elevation would be over the two garage doors, but there was no flue or chimney. He wanted to know if the three garage doors were roll-up or hinged.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Steve Conneff** stated he did the proposed drawings.

**Mr. Steffen** stated Staff had recommended a continuance due to insufficient information that was submitted.

**Mr. Conneff** said he would like to respond to Staff comments and continue with the process. He brought a drawing showing height comparisons to the adjacent building. He felt the information on the site was incorrect, and they had more room than what was shown on the site plan and the model. He wanted to verify it himself.

**Mr. Steffen** strongly recommended a continuance and to bring the petition back. He said it was extremely important that the mass models and drawings that were sent to the Board be accurate. Staff had indicated that some things may not be accurate, and Mr. Conneff was not sure it was accurate. The Board would have a hard time making a decision on it if the information was not correct.

**Ms. Martha Reardon** stated it looked some of the things they had submitted were not accurate, and asked for a continuance to the next meeting.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continued this petition to the February 14, 2007, meeting. Mr. Neely seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Amended Petition of Dawson Wissmach  
Architects  
W. Brooks Stillwell for Ivy Partners, LLC  
H-05-3494-2  
100 Block of West Bay Street  
Building F – Southeast Corner of Bay and  
Barnard Streets  
Demolition and Reconstruction**

Present for the petition was Mr. Brooks Stillwell and Mr. Neil Dawson.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to dismantle the existing building in order to repair the sinkholes and soil conditions caused by the adjacent excavations for the Ellis Square parking garage. It is proposed to subsequently erect a new internal structure and reattach the historic materials.

**FINDINGS:**

1. 121-123 West Bay Street was built in 1852 for George Jones. The structure is one of the oldest on Bay Street, with a handsome stone storefront similar to some on the Jones Ranges on River Street.
2. The interior was gutted to house printing equipment for the Savannah Morning News. However, the exterior walls remained intact and were incorporated into the plans for the redevelopment of the News Press Place. The Review Board approved the adaptive reuse of this building, as well as the addition of a penthouse (H-05-3493-2).
3. The architects, engineers, and contractors are concerned that if the existing walls are maintained by shoring along the lane and sidewalks of Barnard Street and Bay Street, the unstable soil conditions may result in a collapse of all or a portion of the walls. In their opinion, this would create a dangerous condition for the public, and

would destroy the building materials, and make renovation of the exterior much more problematic.

4. In order to resolve this problem, the architects and contractors propose to take down the existing walls while maintaining the materials, to build the new walls as had been previously approved, and then finally, to reconstruct the old walls using the old building materials in order to obtain the same appearance as had been previously approved by the Board of Review.

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

**Mr. Brooks Stillwell** stated he agreed with Staff concerning the soil conditions which were worse than what was anticipated when the project began. He stated he wanted to describe how the existing Certificate of Appropriateness contemplates how it was to be done, what they had asked to do, and he would have Mr. Neil Dawson discuss it further.

The existing Certificate of Appropriateness provided the petitioner would maintain the structural integrity of the three walls that were up today. They were planning to brace the three walls from the exterior, and build a completely new building on the inside that would be connected. He said it was an entirely new building that was being built on the site of the building being removed, but the only thing remaining of the existing building was the façade. The interior structural components which were the footings and everything were all new. The idea was to build a new building from the inside and essentially attach it to the old wall. Because of the problems with the soil they were concerned that if they proceed with the existing certificate and plans, they did not know if there were more voids in the soils around or under the building, and it was very difficult to tell. They were concerned that if they shore on the Barnard Street and Bay Street sides, that it was possible the building could collapse. If that were to happen, then the damage to the building components would obviously be worse than if they were to take them down and reconstruct them after the interior walls were built. That was the proposed alternative number two, as was indicated by Staff; to take down the existing structure, maintain the architectural components, rebuild a new wall from the inside, and reconstruct the exterior façade. He pointed out they were generally talking about the granite on the ground floor, and the brick work on the upper portions. The plans already provide for removal and replacement of all of the windows in the building, which was not an issue.

**Mr. Neil Dawson** showed pictures of Bay Lane. He said the other buildings were affected too. There were some significant holes that have opened up on Bay Lane on the east end toward Whitaker Street. However, Buildings A and C had excavated basements that go down about 15 feet, and there was not a lateral load when Bay Lane was excavated down ten feet. It was not getting close to the bottom of the foundations, and there was no lateral force that the buildings would exert once the soil was removed. The engineer felt confident that Buildings A and C, as long as they were monitored during the Bay Lane excavation, could be retained with no problem. Building F was described as just a shell. At some point in the past during the 60's or 70's, it was hollowed out to make a printing press room, and the walls were actually concrete block as displayed in the picture. The concrete block with a brick veneer was retained, and a two-story steel structure was placed inside. The basement was filled with rubble. They had routed down and found the basement was about nine feet deep. The problems in Bay Lane would require the City to excavate down about ten feet, and they were very concerned. He displayed a section drawing that was a synopsis of Building F, the concrete block, and the steel structure. The steel would be removed as part of the process, with a new concrete frame being inserted into it. All of the shoring that existed in the photographs of the steel would have to be removed in order to build the new building. Part of the problem was when the lagging was inserted for the parking garage wall, some of them were water-jetted into place, and the theory was that the water jetting may have caused erosion of the soil. There was a meeting with City

representatives and Batson-Cook, and no one knew where the sand went, but it was not there. He displayed pictures of the lane to see what they were dealing with. There were significant holes that went down about ten feet, and the power lines in the lane collapsed under their own weight because of the wash out. The power conduits collapsed and the lines had to be replaced. There were a number of similar holes up and down the lane, and it all came to everyone's attention after Thanksgiving. There had been a rush to get information together about some of the other holes using a ground penetrating radar. The ground penetrating radar was only accurate to depths of ten feet. Though they believe that ten feet may be the extent of the issue, it was a critical dimension for them because if it gets below ten feet, there would be a problem with the footing underneath the existing bearing wall. If it was washed out underneath, then it would be a serious problem, even right now with the building. The radar clearly showed there were washouts that go up to a wall, but they would not know how deep they were until they removed Bay Lane. Because the basement had been filled, there was a lateral thrust when the soil was removed. He said he hatched the picture to display voids or loosely consolidated soil. There was soil that probably did not have the bearing pressure they anticipated would be there, because it had probably washed down with water to the next lowest level. That created some minor settlement. Even if the building had not moved more than a quarter of an inch vertically, the potential once the soil was removed laterally would be significant. It was only held by the steel members, and they cannot be removed during construction. He asked the engineer, Tommy Haygood from Sarasota, Florida, with Jenkins-Sharland, one of the largest engineering firms in the southeast, and he produced two schemes. In scheme one, Mr. Haygood recommended a concrete beam at the bottom of Bay Lane once it was dug out, and shore back. Then it could be worked around to run new utilities. The scheme gives some idea that it was not a very practical solution for utility work to be done in the lane with the shoring in the way. They could not consider it as a viable option, and that they did not have an option on Bay Lane, but to take the wall down. It brings into question what to do with the other two walls. He thought it might be possible they could retain the walls on Barnard and Bay Streets. However, as Mr. Stillwell pointed out, it was a complex problem because it required shoring into the parking lane on Barnard and Bay Streets. The City was reluctant to grant approval to close the lanes because it would reduce parking and eliminate pedestrian traffic. Their preference, since they were just dealing with a layer of brick and granite, and there were only two historic elements left, they would like permission from the Board to disassemble them and reassemble them in their same configuration. One of the issues was public health and safety, and their concern was if they do the shoring and take out the steel on the inside, there was still the danger of collapse. Probably not into the public right-of-way, but possibly to the interior of the building, which would endanger some of the construction crews. They would, at that point, have two walls which would be more difficult to brace than a three-wall structure. The windows had been documented as non-historic, and were removed as part of the approved certificate. They would like to document the existing granite. Staff's concerns were valid because they would want to make sure the work was done in the proper manner with documentation. They suggest that they work with the contractor to develop a disassembly plan where the granite elements in particular can be numbered, photographed, documented, and stored in an appropriate manner. They would encourage the Board, if they wanted to assign it as a Staff duty, to review the disassembly plan, review the storage of the materials, and they would make it happen. It was as well as they could do to safeguard that they were trying to do the right thing. They would rather not be present at the meeting, but they were present because of a situation they did not create or control, and they would rather save the building. It had obvious value to the owners, and if they wanted to tear it down and build a six-story building, which they could have done by right, they would have presented it months ago when they first presented the project. He said he appreciated the Board's consideration and apologized for being present under a difficult situation with sketchy information on a short time frame, but it was due to the emergency nature of the holes.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if it was their intention for the building to have a basement.

**Mr. Dawson** said it would not.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the rubble would be stabilized, or if the current slab would be used.

**Mr. Dawson** stated he had a section of it in the engineering drawings. He said their intent was to dig down about five feet and put in a structural sub-base, and span it with a mat foundation.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they could retain the Bay Street elevation and one-third of the Barnard Street side because there was steel framework already in place. He thought it would be less expensive than salvaging the material and rebuilding. He understood they had to remove the south wall, but asked if they would consider his suggestion as an option.

**Mr. Dawson** stated the drawing would point out exactly what Mr. Meyerhoff was talking about. They would save the wall on Bay Street as described, and do a portion on Barnard Street wherever it would be deemed safe to cut the building. Their concern was that the steel currently supporting and giving lateral bracing to the structure had to be removed. All of the structure had to be pulled out in order for them to build a new building. It could not be shored from the interior, they would only be able to shore it from the exterior. It would require shoring well out into the parking lane to do it at an accurate angle.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated before they took the existing steel work in that wall out, they could put in the new columns that would go along Bay Street to support the new structure.

**Mr. Dawson** said it was initially what they intended to do, and the detail of the section through it with the new concrete slabs that would go into place along with the steel posts, it would essentially shore the building from the interior. He said he wasn't going to say they could not do it, but they have had a permit for several months, and one could imagine the interest payments on a project of an entire city block in multiple millions of dollars. They would like to get moving, and have had delays while waiting to find out what they would do with Bay Lane.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated they could not move forward until they determined what caused the potholes, which was described to him by a structural engineer.

**Mr. Dawson** stated he was curious to hear.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated since they had been continuously pumping water out of the hole of Crawford Square for 24 hours, what was happening was they were sucking the percolated water out from underneath the current walls, and the perimeter groundwork was collapsing on all four sides.

**Mr. Dawson** stated it was certainly an issue on Bay Lane and around to Barnard Street.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** suggested they run it by the structural engineers, and if they could, make an effort to save the Bay Street elevation and the corner, the Barnard Street elevation could easily be replaced. He thought it would be more costly, from every aspect, to take it down, store the materials, and build it back up.

**Mr. Dawson** stated they had talked it through a number of times with both the contractor and the engineers, and their thought was if there was only one wall of brick and granite left, that disassembly would allow them the opportunity to pour new footings. Instead of supporting the thick brick veneer wall on the existing structure, it would give them the opportunity to put in new foundations and a comprehensive design, and then reconstruct it in a way that would be



appropriate for a veneer that might be the brick, and it would have the same look and depth. It would not have the excess weight of the concrete block.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if there was the possibility that it could be discussed and then come back to the Board, or if they had to have a decision today.

**Mr. Dawson** said they needed an answer from the Board today. They needed to keep moving on the project.

**Mr. Stillwell** stated that Mr. Dawson described it well. It was theoretically possible they could save the Bay Street façade. The problem was there were no sure answers, because they would not know for sure what was out there until they get down into the lane, and they would not know about the wall if they were to shore it out into Bay Street. It would be possible that it might not work and the wall may collapse. If it collapsed, they would have a more difficult and dangerous situation that would delay the project further and not preserve the materials as well as they could preserve them by taking them down. It was true there was no absolute certain answer about what might work in this case. They know what they were proposing would work. He thought Mr. Meyerhoff was correct in that it would cost them more money than if they would try to shore it. However, if it did not work, then they would be in a mess. They did not want to try something they weren't sure would not work. A public safety issue that had not been discussed and was technically within the purview of the Historic Review Board, but was discussed at length with the City representatives was if they have to shore the wall out into Bay Street, the angle proposed on the shoring would come out. They would be forced to close the pedestrian access to the south side of Bay Street for a period in excess of a year during the whole construction project. What it means was the problems regarding pedestrians crossing Bay Street, and they did not want to do any more than they had to, if they could take it down and rebuild it from the inside as proposed, they would be able to build a covered walkway within the sidewalk of Bay Street. The south side of Bay Street would be closed for a period of time to pedestrian traffic, and it would be limited. That was not a factor they had considered, and that it would be a problem if they could not do it.

**Mr. Neely** stated it would be easier to understand how they could take the brick and marble down. He asked Mr. Stillwell to describe the issues involved in rebuilding it to try to achieve the same appearance that was there now like matching mortar, etc.

**Mr. Stillwell** said those were good points. Re-erecting the granite was somewhat technically challenging because it needed to be documented as to which piece goes where. They needed to be able to fit them back with the same tolerances and accuracies. In some instances, it would be easier because they would be working with a clean plumb and level concrete frame. In that sense, there would be something solid to rest upon, and he did not think the granite would be difficult as long as it was well documented. Part of what gives a brick building the character of a historic building was the modeled effect of the colors on the exterior. Even in the dim photograph he displayed the nuances of how the brick patina could be seen. This particular brick had a tight mortar joint also. All of these were things they want to document; even the natural hues and tones of the brick. They would probably be disassembled in sections so it could be documented that certain bricks were from certain areas. Some bricks were much redder and some were browner at the top from being exposed to different levels of pollutions. Those were things they would document and faithfully recreate a new building if they could. Their concern was having problems with cleaning the mortar and cracking of the brick, then they would have to find replacement brick which would be hard. Fortunately, they have the bricks that had been painted, and he thought there was enough salvage material from one wall to recreate the texture in patterns.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated he had visited the site and walked the lane. He had seen the sinkholes that were further to the east. He did not see any sinkholes behind the building. He understood from the radar the sinkholes were there under the Bay Lane wall, and did not hear any evidence, testimony, or see anything about voids or washouts along Barnard Street or Bay Street facades. He said he thought it was technically possible to stabilize the building through a number of methodologies, through the ones shown already, and through pumping grouting to fill in the sinkholes with concrete under pressure. He had seen it done on numerous historic buildings throughout the country. Looking on the south wall there was not that much fabric, and he could understand why it may be easier to take it down. They were not going to oppose removing the south wall and fixing the foundation for the reconstruction, but they were going to strenuously oppose taking down the Barnard Street and Bay Street façades. He thought it was unsound practice, it could be stabilized, it could be inconvenient to the public, and there had been a number of inconveniences to the public with the project already. Even with the reconstruction there would be inconveniences to the public. Pedestrians won't have access to Bay Street where the building was now missing. There would have to be walkways and closed off areas, and he did not think it was a factor. What was important and the Board's duty was to protect the historic character of the historic designated buildings in the Landmark District, and this was a very important one. He did not believe it would be possible to take the façade down, reconstruct it, and have it retain its original character, patina of age, the integrity of materials would be compromised, and there was absolutely no way to take the building apart without breakage. No one could stand up and say there was not going to be substantial breakage of the brick when taken down. He did not see any fault cracks within the building, and he did not measure it. He knows that granite under stress could actually bend and could start to have character that had been there 160 years. Stone could bend, and if they try to put back a plumb building, we may be back a year from now needing to replace the granite because it would not fit to the new building. He thought it was a dangerous path, they have seen many buildings disassembled with promises they would be put back, and he could not think of one he was happy within the City. He thought the Board was under a lot of pressure and stress to make a decision quickly without much study and evidence. He hoped the Board would encourage the petitioner, whom he did not doubt had the goodwill, interest, and good intentions. Everything they have done had been very high quality, but he thought it was a dangerous path, and that the Board would ask them to come back with a strategy or methodology of retaining the Barnard Street and Bay Street façades.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he fully agreed with Mr. McDonald. The sinkholes were around the perimeter of the Ellis Square excavation, and he did not think they would extend toward Bay Street. If they did, may God help us all regarding every building around the parking garage that was being constructed. He thought every effort should be made to retain the Bay Street elevation and down Barnard Street enough to get stabilization on the corner, and approve the demolition on the south wall, the southwest and the southeast corner. He believed the architects and engineers could find a way to stabilize the Bay Street wall. As Mr. McDonald stated, the Board was setting a precedent of tearing down an 1852 building and rebuilding, and it was not preservation. He began a motion that the Board urge the architects, engineers, and owners to study as quickly as possible, the preservation of the Bay Street and Barnard Street elevations, and allow them to demolish the south wall and southwest corner of the building.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he would try to recraft the motion, but he did not think the Board could make a motion to urge them to do anything. The Board had to give them approval or deny something.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he would make a motion that the Board did not urge, but recommend.

**Ms. Cathy Dunn (Ivy Partners)** stated they had spent eight to ten hours a day for months since the problem first started, after the parking lot closed down, and was working on the problem. They felt the sinkholes were created from the water being pumped into the lane. Batson and Cook had put tons and tons of sand into the sinkholes, and they cannot figure out where it was going. There was a theory that there were tunnels going from the old warehouses into the river. They do not know if the sand was getting into a tunnel and running into the river. Nobody seemed to know what was happening. They had talked to engineers, structural people, and anyone they could. The best solution for everything seemed to be to take the walls down to get a stable foundation to build on. They do not like the situation they were in, they did not create it, but they were in it. It was costing a lot of money for every day they wait. She asked the Board to consider...they would mark every brick. The wall was three bricks thick, and they could have more bricks than they needed to put back on the wall. She asked the Board to consider taking them down to move forward.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated Ms. Dunn was suggesting it become a brick veneer rather than going back to a brick wall as it currently was.

**Mr. Dawson** stated he did not believe it was except on the top level. He believed when the building was significantly remodeled in the 60's or 70's, that they stripped out most of the interior veneer and put in a CMU bearing wall on the interior going up two stories. The answer was they would do a brick veneer.

**Mr. Steffen** stated if Mr. Meyerhoff was going to make a motion, it needed to be a motion that was a proper motion to vote on.

**Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion to deny the demolition of the Bay Street elevation and the western corner of Barnard Street, approve the demolition of the south wall and the Barnard Street corner as suggested.**

**Mr. Steffen** stated he would ask Mr. Meyerhoff to add to the motion that the disassembly plan go to Staff. Mr. Dawson recommended and offered to the Board to let the disassembly plan and reports to come back to Staff on the part to be taken down. He thought it was an excellent idea.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the Board was approving the demolition, and he was not approving the demolition; he was denying it.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the motion was approving it on a good portion of it; on the Bay Lane portion.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated to approve it they did not need to save those bricks because they were going to rebuild it any way.

**Ms. Reiter** stated the motion should say to save the historic materials; the brick, the granite, and the brick on the Barnard Street side. Whether it stands up or falls down, the bricks needed to be saved either in place or carefully documented.

**Mr. Meyerhoff said the motion was to deny the demolition of the Bay Street elevation, approve the demolition of the south side of the building, and the Barnard Street western portion, and keynote the materials saved to be reused in the new construction.**

**Mr. Steffen** added it needed to be reviewed by Staff.

**Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion.**

**Mr. Steffen** said he did not support the motion because he thought the petitioners had presented a situation to the Board that demanded an immediate solution. As difficult as the solution was historically, he thought it was being forced on them by conditions created somewhere else. He wanted to make sure the motion that was made was properly made in the instance it passed.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that the petitioner had been studying it for eight months. The Board found out by letter last Friday; four days ago. The Board was being pressured to make a decision.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he did not want people to suggest that he helped craft the motion, and that he was supporting it. He was helping to craft the motion so it would be a proper motion to do what the Board wanted it to do.

**Mr. Stillwell** stated they had been working with the City and Batson-Cook, trying to figure out what the issues were regarding the settling around the garage. They were not aware of the sinkhole issues and the effect on the foundation until the past two weeks; around Thanksgiving.

**Mr. Steffen** stated there was a motion on the floor.

**Mr. Neely** asked the petitioner to comment on the solution because he had not heard the reaction to the proposed solution.

**Mr. Stillwell** stated it left the problem that he could not tell the Board it was impossible to do what Mr. Meyerhoff suggested. It may be possible, but there was a substantial risk that it would not work, and if it did not work, the result would be a lot worse for the historic condition of the building and for the progress of the project, then if they proceed in the way they outlined. They had carefully weighed the risks and rewards of the different options. They could not tell the Board that one or the other wasn't possible. They believe the risks of doing what Mr. Meyerhoff suggested outweigh the possible rewards. There was the substantial risk that it would not work, and if the wall was to collapse, it would not preserve the elements as well as they could be preserved in taking them down. They feel they could build a safer, sounder, and better structure doing it the way they had outlined. It was a tradeoff, and he was not suggesting it was the best. The best would be if they could have done it the way they wanted in the beginning, but given the risks of the soil conditions and other factors outlined, that the solution they were requesting was the best solution, and asked the Board to approve it.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** said if the risk of soil conditions was as big an issue on the Bay Street elevation of the building, then God help them all for the perimeter buildings around the Ellis Square excavation.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Hutchinson seconded Mr. Meyerhoff's motion and Mr. Neely voted for the motion. Dr. Johnson, Dr. Caplan, and Mr. Steffen voted against it. Dr. Watkins did not vote. Therefore, the motion was a tie and did not pass. Mr. Steffen entertained a new motion.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked how the Chairman could choose to vote when he could chose to vote. The vote was three to two and it was not tied. The Chairman breaks the tie.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the Chairman had the prerogative to vote any time he chooses, and the Chairman decided not to vote in the interest to appear impartial. When the vote was close enough to where the Chairman's vote would create a tie or decide the question, then the Chair was encouraged to vote. He was voting because he believed the particular motion was not well-founded and he voted against it. It was tied and, therefore, failed.

**Mr. Neely** asked if Roberts Rules said it was tied then the motion failed.

**Mr. Steffen** answered yes, but he would entertain a new motion.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that Mr. Dawson and his group had studied this problem for months. The Board was looking at it in a matter of hours, and it was difficult to second guess on what was right and wrong. The Board had to depend upon the best judgment. The petitioner had worked hard to come up with an answer, and it may cost more money to do it. He thought the Board's procrastination or denial would cost more delay of the project which was already delayed. No one liked taking the building down, and everyone was concerned that it would not be put up properly. There had to be certain safeguards and a decision made to the best approach. To him, he could not second guess what the gentlemen had spent weeks doing. Therefore, he voted against the motion because he thought they had the best interest of the community at heart, and were trying to find the best answer.

**Mr. Steffen** stated there still needed to be a motion on the floor to get the majority of votes of the Board.

**Mr. Neely** said given the circumstances the project needed a response and the Board needed to make a decision. He would approve the demolition of the entire building subject to a detailed demolition plan being submitted to Staff, and the plan being reviewed in its implementation weekly, if not more often, to address the storage and maintenance of the materials, and to assist in the supervision and accurate reconstruction of the building when that occurs.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he wanted to reiterate that they were the Preservation Board and not the rebuilding Board. Approving the rebuilding of a building built in 1852, that in part could be saved, was the wrong thing for the Historic Preservation Board to do.

**Mr. Stillwell** asked if it was appropriate to hear from the public.

**Mr. Steffen** stated they had been out of order because of the nature of the project. It was an unusual project that had come before the Board on very short notice, and he was allowing the bending of the rules of discussion.

**Mr. McDonald** said for the Bay Street façade that it was extremely dangerous to take the façade down. They had not heard any evidence that there was any danger to the façade eminently collapsing, and none put forth. All they heard was that it would be easier on the petitioner, and he asked the Board to think long and hard before it was allowed, and to take responsibility for how it would look. If the Board approved it and it looked differently, and it looked like a new building just like the other modern hotel buildings along Bay Street, then the Board would be responsible for a long time for the erosion of character along Bay Street. That was a very legitimate concern. There would be breakage of the brick because it was only one layer thick, and even if it were three, that was a face brick on the building. The second and third layers of brick that were on the Barnard Street façade cannot be used as face brick. A fill brick was used for the second and third layers, and it would look different. There was no way to tear the building down without losing at least 15 to 20 percent of the brick from loss. He asked the Board to please save the Bay Street façade.

**Mr. Steffen** stated depending on how the vote came out, there may be a third solution to this.

**Mr. Meyer** asked what the motion was.

Mr. Steffen stated the motion was to allow the demolition of the project on the condition that the disassembly plan be submitted to Staff and updated on a weekly basis, and Staff would have input into the plan.

Mr. Neely added including the reconstruction plan.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for demolition and reconstruction with the following conditions:

1. A detailed disassembly plan shall be submitted and approved by Staff.
2. The historic materials including brick, brownstone lintels and sills, and stone storefront shall be saved and stored in a protected location.
3. The disassembly and reconstruction shall be supervised on a regular interval (no greater than weekly) by Staff.

Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and Dr. Johnson voted for the motion. Mr. Hutchinson and Mr. Meyerhoff were opposed. Mr. Watkins and Mr. Steffen abstained. The motion passed three-to-two.

**RE: STAFF REVIEWS**

1. Petition of BMW Architects  
Bryce Bounds  
H-06-3724(S)-2  
212 East Jones Street  
Partial Demolition  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
2. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products, Inc.  
Jeff Bradtmiller  
H-06-3737(S)-2  
201 West Bay Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
3. Petition of Suzanne Inman  
H-06-3738(S)-2  
14 East Jones Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
4. Petition of D & D Signs  
H-06-3739(S)-2  
720 West Oglethorpe Avenue  
Color Change/Sign  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

5. Petition of Stewart Putman  
H-06-3742(S)-2  
309 West Julian Street, Unit 12  
Awning/Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
6. Petition of Jan de Voest for  
Lady & Sons Restaurant  
H-06-3743(S)-2  
108 West Congress Street  
Awning/Window Replacement  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
7. Petition of Ed Yannett for  
Vision Equity  
H-06-3744(S)-2  
503 Hartridge Street  
Windows and Doors  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
8. Petition of BMW Architects  
Bryce Bounds  
H-06-3745(S)-2  
212 East Jones Street  
Siding Replacement  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
9. Petition of Clark Creative  
Cari Clark  
H-06-3748(S)-2  
513 – 517 East Gordon Street  
Color/Shutters  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
10. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
Jeff Bradtmiller  
H-06-3754(S)-2  
42 Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
11. Petition of R. K. Construction & Development Co.  
H-06-3755(S)-2  
220 West Bay Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
12. Petition of William Carroll  
H-06-3756(S)-2  
528 East Jones Street  
Alteration  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

**G. MINUTES**

Approval of Minutes - December 13, 2006  
Approval of Minutes – January 10, 2007

**H. OTHER BUSINESS**

**Mr. Steffen** welcomed the Preservation Interns, Marisa Gomez from Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD), and Brian Carney from Armstrong Atlantic State University (AASU). He then introduced Dr. Malik Watkins, who was appointed to the Board, and mentioned two additional members who would join the Board at the next meeting. He understood that City Council would appoint additional members prior to the next meeting. The Board would be having a retreat in the future, and he asked the Board if they could arrive a half-hour early to the next meeting to work with the new Board members and to help them familiarize themselves informally with the rules and what they do. He was not requiring their attendance, and asked the Board to arrive by 1:30 p.m.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that on Saturday, February 17, 2007, as part of the Daffin Park 100<sup>th</sup> Birthday celebration, there would be a tour of Daffin Park with the dialogue written by Ms. Reiter and Ms. Harris. Ms. Reiter would be conducting the tour along with Ms. Ward. She invited the Board to take part in the festivities.

**I. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

**J. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**K. ADJOURNMENT**

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

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp